



AGENDA V1.1

What: BiodiverCity Advisory Committee

When: 13 July 2016
5:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Where: Heritage Boardroom, 6th floor
Calgary Public Building
205 - 8th Ave SE

Contact: Alex Kent (Chair)
416-528-0986
akentecology@gmail.com

Steven Snell (Admin rep)
403-268-3527
steven.snell@calgary.ca

Item	Who	Duration	Action
1 Carry over agenda items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve previous minutes Open floor for committee member announcements 	Alex	10 mins	(Information)
2 Biodiversity Implementation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 minute Presentation 15 minute Q & A 	Angie Arrau	45 mins	(Information)
3 Natural Area Mgmt Plan/IPM - revision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open discussion 	Steven/Chris	45 mins	(Information)
4 Updates from subcommittees and work plan update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information from subcommittee reps Update on the business unit survey Discuss list of potential 3rd party partners Chair and Vice Chair updates for next year Open floor discussion 	Laura/Alex	20 mins	(information/decision)

Minutes approved

Urban Conservation re-org

- A year ago, IPM joined
- Still working on how to be strategic all together
- BAC is part of that strategy

This is Alex's last meeting to move to Toronto and will be stepping down as chair



Applications have been received for new BAC members

- Chair and Vice Chair will go through applications and then City Clerks will review
- May need to elect a new Chair as Steven needs to check with City Clerks
- Laura will be Acting Chair, Chris can be Acting Vice Chair

Angie presentation

- The implementation plan will help organize initiatives outlined in the strategic plan.
- Angie shared a handout to guide the review of the draft BiodiverCity Implementation Plan that Steven circulated to BAC on Monday – two week deadline was given for response.
- Angie reviewed other cities and pulled the best components of their implementation plans. Other cities have included their implementation plans with their strategy documents, but Our BiodiverCity is a standalone policy document, so a separate implementation plan is required.
- Discussion on BAC coming to understand the timing of this draft plan:
 - The implementation plan is for the department and does not need to be approved by another team or council
 - Review deadline can be adjusted if needed based on BAC availability
 - This is the first of a number of drafts...BAC will be kept informed
- Chris envisions coming to BAC with trends and analysis from database (build is underway) to interpret trends
- Angie is looking for BAC feedback on:
 - Terms and definitions
 - indicators and targets,
 - are any sections missing from a biodiversity action plan?,
 - Next BAC meeting is in September
 - Angie can collate BAC comments and come back in September with 'this is what we heard' for further discussion with BAC
 - Opportunity for BAC workshop on this with HCR in the fall??
- Alex: how will measurements work on ecological timelines that are longer than 10 year plan (e.g. if project starts in year 6)?
 - Angie: this implementation plans is focused on the 10 years, could include strategy for how to consider past 10 years in this document, or in a different document...
- Angie: trying to tie existing performance measures that staff are already collecting into this reporting
 - Data collection is determined by annual budgets on 3 year time cycles
 - Implementation plan would be living document and would change with budget cycles
- Chris: implementation plan would be a public document – need to manage the level of technical information in public document
- BAC is not specifically referenced in the implementation plan
 - BAC's existence beyond the 10 year strategic plan is contained within the ToR, which can be reviewed 'at the committee's will'.
 - The biodiversity policy exists...the 10 year strategic plan is just a manageable amount of time...could review and extend in year 8, etc...would give the advice to Council that a forward looking strat plan was still needed
 - E.g. NAMP from 1994 is still referred to



- Discussion on complexity of measurements – increased complexity can complicate communication (internally and externally) and management of data and reporting. Will need to consider what is truly required to report on the strategy.
 - City has corporate standard for project management, which these performance measures would want to align with.
 - Evaluating existing performance measures to see if they are still needed
 - Geoff asked whether BAC could be informed about existing performance measures – Chris will coordinate this
 - **Steven:** LAB intends for measurements to be at initiative level...however, measures likely shouldn't be created until the initiative is started
 - Biodiversity is long term and complex...measurements are not as easy...may be good to choose a few leading indicators
- Natasha: RBA (results based accountability) is the new way the city is reporting on performance measurements
 - Angie to look into this to align with reporting
 - RBA could be used to help communicate value of implementation plan to the public – RBA has its own specific language
- Steven to Natasha: is there a current implementation plan for the riparian strategy
 - There are 1-2 indicators for each procedure in riparian strategy and it is being aligned with RBA
 - Trying to keep the indicators simple to make it publicly oriented
- **Rob: document should also recognize that there are other items important to biodiversity that aren't** covered in the top three focusses on size, fragmentation and invasive species
 - Discussion on how 'textbook' top 3 pressures to biodiversity are typically considered globally; however, an urban lens may need to be applied for the city context.
 - Could draw on the Singapore Index metrics (although some wouldn't apply in a First World context)
 - Understand that the city has available data and some reporting can be easy to do and it is important to use and understand that data better
 - It will also be important to ensure there are direct measurements as well as indirect biodiversity measurements.
 - Want to ensure that readers of the document don't incorrectly get the impression that no other aspects of biodiversity are important.

NAMP (1994) and IPMP (1998)

- 6 slide Presentation by Chris and Steven in lieu of Chris not being able to make the conservation subcommittee meeting on Monday evening
- Urban Conservation will be reviewing these two plans in tandem
- Question: how is timing going to work between implementation plan and NAMP/IPMP reviews
- Revisions will focus on what policy/strategy document is, excluding implementation plan
 - This is a reflection of change in administration practice in recent years at city: policy taken to Council for approval, implementation plan kept at administration level
 - This allows flexibility and improvements to program to be made without requiring Council approval as part of process
- MDP has inherited key policies out of NAMP: e.g. building setback on escarpments (visual but used for corridor protection)



- Analysis of gaps and policies will be if things live satisfactory in other policies or is more policy needed?
- Existing business unit tools e.g., habitat restoration project framework, urban wildlife strategy program, weed app to map invasives
- NAMP is a mix of policy and specs, starts with public opinion survey results
 - IPMP is also really a land management tool; a subset of NAMP, but one that applies to the whole city
- Urban Ecosystem Management Plan is envisioned to be an asset-level approach to natural areas management with strategies for a city wide ecosystem approach to biodiversity conservation (includes NAMP, IPMP and other current policies and practices). This means that while the focus will be on the urban park asset, there is the recognition that parks can't be managed on their own, and other City assets, such as transportation corridors also need strategies on how to manage biodiversity.
 - Want to be able to apply HCR, park-specific management plans with long term multi decadal visions on outcomes
 - Feedback solicited on proposed title of new document: Urban Ecosystem Management Plan
- Suggestion to provide feedback according to NAMP ToC with comments such as 'update, keep, supplement, delete' with direction for whether components should be moved into policy or implementation document
- Question: how does this fit into urban parks master plan, Inglewood bird sanctuary master plan, bowmont natural area management plan, etc
 - Would need to decide how these plans fit with new proposed plan document (UEMP)
 - Wouldn't necessarily revise these master plans as that would be a separate process. Newer policy should reference existing plans and rescind/enhance components, where appropriate.
- Discussion how at this time, there may be no more true natural areas and we may be transitioning to managing urban ecosystems: what is interpreted as nature in the city?
 - Definition of urban ecosystem may inform/shift targets and measurements for biodiversity
 - Risk would be defining urban ecosystem generically such that all development fit within that definition: important to not lose sight of the pinnacle value of true native ecosystems
- Proposed UEMP content
 - Principles, procedures, priority setting
 - Regulatory compliance statements
 - Benchmarks
 - Standards
- UEMP would also include/overlap wetland management plan, riparian strategy, urban wildlife strategy, etc
- BAC to review NAMP and flag what isn't in other policy that should move to UEMP
 - Chris/Steven to provide gap analysis or concordance table to BAC to guide what is already covered in MDP, etc so that BAC can focus literature review on policies and plans highlighted (e.g. to give feedback on whether NAMP principles are adequately covered in other plans/policies)
- UEMP seems to move in the direction of 'rights of the environment'
- Potential existing gaps: ecosystem services, people management (carrying capacity), original NAMP discussed what Calgarians perceived as receiving from natural areas, but maybe what is needed is what Calgarians need from the natural areas.



- BAC to review proposed UEMP content and comment on whether any other content/structure is needed
 - E.g., climate change isn't specifically covered...a climate change plan is under development, new UEMP could speak to ecosystem resiliency
- BAC to provide input on project scoping, research, literature review and best practices in asset management to develop content areas, outreach to researchers, etc.

Subcommittee Updates – Conservation

- Met this week to discuss NAMP
- Geoff has circulated comments by email
- Some discussion on the draft implementation plan, as discussed above
- Discussion that policies this committee has discussed is always discretionary; requirements would need to be made into by-laws

Literacy Subcommittee Update

- City has communication plans for next year
 - Will engage and participate
- Review and comment group list that was sent out with the agenda

Common discussion at both subcommittees

- BAC has done a lot of organizational work
- Today's discussion emphasizes that planning is long term work
- What is role of BAC in commenting on City decisions? (e.g. Bend in the Bow)
 - May need to have discussion on BAC function and ability to discuss whether City decisions have represented biodiversity
 - Would BAC be invited to stakeholder consultations? (similar to a lot of the work that river valleys committee did)
 - Providing feedback to Council is part of ToR under strategic advice (e.g. use annual report to comment on e.g. Bend in the Bow decision)...and/or BAC and review and amend ToR
- BAC members are looking for opportunities to make meaningful contributions – implementation plan and UEMP are going to be good opportunities
- Recognize that progress is being made with each meeting
- For consideration next time: missed opportunity to link to more biodiversity with goat project and direct reference to biodiversity strategic plan as part of goats

Business Unit survey – still with Katie

Other items

- Is there a way to recognize some activity in the city on how to recognize something done in the City to recognize biodiversity
 - E.g. chair to send message to the artists and the monastery that this links to the biodiversity strategic plan
 - This could go to Sarah Illy – Manager of public art
-