



**PUBLIC AGENDA  
SASKATOON ENVIRONMENTAL  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, June 11, 2015, 11:30 a.m.  
Committee Room A, Second Floor, City Hall  
Committee Members:**

**Dr. M. Hill, Chair  
Ms. K. Aikens, Vice-Chair  
Councillor M. Loewen  
Ms. N. Kochar  
Ms. A. Bugg  
Dr. D. McGrane  
Dr. S. Moshiri  
Mr. S. Homenick  
Ms. A. Garg  
Mr. B. Sawatzky  
Mr. B. Latimer**

**Pages**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

**Recommendation**

That the agenda be approved as presented.

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**Recommendation**

That the minutes of Regular Meeting of the Saskatoon Environmental Advisory Committee held on May 7, 2015 be adopted.

**4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**5. REPORT OF THE CHAIR (File No. CK. 175-9)**

*Verbal Update - M. Hill*

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**6. COMMUNICATIONS**

**6.1 Dark Sky Policy (File No. CK. 6300-1)**

4 - 7

*Presentation - R. Huziak, Saskatchewan Light Pollution Abatement Committee*

Attached for the Committee's information is a letter in regards to the above-noted matter.

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**7. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATION**

**7.1 Dark Sky Lighting Policy (File No. CK.6300-1)**

8 - 10

*Verbal Update - D. Dawson, Manager, Development Review, Community Services*

Attached for the Committee's information is a memo in regards to the above-noted matter.

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**7.2 Environmental and Corporate Initiatives Update (File No. CK. 7550-1)**

*Verbal Update - B. Wallace*

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**8. EVENT SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE (File No. CK. 175-9)**

11 - 11

*Verbal Update*

Attached for the Committee's information is an update in regards to the above-noted matter.

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**9. STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES (File CK. No. 1704-5)**

12 - 12

Attached is a current Statement of Expenditures.

**Recommendation**

That the information be received.

**10. 2016 PROPOSED BUDGET (File No. CK. 1704-5)**

The Committee is requested to put forward a proposed budget submission for 2016 for inclusion in the 2016 Operating Budget Review. For the Committee's information the following is the budget from 2015:

\$100 Publications/Reports

\$6,000 Public Education, Information Gathering

\$500 Conferences/Workshops

\$200 Membership Fees

Total: \$6,800

**Recommendation**

That the direction of the Committee issue.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

February 5, 2015

**Saskatchewan Light Pollution Abatement Committee**  
c/o RASC Saskatoon  
PO Box 317, RPO University  
Saskatoon, SK S7N 4J8

**Saskatoon Environmental Advisory Committee**  
c/o City Hall  
222 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue North  
Saskatoon, SK S7K 0J5

**Re: Dark-sky Policy File CK 6300-1**



Dear SEAC Committee,

This letter is to inform you of my complaint to Councilor Charlie Clark regarding the proposal by the City and the *Business Improvement Districts* committee to extend decorative lighting until March 20. (Ref: Files CK. 6300-1 and WT. 6305-1). I have included my original (Jan. 12) e-mail to Councilor Clark at the end of this letter for your reference.

However, what has been publicly reported in the newspapers understates the proposal by Councilor Clark and *BIDs*. The extended decorative light trial this year goes until March 20, but the real cost is not \$200 for electric bills, but also includes some portion of \$6800 for included maintenance as stated by Jeff Jorgenson (Transportation & Utilities) in his report.

The Inquiry document goes on to state that “*partnering opportunities*” should be looked at and that “*Year-round lighting opportunities will also be discussed with an aim to improve the streetscaping of major roadways. Administration will advise the BIDs of City Council’s resolution for this report and will work with them to explore future decorative lighting opportunities.*”

This is ***no longer*** Broadway and Third Avenue but is destined to become a hundred times larger and a major source of light pollution emanating from all over the city. The lighting being discussed is unlikely to be able to be chosen to reduce or eliminate light pollution, and is in such quantity that it will be a major user of electricity. The project will also become so big so fast that the *Dark-sky Policy* will not be able to scale it back once deployed.

Councilor Lorje also publicly stated (*Councillors support extended decorative lighting, Star Phoenix, Jan. 12*) “*With the advances in LED lighting, there’s a whole range of opportunities that could be looked at.*” This is completely wrong thinking that has the potential of reversing any gain that the City will receive by going to operationally less-expensive LED lighting! We shouldn’t consume more because it costs less! (*See the attached email for the most recent study on this phenomenon.*)

To be clear, I am not objecting to the lights themselves if they can be made it comply with the *Dark-sky Policy* in not producing light pollution or its side effects, but I am objecting to what appears to be no overall policy for GHG reduction in the City. With a cohesive *GHG Plan* and *Environmental Protection Plan*, ***if you want to add energy for lighting for some new purpose, you have to find a way to reduce more from somewhere else so that your GHG budget reduces.*** Nowhere in the *BIDs* proposal do I see any justification or plan towards this end. So *BIDs* wants more lighting but no architectural controls are

being imposed, nor are they under any obligation to reduce GHG emissions as part of a city-wide plan. This just isn't right.

In October, the *Northeast Swalewatchers* made a presentation to the *Meewasin Valley Authority* Board of Directors strongly suggesting that the design of the Swale “park” be such that floral and faunal health be the driving decision for any development, and in January, *Swalewatchers* and the *Saskatchewan LPA Committee* proposed to Alan Otterbein (MVA) that the Northeast Swale should consider becoming certified as a *Nocturnal Preserve* (under the RASC NP program.) Our major concern is that nighttime has to be preserved for the health of the flora and fauna, and this implies that a bylaw change is necessary to place architectural controls on properties in the immediate vicinity of the Swale. Again, this is necessary to pursue because the envisioned *Dark-sky Policy* will (currently) only apply to City infrastructure, and not residential, business or industrial lighting, and the *Wetland Policy* is only partly completed and does not contain provisions that could protect darkness. Unshielded lighting and the Decorative Lighting initiative both have huge implications for the ability to retain darkness within the Swale.

In addition to the Decorative Lighting initiative, I have also investigated the *Façade Improvement Policy* (C09-040) that encourages renewal of façade structures and encourages “upgrades” to outdoor lighting, but imposes no architectural controls on the type of lighting and there is no requirement for energy efficiency nor environmental protection . Façade lighting is often interpreted as decorative “acorn or globe period lighting”, contrary to the recommendations of the *Dark-sky Policy*.

Some good news is that last week, the City of Vancouver council unanimously adopted a resolution to begin addressing their light pollution issues. This brings them in line with other Western Canadian cities and areas that are now addressing light pollution, including Victoria, Edmonton, Calgary, Canmore, Banff, Jasper National Park, Elk Island National Park, County of Strathmore Alberta, Cypress Hills Interprovincial Park, Grasslands National Park and Saskatoon.

Sincerely,



Richard Huziak  
Saskatchewan LPA Committee  
<[rickhuziak@shaw.ca](mailto:rickhuziak@shaw.ca)>  
tel: daytime 306-933-1676  
tel: evening 306-665-3392

---

**From:** Richard Huziak [[rickhuziak@shaw.ca](mailto:rickhuziak@shaw.ca)]  
**Sent:** January 12, 2015 10:33 AM  
**To:** Clark, Charlie (City Councillor); Wallace, Brenda (CP - Environmental & Corporate Initiatives); Loewen, Mairin (City Councillor); Hill, Darren (City Councillor); Lorje, Pat (City Councillor); Paulsen, Tiffany (City Councillor); Jeffries, Zach (City Councillor)

**Cc:** Michael Hill - SEAC

**Subject:** Christmas Streetlight Expansion - IMPORTANT information for today's meeting.

Councilor Clark et al.,

I was astounded hearing that Councilor Clark has suggested extending the duration of use of Christmas lighting decorations from January 15 until March 20.  
<http://www.thestarphoenix.com/news/Councillor+prepared+keep+lights/10718026/story.html>

Despite being branded as Scrooge, I feel I must reject the proposal and urge all others to do the same.

This proposal is so wrong on so many levels.

-this change is currently proposed for the Downtown, Broadway and Third Avenue business areas that are already over-lit and more light energy is to be added? It is not unreasonable for all other business districts to request equal treatment, increasing the use of light energy across the City in contradiction to the principles of the City's GHG Policy.

- keeping lights on after everyone has gone home after business closing just wastes power. (As a matter of fact, by definition, all decorative lighting wastes power, since decoration is not utility, so decorative energy should be minimized.) So is part of a mitigation process to be that these light go off after businesses close?

- by contributing personal money to the project to affect the take-down schedule, you demonstrate once again that \*if you can afford it, it is okay to waste energy\*, the typical justification that undermines progress in GHG reduction.

- and it is not the cost of operation, it is the principle and precedent this sets.

Of course businesses will agree to keep lighting on! There are many reasons for this, including light being seen (by business) as a measure of \*progress and commerce\* and that LED lighting is now cheaper, so, in spite of some marginal awareness of the effect of power use on GHG emissions, more lights are being used as the cost decreases! This is completely counter to new technologies being created to use less power! As our population grows nationwide at 3% per year, lighting is growing at 7% per year.

A study released in December by NASA from results of the NASA SUOMI-NPP satellite mission shows that during festive seasons (Christmas, Ramadan, etc.) the amount of outdoor energy use (lighting) \*increases\* by 20% to 50%! This should be a wake-up call!

<http://www.space.com/28036-holiday-lights-from-space-satellite-photos.html>  
[http://www.nasa.gov/mission\\_pages/NPP/news/earth-at-night.html](http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/NPP/news/earth-at-night.html)

If the City actually cared about the policies they have enacted, such as the Green House Gas Reduction Policy and the Dark Sky (Responsible Community Lighting) Policy then you should be calling for a \*reduction\* in how long the lights are up and powered, either in calendar length or nightly duration (by turning them off after a specific time of the night) in order to save energy and reduce GHG emissions.

From the Inquiry by Councilor Clark,

[http://www.saskatoon.ca/DEPARTMENTS/City%20Clerks%20Office/Boards%20and%20Committees/agendasandminutes/Documents/agendas\\_2015/a\\_eu\\_120115.pdf](http://www.saskatoon.ca/DEPARTMENTS/City%20Clerks%20Office/Boards%20and%20Committees/agendasandminutes/Documents/agendas_2015/a_eu_120115.pdf)

*[This link has now moved due to the new City Website launch.]*

the Inquiry further goes on to state that there is a "*consensus that it would be beneficial to extend the duration further into the winter season.*" Exactly what is the \*measurable benefit\* to this program? How are you certain this can help the City in any way? This is clearly and simply a marketing idea from the Business Improvement Districts, again with no architectural controls imposed by the City to meet the GHG Policy. Why hasn't BIDs heard of the GHG program?

Although the question asked is way too broad, an informal poll taken by CKOM radio shows that 86% of people are \*against\* keeping the lights up longer.  
<http://www.ckom.com/poll/should-saskatoon-s-christmas-lights-stay-until-end-march/476103>

The City Inquiry report goes on even further to suggest expansion of decoration street lighting (in areas that already have excessive, energy-wasteful streetlights), and that this should be looked at more for even greater decorative lighting opportunities! (read *energy-consumption opportunities!*) The Impact section of the Inquiry report also indicates there are no policy implications. What?? The report itself states that the GHG policy is affected. This in itself is reason enough for total rejection of this idea! Beautify the City in some other way that does not increase energy use! Show the world the beauty of a responsible city that considers conservation, sustainability, environmental stewardship and leadership as their guiding principles!

As councilors, your jobs are to evaluate all proposals against their effect on the policies to see if they comply or not. You cannot willy-nilly pick and choose how you will ignore policies for "feel-good" reasons without any proven benefit! The City needs to be looking at ways to \*reduce\* energy consumption - not expand it!

Geez!  
Richard Huziak  
Saskatchewan LPA Committee  
<[rickhuziak@shaw.ca](mailto:rickhuziak@shaw.ca)>  
tel: day 306-933-1676  
tel: eve 306-665-3392

**Community Services Department  
Planning and Development Division**

To: Saskatoon Environmental Advisory Committee      Date: June 2, 2015

Phone:

Our File:

From: Darryl Dawson, Manager  
Development Review Section

Your File:

**Re: Current Civic Regulations and Guidelines that Pertain to Outdoor Lighting**

At the November 13, 2014 meeting of the Saskatoon Environmental Advisory Committee, the Committee requested:

- “1. That Development Review Section Manager provide, in the first quarter of 2015, an analysis of the current bylaws affecting outdoor lighting; as well as information on Dark Sky compliance and explain how it can be achieved in new neighborhoods, as discussed at the meeting; and
2. That the draft *“Responsible Outdoor Lighting Policy”* be received as information for future use by the Committee.”

The purpose of this memo is to outline Civic Bylaws and guidelines that are currently in place that pertain to outdoor lighting. I will be attending the June 11, 2015 meeting to review this information with the Committee.

Zoning Bylaw No. 8770

The Planning and Development Division is responsible for administering Zoning Bylaw No. 8700 (Zoning Bylaw). The Zoning Bylaw regulates the development and use of land within the City and implements the Policies contained in the City of Saskatoon’s Official Community Plan. Regulations for outdoor lighting are primarily contained in Section 5 – General Regulations and the in the Sign Regulations (Appendix A to the Zoning Bylaw).

Section 5.4 of the Zoning Bylaw states that Outdoor lighting for all developments shall be located and arranged so that no direct rays of light are pointed at nearby properties, or interfere with the safe operation of nearby roadways or traffic control devices. The Transportation and Utilities Department are consulted when necessary to ensure lights do not interfere with the safe operation of nearby roadways or traffic control devices.



There are no provisions in the Zoning Bylaw regulating the type of light fixture or prescribing a specific 'brightness' of a light.

Provisions in the Sign Regulations prohibit flashing images or flashing light on any sign, including digital billboards or electronic message centres. The Sign Regulations also requires digital billboards and electronic message centres to contain a dimmer switch and must be adjusted in accordance with any direction given by the Development Officer. Transportation and Utilities Department are consulted when necessary to ensure signs (and lighting of signs) do not interfere with the safe operation of nearby roadways or traffic control devices.

### Building Code

Building Standards Division issues building permits and administers inspection programs related to regulations contained in the Building Bylaw No. 7306 (Building Bylaw), the Uniform Building and Accessibility Standards Act (UBASA) and the National Building Code of Canada(NBC). The Building Bylaw, along with UBASA and the NBC, address the construction of buildings as it pertains to life safety. The NBC provides requirements for lighting and emergency power systems within buildings. These requirements address minimum lighting levels for specified areas within buildings in order to ensure life safety. The NBC does not address light pollution or the design of spaces outside of the building.

The building bylaw does contain requirements for the construction of signs; however, the requirements do not address lighting of signs.

### The Temporary Sign Bylaw No. 7491

The Temporary Sign Bylaw No. 7491 regulates the placing of temporary signs on streets and municipal buffer strips. Section 6(a) of this Bylaw prohibits temporary signs which are flashing, rotating, animated, illuminated or contain moving lights or other electrical features on all streets and buffer strips.

### Saskatoon Light and Power

Saskatoon Light & Power owns and maintains approximately 24,000 street lights. The majority are high pressure sodium (orange/yellow light), some areas have metal halide (white with a hint of blue).

Roadway lighting allows timely, accurate and safe visibility at night. This:

- Allows for the safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians;
- Reduces night time accidents;
- Raises a sense of personal security; and,
- Encourages the night time use of the area.

Roadway and pathway lighting is designed to meet the Illumination Engineering Society of North America Guidelines (IES RP-8-00 and DG-5-94). These guidelines establish appropriate lighting levels and uniformity of lighting for a given class and operational characteristics of a roadway.

Saskatoon Light & Power is installing LED (light emitting diode) lighting in new areas of the City. The fixtures use approximately 60% less energy than high pressure sodium (HPS) and significantly reduce the amount of light shining onto private property. A colour temperature of 4100K has been selected for the LED fixtures.

DD:dd

## **SEAC Event Sustainability Subcommittee Update:**

The Festival and Event Subcommittee met on May 26<sup>th</sup> to discuss next steps on SEAC's festival and event portfolio. New direction was sought to replace the festival waste audit research that was conducted last year, but not carried forward into this summer.

The subcommittee puts forth the following recommendations:

- The subcommittee work with the Leisure Services Department to include a provision for those seeking special event permits to demonstrate their plans for waste management.
  - Aim for the 2016 permitting process (which begins October 2015).
  - At least for the first year, organizers plans should include:
    - What are their waste outputs, and how are they being handled (garbage/ recycling/ composting)
    - Procurement practices
    - Minimization efforts
    - A feedback mechanism for organizers to share their plans for the future, and where they might need help in the future.
  - The decision by Leisure Services to grant the permits will be dependent on organizers submitting a complete plan, not on the content of the plan.
  - This information is to be shared between Leisure Services and the Environmental and Corporate Initiatives Department, who will also share the consolidated information with SEAC.
- The subcommittee work with the Environmental and Corporate Initiatives Department to assess what further information can be gained on festival and events through the Department's Let's Roll Recycling summer students.

