

Capital Regional District Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Summary of Public Input 2010 - 2016

2010

In 2010 the CRD moved to reduce overall project costs by adopting a single centralized treatment plant at McLoughlin Point. Public input was sought regarding plant design and mitigation.

Two open houses were held in July 6 and 8 2010 to provide information on the chosen treatment system, and to seek feedback and suggestions on mitigation and community benefits.

155 residents attended the information open houses, 63 completed feedback forms were received and 11 submissions were submitted on-line.

Key themes arising from the input were:

- Concerns regarding the lack of public consultation prior to decision being made
- Concerns regarding odours
- Concerns regarding trucking and noise
- Concerns regarding the appearance of the facility
- Concern over the lack of long term planning and constraints of the site for future growth
- Concerns regarding the overall cost of the treatment facility and impacts to taxpayers, specifically Esquimalt residents and loss of property values
- Request for resource recovery/new technologies to be integrated in the facility
- Request for involvement in future public consultation processes
- Request for the facility to be aesthetically designed and integrated into the public space

2013

In June 2013, eight open houses were held to determine the degree of public support for the two candidate sites for the BioSolids Energy Centre. 689 responses were received, with 61% favouring Hartland, 14% favouring Viewfield, and 24% neither or no response.

The comments and correspondence indicated that most of those participating in the consultation did not perceive that potential benefit in economic or environmental criteria outweighed the perceived social disadvantages of locating the facility near a residential community.

Key themes arising from the input were:

- Concern about the impact of the siting of the BEC on property values.
- Proximity of BEC facilities to residential neighbourhoods and schools, and need for a buffer zone.
- Property tax revenue loss to the Township of Esquimalt.
- Safety concerns about the facilities, including the risk of fire or an explosion.
- Traffic, noise and dust during construction.
- Odour control and noise during the ongoing operations.
- Health concerns including proximity to residential areas and long-term effects.
- Need for a buffer zone.

Capital Regional District Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project

Summary of Public Input 2010 - 2016

In July 2013, the McLoughlin site was rezoned for up to a 108 MLD treatment plant.

Key Themes expressed by speakers at the public hearing:

- No need for treatment
- The plan is bad/ flawed
- Cost escalation/property taxes
- Environmental impacts, safety, health
- Odours, view impacts, impacts on tourism
- Lack of meaningful consultation
- Resource recovery should be included

2014 - 2016

In 2014 the treatment plant RFP process was carried out for a larger 124 MLD plant in order to maximize the site's potential. Two open houses were held in February to provide information regarding the rezoning of McLoughlin Point for a plant with greater capacity.

The Township of Esquimalt held public hearings on Feb 18, 19, March 20 and 22 2014.

116 people addressed council.

Key themes raised by speakers:

- Site too small/ too close to shoreline/set-backs unacceptable
- Blight on harbour/destroying beautiful waterfront
- No need for treatment plant/ current system working fine
- No plan/design
- Escalating costs/costs per household
- Odour
- Air quality

In response to public input, the plan to build one regional plant at McLoughlin Point was put on hold by the CRD Board. The CRD Board directed Core Area Committee to develop a new process

2 new advisory select committees were formed - Westside Select Committee and Eastside Select Committee. The site review process produced seven different options and configurations – ranging from a one plant to a seven plant option. Through January and February of 2016, these options and costing analysis were introduced to the public for feedback through a number of consultation activities.

From January 25 through February 20 2016, a Core Area on-line survey asked respondents to comment on their highest priorities for the project as well as the acceptability of each of the seven options. Communications tools to drive participation in the survey included a webpage with a dedicated URL, advertising, earned media, social media, postcard mailer, and storefront information centre.

Survey Results Overview:

1357 respondents completed the survey on-line and 17 submitted hard copy. (27% West, 69% East)

Highest Priorities for Project:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Taxes | 43% |
| • Quality of discharge | 29% |
| • Opportunities for reuse and recovery | 10% |
| • Location of Plants | 9% |

Capital Regional District Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project

Summary of Public Input 2010 - 2016

Acceptability of Options – (Very and Somewhat Acceptable)

One Plant – secondary	61%
One plant tertiary	56%
2 plants	49%
3 plants tertiary	30%
3 plantssecondary	29%
Four plants	23%
Seven plants	17%

80 Emails were received as input:

Key Themes:

- Treatment not necessary
- Survey poorly conceived, too technical, not user friendly
- Too much information – too complex for non-technical people to offer an opinion
- Too costly – impact on taxpayers
- No P3
- Survey manipulative toward Rock Bay
- More innovative solutions needed

Community Meetings were also held in January and February 2016

260 people attended six Westside meetings between February 10 and 16

Key Themes: Concern regarding community impacts, costs, and fairness, and frustration for taking so long to make decision

Eastside held six open houses and workshops and nine stakeholder meetings with community associations between Jan 30 and Feb 17 2016.

Key Themes: Cost, location (go back to McLoughlin), no need, environmental impacts, and more innovation needed.