

Question 1: Please share your vision for success – what are the best outcomes for sewage treatment?

Location				Response
Saanich	Victoria	Oak Bay	NO Identity	
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	A consensus decision to choose between secondary or tertiary treatment - whichever is most cost effective to meet mandated standards. No treatment improvement isn't a viable option. We must not be seen as a recalcitrant refuser to treat our waste as in done throughout North America.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Environmentally responsible. Resource recovery. Financially responsible. Sustainable. Minimal climate. Life cycle costing over 50 years.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Plant shouldn't be in rural Saanich. Site should be within stakeholder neighbourhood. Please provide treatment choices next time.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Maintain as much of the existing infrastructure as possible. Minimize environmental disruption during construction. Achieve tertiary treatment with resource control. FIND USE FOR TREATED WATER. Don't just dump it back into the ocean.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Define input → process → Outcome & Byproducts → disposal. Efficient, effective, optimum costs, minimum impact on residents. Fair cost sharing between municipalities. Use of existing infrastructure.
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Septic tank. Want to know pluses and minuses of all the options.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	1. Optimize response to climate change. 2. Optimize resource recovery. 3. Optimize location of infrastructure to accomplish the above. 4. Minimize the costs to citizens including lifecycle costs. 5. Encourage innovation including lifecycle costs. 6. Meet or exceed federal regulations.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Measurable improvements in water quality if that's even possible. Accountability. It's no good if it's the most expensive clean water. Flexibility of technique, future-minded. Political investigation of the legal obligations. Science and peer reviewed methods, technique and process.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Give people goals for public consultation ie. Minister Penner's letter of criteria or standard framework themes ie. public health and safety, technological ideals, costing, environmental neutrality, multi "bottom line" ie. social/enviro. All my comments are encapsulated by our table discussion.
FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	If happen, I have a few concerns. I want this done and kept public NO P3. Where are the SITE examinations and the other work done on this very same issue. Will it be made available at future public meetings beside the new pieces that come forth?
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Clean ocean water around Vancouver Island. Be responsible members of global society.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Honest and intelligent work for larger community and future generations. NOT for <u>profit</u> of some arrangements or P3 over 35 years! Accounting of finance and ethical advice must be transparent! And archived for public access.

FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Principals: · impacts cannot be ignored/hidden, ie. emissions of a burn on flows must be away from residential community. · East shore plants due to prominent SW winds hence side - somewhere between Clour Paint and Sydney. · Site must secure possible minimizing earthquake “liquidation” fears. · Costs less than or equal to costs suggestions 2 years ago. · Neighbourhood should receive positive net benefit.
FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	Ability to embrace future technologies. Long term planning or focus to the point of complete recycling of waste. There will be a point in time that the South Island will <u>not</u> have sufficient resources for fresh water for the population. Visual appealing treatment plant or hidden from view plant by underground or over ground construction to blend in to the environment.
FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	Innovative tertiary treatment. Integrate plant into local community. It should be an asset to local community.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	We (Greater Victoria) have a sewage system that has been monitored for many decades. Can we improve on it? First we need to do a proper cost benefit analysis. The study needs to include the energy and GHG’s that will be produced by constructing and operating a land based treatment system. How much resource recovery can there be? Who will benefit? The contractor or the taxpayer? A study needs to conclusively show that the existing system is harmful to the marine environment. If the costs outweigh the benefits, then the proposal is not justifiable.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	A scheme that meets all provincial and federal regulations. Cost effective resource recovery. Minimize local taxpayer cost. Maximize senior government funding. Maximize continued use of existing infrastructure. Minimize social and environmental impacts
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Smaller distributed systems that integrate seamlessly into the community. Tertiary treatment.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	1. Incremental improvements to existing infrastructure. 2. Pursue an equivalency agreement for a “made in Victoria/BC” solution as in Quebec and Yukon. 3. Science-based decision making; not politically driven through bad/inappropriate legislation. 4. Affordable and sustainable for taxpayers and municipal governments and the CRD.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Scientific reason to do this. Flow danger. Low cost. Why the rush - risk - public health - public impact more important that the cost. Engagement of communities. Safety. Keep it public.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Stay with current system - it is most sustainable. Low cost and low danger. Concern about: Hazard, Safety, Danger, Threat.
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Resource recovery concern about mess for the bio solid resulting from the sewage treatment process. Success for me would be to find an end product which would be safe for use on food crops.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Good opportunity for public participation - so far, the process is good. Treatment sufficient to deal with emerging chemicals of concern - to remove from effluent what can’t be dealt with through source control. Effective resource recovery and adaptability to allow new technologies to be incorporated. I worry the short timeline and concern about loss of funding will force us to adopt technology that is potentially inadequate and out of date. Sewage treatment must go ahead - science can be used to either support or refute treatment. Depends on what substances are considered and who/what is being affected. Process also improves storm drain situation. Careful attention to cost, but don’t just assume the cheapest treatment up front is best or cheapest over the long term

FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	A distributed tertiary system with maximum integrated resource management and recovery. It should be a modular system(s) that can accommodate increased capacity in the future. The solution should be site-specific and should use the existing features to their advantage. It is essential that, as part of this project, the wastewater supporting infrastructure (ie. Pipes) be fixed so that sewage overflows be minimized in the future. Source control is imperative. Public education and responsibility for what goes in.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Principle for sewage project. Everything is being considered of this point. Equivalency - micro plastics, antibiotics are having an impact - we are treating sewage. Lisa Helps "not treating sewage is not an option" What are we going to get for our bucks. Ray - Second treatment best. What kind we build? Billing costs differ between resource recovery - not been able to harvest methane. John Newcombe - hazard, threat, danger, safety - important principles. Surfrider Foundation water sampling - recreational use, economical situation. Inclusive process. Cost!!!
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Project does not negatively impact public health or the environment or local community values. Project can be completed/substantially completed within 5 years from now (within deadlines for funding). Project is leading edge and does more than what is legally necessary so it becomes a showcase for the Pacific Northwest. Project is affordable based on full life cycle cost analysis. CRD transfer title of the McLoughlin Point site lands back to the First Nations and they develop a world class native heritage site there. (eg. Long house, village, totem poles, etc.) For all to benefit.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	If it's harmful to put sewage solids in the ocean (far from our homes), how is it less harmful to put sewage solids on land near our water and food sources? If it's OK to put sewage solids on land then it should be OK to put it in the ocean. But if it's harmful in the ocean and harmful on land then the best outcome is to neutralize the solids. The outcome that's best then is which process most effectively neutralizes solids and reduces/eliminates the harm.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	GET IT DONE!!!
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	The right site must be in a higher elevated, safe site that can use existing infrastructure. The should be secondary and tertiary treatment with capacity for an increased population. Tax payers have finite resources so a cruise ship tax could help with funding the facilities and the need for a commitment to continued upgrading of facilities with newer technologies. Sewage treatment must be sited in a safe (earthquake/tsunami) area.
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Pick best site - based on cost and technical environment - NOT Nimby view. Treatment ASAP. Optimize resource recovery balanced with cost. Use existing infrastructure. Keep funding. Land application. Proven technology. 1 Site reduces costs. Scalable. Costs minimized - meet regulations. Use of clover, McLoughlin area minimizes cost.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Improved environmental impact compared to present minimal environment impact. Treatment to reduce toxic medical/drug presence in wastewater as far as can be achieved with current technology – and also other synthetic substances/plastic etc. Generation of heat and other benefits - resource recovery? Current technology that can adapt to future technological changes and new inventions (e.g. what's next after micro plastics). What happens to matter that is removed from wastewater? Municipalities need greater financial support from Prov. and Fed. governments – they take almost all our tax dollars.

FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	MUST: be acceptable for neighbors—LIVABLE ; be EFFECTIVE-generating a clean end product; neutralize or destroy substances of emerging concern (toxins, microplastics,hormones, plasmids bacteria etc); be SAFE and NON-HAZARDOUS in function; Not be DANGEROUS (ie fire, explosive, corrosive,toxic); EFFICIENT; be Able to adapt to future CAPACITY and influx of ingress of residents (potential for expandability); be able to recoup some financial benefit and usable clean water to conserve our dwindling resource; have Social Licence and hopefully endorsement of taxpayers/stakeholders/community; Would be wonderful to realize an attractive and usable resource for the community and possibly for tourism
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Taxpayers need to vote on “Best Sewage Treatment Plant Ever !” or a Basic Facility which Meets but not Exceeds the minimum legal (once established) and regulatory federal and provincial mandated operational requirements. Core municipalities in Capital Regional District have financial shortfalls - infrastructure, service buildings, roadways, transit - which are municipal responsibilities, plus challenges related to homelessness, regional policing, and substance addiction, which have been downloaded by higher levels of government. Voters and taxpayers may well decide that once minimal sewage treatment is achieved, tax funds should be spent on other priorities which have higher benefit to the liveability of the core municipalities of greater Victoria. There are many more beneficial purposes to spend \$ 1B in greater Victoria than on advanced sewage treatment (which may in fact not be scientifically required).

Question 2: Please share your own priorities for sewage treatment in your community.

Location				Response
Saanich	Victoria	Oak Bay	NO Identity	
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Site the plant at Clover Point if that is the most technically feasible location. If new buildings in growth areas like Rock Bay can provide a treatment similar to Dockside Green all the better. Public-Private partnership shouldn't be off the table.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Strive for best available modern system. Let's have aggressive goals! Follow best practices from rest of developed world. Build in stages if necessary i.e. Barge sludge to lower Mainland for first ten years as operation until we can GASSIFY!
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	We need technical information on what is collected. What is acceptable or mandated expectations of disposal. Do we need to go beyond Secondary. At what cost? Why?
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	The effect of human faeces is less important in the grand scheme, than the effects of artificial chemical classics and such materials as endocrine disoptous and pharmaceuticals
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Upgradeable when new technology comes along. Get the job done.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Source control including work with other conditions to demand more enlightened commercial designs.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Fear political " trade-offs" may overpower rational considerations. Do not employ unproven technology. No "plant" should be sited such that odour/emissions would drift to residence within 500 metres.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Science-based and triple bottom line. Cost-benefit analysis.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Discussion - why are we not listening to scientists regarding this.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Danger, Safety, Threat, Risk. *¶ <u>Low Cost</u> → Must be <u>LOW COST</u> . *¶ Far from neighbours.
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	How many "buildings are envisioned? One for each municipality? All culminating in a final product facility.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Removal of "emerging" contaminants to the best extent possible. Best possible resource recovery - svn if getting best technology means some delay in completing. Good monitoring program needed - already happening but must be maintained and improved.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Distributed tertiary system. Max integrated resource management and recovery. Corrections to supporting piping infrastructure to avoid combined sewage overflows. Best avail. technology. Site-specific solution. Public education and responsibility. Modular. Lon-term solution. Source control. Please be transparent about the technological details.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	I support and advocate for a distributed tertiary sewage treatment system with solid gasification for optimal resource recovery - provided it is planned, designed and executed properly by professionals that are able to think outside the box wit a firm grounding in simple/practical principles. Any site should be on the list for consideration including parks, playgrounds, vacant residential/commercial/industrial sites, potential joint development sites. The public can the provide feedback for the decision makers.

TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Forward thinking resource recovery. Why do we use water once and then throw it away? Source control means education on: micro plastics in toothpastes, personal care products, micro fibers in laundry grey water, excreted pharmaceuticals (Viagra, birth control), Sucralose excreted, no hospital waste water included (treat separately), no harmful industrial wastewater (hosing down toxins from equipment) treat separately, no landfill leachate (treat separately), all new subdivision or industrial developments must include full treatment of <u>all</u> wastewater.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Recapture resources (heat, water, biosolids) for cement production etc.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Must NOT: affect Airshed, Watershed, and rural wells; jeopardize quality of enjoyment of property; negatively affect property values \$\$\$; create ODOUR, NOISE, excessive TRAFFIC Site must match it's purpose- SITE needs to be an excellent fit for current residents and homeowners, and future generations; Must be reasonable and AFFORDABLE going forward in amortizing over the lifetime and operation of the project.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Measureable Goals, Objectives, and Implementation Timeframes for the project need be established and accepted by both voters and taxpayers <u>before</u> cost estimates are prepared.

Question 3: Is the anything else you want to share? (general notes)

Location				Response
Saanich	Victoria	Oak Bay	NO Identity	
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	The provincial and federal government's demands should mean provincial land or DND land be considered for the secondary/tertiary treatment facilities. Black water biosolids must be dealt with here in Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay. Grey water could be placed in a boggy area for plants etc., to take up the phosphates (chemicals) and reduce the costs by use of our natural environment
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	I'm so glad to be here, to be included in this process. I so hope that this inclusiveness will truly be a part of the process to the completion of the project. <u>No P3</u> . No big outside offshore component of the project or operation.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	See attached documents: 1. Multi-criteria decision making framework for sanitation projects - from a University Study in Europe - recommended best practices. This is a starting point for us - some changes need to be made for our specific situation. Getting specific data to complete the metric is critical. 2. Estimates of capital cost must be realistic and accurate with impact from construction contractors (not only consultants). Contingencies must be realistic and a minor percentage go the total, ie., preliminary designs must be advanced beyond the conceptual/preliminary stage. Completed tertiary treatment plants have been built for "want costs" based on similar criteria to that proposed, for the defunct McLoughlin Pt. centralized plant. 3. Project costs for households are not onerous or particularly significant based on Seaterra's costs for the defunct McLoughlin plan, with or without senior government funding. If in fact a distributed tertiary treatment system would cost a little more (say 20%) the household cost would still be very reasonable and supportable.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Don't completely close off options for resource recovery too soon – leave some "wriggle room" to allow ongoing adoption of technology - meaningful progress is being made. Be openminded!
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Need cost/benefit analysis of <u>current</u> system versus <u>all</u> options. Sites should be <u>far</u> from neighbourhoods.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Can we afford all this? - Cost to poorer people.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	See ARESST wed-site and published material.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	What is an "Eastside Solution Set?" to be identified by June 11.? What business plan information will be available for review of alternatives for Eastside. Who will be professionally responsible for technology alternatives review and recommendations by June 11?
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Equivalency agreements have already been granted in Canada by the Federal government to jurisdictions that can meet wastewater standards. Victoria could clearly meet those standards. Why doesn't CRD appeal to the province to apply for "equivalency"?
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	It would be nice for there to be an informative documentary to be done to provide insight on the impacts of the current situation of how Victoria as a whole deals with its sewage. To outline the effects on the environment.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Triple bottom line! Concern for future generation! TAXES are the cost of a stable society!

FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Give the job to people who know how to build sewage treatment systems and let me get it done. Strive for consensus, but in absence move ahead on majority vote.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Don't just divert toxins to landfill!
FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	We have had years of meetings open to the public at CALWMC a few times it was good to hear eloquence from politicians who agree we need to treat. Please recognize the time and thought presented the debated of the past gave us a project that filled the needs of people tonight are asking for it repeat. Political and respect for the site that led to a project stopped by a few sites at one municipality. Hope it does never happen again.
FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	Collective opportunity to succeed. Technically feasible sites. Time to take action based a hope. Goals, information, project and process - start more. Decision making process IAP2. Go about two way information. Keep the door open to funding without closing the door on options.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	I still believe the scope and scale being proposed is ultimately unnecessary. Public ownership. <u>NOT P.P.P.</u> Not a "bridge referendum"
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	I belong to the camp where citizens believe we do not need a sewage system. Source control is the best way to handle microfibers, bio-/medi- stuff. But given that we have to accept a sewage treatment plant I am looking for an effective, efficient, and economical solution.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Poop flows downhill! Minimize pumping uphill! (ie. to Hartland).
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	Optimize: Climate change impact, resource recovery.
FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	Please meet funding matching deadlines. Hopefully proposed solutions aren't greeted with cynical rejection from those who support status quo. People can't claim they weren't consulted. All in all, good night and good luck.
TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	As I reside in rural Saanich, and am responsible for my own sewage system, I wish to be exempted at this time from contributing to the financial support of the sewage treatment of the greater Saanich municipality/crd. I also wish it stated that I DO NOT ENDORSE any use of DIGESTERS, INCINERATORS, or PUMPING OF EFFLUENT to the Willis Point area of Saanich to service the whole region of Saanich and Greater Victoria/crd. Again, thank-you for encouraging public discourse on this very weighty issue that involves all of us, and many generations of taxpayers to come.

TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	<p>Why are we doing this? Is there is a requirement for justification of the need for this project on a scientific and community health basis.</p> <p>High profile competent ocean science scientists and public health officials have indicated that the existing deep water discharge system causes no threat to public health. A former federal Minister of the Environment claims the existing sewage system is adequate. Testing by competent and trusted third party professionals of the effluent from the present system 50 meters downstream from the discharge is required. Victoria's test results need then be compared to effluent measured 50 meters downstream and under similar flow conditions from discharges from wastewater treatment facilities at Vancouver, Calgary, Ottawa, and Halifax. If Victoria's results are appreciably different from the other urban centers, or if community health hazards exist, then greater Victoria via the CRD needs to proceed with additional sewage treatment. Correspondence from the BC Liberal government led by Gordon Campbell suggest that the former Premier promised to mandate secondary sewage treatment for greater Victoria in return for support by the States of Washington and Oregon for the emergent bid for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. The BC Minister of Environment of that day was a small town lawyer reputed to talk to the Empress Hotel marmot over the legislative lunch hour. The federal government of the day built fake lakes in downtown Toronto and gazeboes in Ontario cottage country to reinforce Canada's "woodsiness". Locally in greater Victoria, both the Chamber of Commerce and Victoria Tourism Authority were traumatized by a school teacher who wandered about dressed up as a turd.</p> <p>The follies and pratfalls of politicians of the day, and most certainly since - at federal, provincial, and municipal levels – have further eroded the trust of voters and taxpayers. Present day voters and taxpayers are simply unwilling to pay \$ 750M – \$ 1B which may only be needed to fulfill a series of backroom political deals. If no health reason justifies this project, voters simply will neither support the project or the project proponents. CRD officials should simply return the issue to the government of BC for construction of whatever facility BC wishes to fund and build. Previous members of CRD Sewage Committee lost voter confidence through their zeal to spend to meet artificial timelines. Time and resources were wasted trying to meet "free money" grant requirements from federal and provincial governments. Local voters and taxpayers provided all of these funds, regardless of which level of government has picked our pockets.</p> <p>The Equivalency Agreement to Satisfy Federal Wastewater Regulations as proposed by Association for Responsible and Environmentally Sustainable Sewage Treatment (ARESST) should be vigorously pursued. A positive response obviate the requirement to spend \$ 750M – \$ 1B .</p> <p>A negative response will force a listing of the detailed operational requirements and discharge criteria which any new facility must meet.</p>
------	-------	-------	-------	--