



Making a difference...together

CORE AREA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROJECT BOARD

Notice of Meeting on **Tuesday, September 6, 2016 @ 9:00 am**

6th Floor Boardroom, 625 Fisgard Street, Victoria, BC

Jane Bird (Chair)
David Howe

Don Fairbairn (Vice Chair)
Bob Lapham

Jim Burke
Colin Smith

Brenda Eaton

AGENDA

1. Approval of Agenda and Statement of No Conflict
2. Approval of Minutes
 - a. August 25, 2016
 - b. September 1, 2016
3. Report of the Chair
4. Presentations/Delegations
5. Business Case Development – Verbal Update
6. Budget Update – Business Case Development
7. Correspondence
 - 7.1 August 2016 (Part 2) correspondence
 - 7.2 September 2016 (Part 1) – correspondence
8. New Business
9. Motion to close the meeting in accordance with the *Community Charter*, Part 4, Division 3, 90(1)(e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the regional district considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the regional district; (m) a matter that, under another enactment, is such that the public may be excluded from the meeting; and 90((2)(b) the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the regional district and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party.
10. Adjournment

To ensure quorum, advise Sonia Santarossa 250.360.3129 if you are unable to attend.

EXEC-184034712-87



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board
Held Thursday, August 25, 2016, in the 6th Floor Boardroom, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

Present: **Members:** J. Bird (Chair), D. Fairbairn (Vice Chair), J. Burke, B. Eaton, D. Howe, R. Lapham, C. Smith
CRD Staff: L. Hutcheson, Interim Project Director; D. Telford, Senior Manager, Environmental Engineering; S. Santarossa, Manager Legislative & Corporate Initiatives (recorder)

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Approval of Agenda and Statement of No Conflict

MOVED by D. Howe, **SECONDED** by C. Smith,
That the agenda and supplementary agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

The members stated they did not have a conflict of interest with any of the agenda items.

2. Approval of Minutes – August 4, 2016

MOVED by B. Lapham, **SECONDED** by D. Howe,
That the minutes of the meeting held August 4, 2016 be approved.

CARRIED

3. Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that the Project Board's Interim Report was released yesterday and is available on the CRD website. She highlighted the three short-listed options for a wastewater treatment facility - a single plant at Rock Bay, a single plant at McLoughlin Point or two plants; one at Rock Bay and one at McLoughlin Point. The Chair also noted that in all options, biosolids would be conveyed to the Hartland landfill.

The Chair also reported that a further amendment was made to the Partnerships BC contract to authorize Partnerships BC to engage KPMG to provide services for cost and financial analysis associated with the Business Case to a maximum of \$50,000 in fees.

4. Presentations/Delegations

4.1 Delegation: Patrick Lucey, Aqua-Tex Scientific – Item 5

Using PowerPoint, Mr. Lucey presented a proposal for sewage treatment in Colwood and Langford for consideration as part of the Business Case development. The delegation provided a copy of his PowerPoint presentation and speaking notes, on file in Legislative & Information Services.

4.2 Delegation: David Langley – Item 5

Mr. Langley appeared before the Project Board to speak to the need to address water recycling from sewage treatment to reduce existing fresh water supply system demands to assess the costs and benefits of tertiary treatment options. The delegation provided a copy of his speaking notes, on file in Legislative & Information Services.

5. Business Case Development – Verbal Update

The Chair stated that the Final Report would be publicly available on September 7 to be considered by the CRD Board on September 14.

6. Correspondence

6.1 City of Victoria, Wastewater Treatment Update Report – August 2, 2016

6.2 August 2015 (Part 1) Correspondence

MOVED by D. Howe, **SECONDED** by J. Burke,

That the following correspondence be received for information:

6.1 City of Victoria, Wastewater Treatment Update Report – August 2, 2016

6.2 August 2015 (Part 1) Correspondence

CARRIED

7. New Business

None

8. Motion to Close the Meeting

MOVED by D. Howe, **SECONDED** by J. Burke,

Motion to close the meeting in accordance with the *Community Charter*, Part 4, Division 3, 90(1)(e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the regional district considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the regional district; (m) a matter that, under another enactment, is such that the public may be excluded from the meeting; and 90((2)(b) the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the regional district and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party.

CARRIED

The Project Board moved to the closed session at 9:31 a.m.

The Project Board rose from the closed session at 3:05 p.m. without report.

9. Adjournment

MOVED by C. Smith, **SECONDED** by R. Lapham,
That the meeting be adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR

RECORDER



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board
Held Thursday, September 01, 2016, in Room 488, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

Present: **Members:** B. Eaton (Acting Chair), J. Bird (5:18), J. Burke, D. Howe, R. Lapham, C. Smith
CRD Staff: D. Telford, Senior Manager, Environmental Engineering; S. Santarossa, Manager Legislative & Corporate Initiatives (recorder)
Absent: D. Fairbairn (Vice Chair)

In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, B. Eaton assumed the role of Acting Chair.

The Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED by B. Lapham, **SECONDED** by D. Howe,
That the agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Motion to Close the Meeting

MOVED by D. Howe, **SECONDED** by B. Lapham,
Motion to close the meeting in accordance with the *Community Charter*, Part 4, Division 3, 90(1)(j) information that is prohibited, or information that if it were presented in a document would be prohibited, from disclosure under section 21 of the Freedom on Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

CARRIED

The Project Board moved to the closed session at 4:05 p.m.
The Project Board rose from the closed session at 6:20 p.m. without report.

3. Adjournment

MOVED by B. Lapham, **SECONDED** by D. Howe
That the meeting be adjourned at 6:21 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIR

RECORDER

**REPORT TO CORE AREA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROJECT BOARD
MEETING OF TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2016**

SUBJECT **Business Case Development – Budget**

ISSUE

To provide the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board (Project Board) with a monthly budget update.

BACKGROUND

At its August 4, 2016 meeting, the Project Board received and approved the revised budget for the Business Case Development phase. The Project Board requested that a detailed budget update for the Business Case Development phase, with actual expenses and commitments, be provided to the Project Board on a monthly basis.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Funding for the development of the business case is being drawn from the Core Area Wastewater Treatment capital budget. The Budget for the Business Case Development is \$2.025 million and approximately \$876,000 remains unspent and uncommitted.

CONCLUSION

Due to the accelerated pace of work on the business case, invoicing received from some of the suppliers and consultants may lag over the course of the summer. An updated budget with actual expenses and outstanding commitments to August 31, 2016 is provided to the Project Board as summarized in Appendix A.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board receive this budget update for information.

Submitted by:	Dan Telford, P.Eng., Project Manager, Core Area Wastewater and Resource Recovery Project
Concurrence:	Rianna Lachance, BCom, CPA, CA, Manager of Financial Planning and Analysis for Rajat Sharma, B.Eng., MBA, CPA, CMA, Acting Chief Financial Officer

LH:cl

Attachment: Appendix A – Business Case Budget

CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT
Business Case Development
as at August 31, 2016

	PROPOSED BUDGET	ACTUAL	COMMITTED	TOTAL	REMAINING
Project Oversight (Project Board)	450,000	273,282	-	273,282	176,718
Communications	105,000	17	61,965	61,982	43,018
Feasibility and Costing Analysis	450,000	-	411,381	411,381	38,619
Business Case review	100,000	-	-	-	100,000
Partnerships BC	345,000	36,195	308,805	345,000	-
Project Management (Staff and Wages)	275,000	4,673	-	4,673	270,327
Miscellaneous and Legal	300,000	52,552	-	52,552	247,448
CALWMP Total	2,025,000	366,718	782,151	1,148,869	876,131

From: [Jim Lloyd](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: An Operator's View on the Victoria Sewage Project
Date: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 11:44:26 AM
Attachments: [An Operator's View on the Sewage Project - Aug 2016.doc](#)

Hello Lindsay:

I have put together some comments and suggestion regarding the current sewage project based on my extensive experience as as Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator. Would you please forward on the attached Word document to all the Core Area Wastewater Project Board members and any other individuals you may feel would be interested in seeing these comments.

If you have any questions please email me. Please confirm receipt and that it has been forwarded onto the Board members, thank you.

Best regards,

James Lloyd

From: [Betsy Nuse](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: announcement of short list
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 8:59:18 AM

Dear Project Board

Thank you for continuing to move ahead the important project of treating Victoria's sewage responsibly.

Of the two options, I would reiterate my support for McLoughlin; I imagine that construction necessary at Rock Bay could be quite disruptive to that neighbourhood and to Victoria's downtown in general.

with thanks for your efforts

Betsy Nuse
303-1025 Fairfield Road
Victoria

From: [Marne](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Appreciation
Date: Friday, August 26, 2016 1:24:26 AM

Such a hard decision and so many meetings to attend, readings to cover...
I wish you well in the next stages of your work .
Thank you for not building the sewage treatment plant on Clover Point.
Marne St Claire

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jamie Kyles](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Clover Point
Date: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 7:36:59 PM

If, as indicated in the media today, common sense has prevailed and Clover Point is no longer being considered as a possible location for the proposed sewage plant, I would like to congratulate the committee on some clear thinking.

That said, and as indicated in earlier correspondence, it is not unreasonable to consider the south end of Beacon Hill Park (still in Fairfield) as a possible location IFF political expediency drives you to a 2 plant (and much more expensive) solution.

Jamie Kyles P Eng, Sustainable Livelihoods Consultant (Africa), Fairfield resident

From: talyachristbason@hotmail.com
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 1:22:44 PM

The following message was received through the form at '<https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:

Talya

Your Email Address:

talyachristbason@hotmail.com

Message:

Thank you for taking the time and professional approach to this discussion. I am very interested to know if the proposed budgets for the 3 short-listed options include the pipes from the site(s) to Heartland. It is not clear from the interim report how the bio-solids will "travel" to heartland. If a solution is trucking, certainly for McCloughlin this would create a level of industrial traffic which does not fit with it's current residential/commercial mix. With an elementary school and a francophone school within feet of what could be the routes I am curious what processes are in place to review these issues (smell, intensity of traffic, pedestrian/bike safety, enviro impacts, noise etc) within the final recommendations and, if this has any impact of the criteria for a single site at rock bay which already manages these issues in a dense commerical area. many thanks,

Talya

Submitted at: 8/25/2016 1:22:38 PM
Submitted via: <https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/52.0.2743.116 Safari/537.36
User Host Address: 142.24.95.107

From: [Betsy Nuse](#)
To: premier@gov.bc.ca; ENV.minister@gov.bc.ca; CSCD.minister@gov.bc.ca
Cc: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project
Date: Friday, August 26, 2016 12:27:04 PM

Dear Premier Clark, Minister Polak and Minister Fassbender,

I have been a supporter of sewage treatment in the Victoria area for many years and was pleased when your government stepped into the process by creating a Project Board to review the issues and choices, recommend the best system for our area.

I am delighted that the board's work is on schedule, but I was dismayed to hear yesterday that the board's recommendation will be put to the CRD ... which has fudged, delayed and wrangled over this issue for years.

Please assure me and others in the capital region that your government would be willing to move forward on the Project Board's recommendations despite a replay of the same old objections and delaying tactics from the CRD!

most sincerely

Betsy Nuse
303-1025 Fairfield Road
Victoria

From: [Allan Crow](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Final decision
Date: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 2:24:50 PM

Dear Chair and Project Board Members

Thank you for your continuing efforts. I have a few brief points regarding your final decision.

The original proposal for McLoughlin Point had capacity to meet the regions needs until 2060. If two plants are required to divide or increase capacity.... wouldn't it make more sense to build a second plant in Langford or Colwood sometime in the distant future when McLoughlin is nearing capacity?

What is the working lifespan of the current outfall pipes at Clover and Macaulay? Do we need to build a brand new discharge pipe? Can we use the existing ones or are they beyond their best before date?

With the cooperation of various levels of government I could see how West Bay, McLoughlin Point, and Macaulay Point could be connected by a boardwalk/marine trail on publicly owned land. That would be a spectacular amenity!

Thanks again. -Allan Crow

From: [MICHELLE COBURN](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Fwd: News release and site selection
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 9:24:10 AM

From: "MICHELLE COBURN" <michellecoburn@shaw.ca>
To: michellecoburn@shaw.ca
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 9:22:13 AM
Subject: News release and site selection

As a long time supporter of the sewage treatment project for Victoria area, as were my parents who were born here in the early years of the 20th century, I would like to add my voice to those who have supported the McLoughlin approved site with advanced tertiary as the best of all solutions . The plan that was provincially approved on land owned by the CRD was decided upon by our democratically elected votes years back and nothing since that time has made greater sense. Thank you to all of the committee for your work and continued efforts to get this project started. Michelle Coburn
,Greater Victoria Water Watch Coalition and Victoria Sewage Treatment Alliance

From: [derek.randall](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 3:10:50 PM

I have been a resident of Victoria since 1977 and have long championed secondary or tertiary sewage treatment for the area. I was glad to see your release on Wednesday of the sites under consideration namely Mcloughlin, Rock Bay or a combination of the two. I am writing to you to express my choice of Mcloughlin alone as the site for a secondary, enhanced secondary or tertiary treatment plant. It was the correct choice two years ago and remains the only sensible option today. I am convinced that it would be an asset to Esquimalt to have an attractive treatment plant built on that site and right in view of incoming cruise ships who will be reminded that finally this area has done the right thing. It is also encouraging that you plan to compensate them in the event that it is the chosen site.

I am sure that there will be enough CRD board members who will support this choice regardless of opposition from Barb Desjardin, Vic Derman and one or two others.

Sincerely

Derek Randall

From: barbaraann@integrity.com
To: cawtpb
Subject: Re removing Clover Point as a Sewer Treatment Plant.
Date: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 7:05:47 PM

Dear CAWTP Board,

With deepest appreciation thank you for removing Clover Point as a site to processes a tertiary sewer treatment plant for the City of Victoria, for considering another site I am truly grateful.

Respectfully and with the Kindest of Regards,

Barbara Bowman

234 Moss Street

Victoria, B.C.

From: [Jamie Kyles](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Sewage - solids processing - an alternate suggestion
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 8:49:11 AM

I read with satisfaction about your interim report today.

That said, it still leaves some very expensive options (like a plant at Rock Bay) open for the NIMBY or the 'we must share the pain' crew in Esquimalt.

I wonder if there is a 'middle ground' solution that makes a lot of sense? The suggestion is to have 1 main processing facility at McLoughlin Point and, rather than moving residual sludge to Hartland at great expense, have these 'solids' processed at a facility located at Rock Bay. This would give a nod to the 'we must share the pain' folks in Esquimalt AND, I suspect, have significantly lower costs than the Hartland option. In fact, based on experience with various large European facilities over the past decade, it may be that the advanced steam gasification proposed by Pivotal IRM might be the right technology to consider given the minimal emissions from the process.

Although I continue to have reservations about working with a company like Pivotal IRM that has never built anything, they DO apparently have access to this technology. One might envision a relationship where they receive a licencing fee for the technology but a more established firm actually designs and builds the unit?

Regards

Jamie Kyles P Eng (retired), Sustainable Livelihoods Consultant (Africa)

From: [surroundings](#)
Cc: [bart reed](#)
Subject: Sewage Treatment ...NO to Rock Bay
Date: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 2:14:30 PM

Good Afternoon,

I have owned Surroundings in Cook Street Village for over 23 years.

I have watched in disbelief at the CRD's handling of the Sewage Treatment for what seems like forever. Nothing has shocked me more than the consideration of Rock Bay as a possible site.

Business IS THE TAX BASE for all municipalities, and yet the CRD Board has not even considered the disastrous economic impact the Rock Bay site would inflict.

Rock Bay would mean the destruction of two major roadways, Cook and Bay Street, and the demise of EVERY business en route. Does anyone remember what happened to Cambie St. in Vancouver???!?! Furthermore the fact that the CRD plans to lease the land from the First Nations... FOREVER..... honestly just makes this option ridiculous.

McLoughlin Point is the clear option: The Land is owned by the CRD, and no prolonged negative disruptions. The only stumbling block has been Mayor Desjardins, who sits on the CRD Board. My hat goes off to Mayor Desjardins, she has worked hard to keep the sewage out of her jurisdiction, however, she is missing the most valuable opportunity, to be the SOLUTION to the Sewage Treatment Facility.

Giving the residents of Esquimalt a tax/ rebate incentive to compensate for the Sewage Plant is well within reason. This would be far more cost effective than destroying vibrant business communities, with losses in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Owning the land which our Sewage Treatment is on, is imperative. Trust me, as business owner, who does not own her building, every lease renewal puts you between a rock and a hard place..... do you really want to do that with the largest capital expenditure ever?

Lets make McLoughlin Point work.

Kristiane Baskerville
Owner
Director, CSVBA

Surroundings
249 Cook St
Victoria, BC
V8V 3X4

From: [Trudy Bailey](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Thank You
Date: Thursday, August 25, 2016 7:24:34 AM

Dear Board members,
Thank you so much for saving Clover Point Park!
Yours Sincerely
Trudy Bailey
4 Bushby St
Victoria

From: [James Skwarok](#)
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: thank you
Date: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:42:33 PM

Dear Members of the Project Board:

Thank you for removing Clover Point from your list of possible sites for sewage treatment plants. I urge you to further consider a single plant at McLoughlin Point, which I have already detailed the benefits of, at the August 4th meeting of the Project Board. The social and economic disruption and cost to pipe sewage from Clover Point to Rock Bay is just not worth it. Cook Street businesses would go under and people are adamantly opposed to a 4 metre wide trench being dug up Cook Street.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

James Skwarok
Victoria Sewage Treatment Alliance

ITEM 7.2

From: hans@yourhealthbase.com
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:42:02 PM

The following message was received through the form at 'https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:

Hans Larsen

Your Email Address:

hans@yourhealthbase.com

Message:

Dear Project Board Chair and Members,

I noted with despair recent attempts by certain CRD directors to again stall the implementation of wastewater treatment facilities for Greater Victoria. Specifically I am concerned about the persistent push for the private sector to become involved in the project and thus ensure further lengthy delays and essentially nullify the work done to date by the Project Board.

Please correct me if I am wrong, but it is my understanding that the Biosolids Centre for sludge treatment and resource recovery planned for the Hartland landfill site has received conditional approval for an \$83.4 million P3 (public private partnership) grant. The grant specifies that the private sector will be responsible for designing, building, financing, operating and maintaining the Biosolids Centre for 25 years. It is also my understanding that the design, construction and operation of the wastewater plant(s) are not subject to the conditions (private-public partnership and an innovative approach) specified in the P3 grant as this is not part of the funding by the Federal and Provincial for wastewater treatment.

Assuming that the above is correct, I fail to see why the site selection, design and construction of the wastewater treatment plant(s) should be held up waiting for proposals from the private sector. There would presumably also be no need to come up with an innovative design ("A first in the world in Victoria") for the wastewater treatment plant(s). Wastewater treatment plants have been around for a long time and are now highly effective and environmentally friendly. Thus cost-effectiveness, not innovation, should be the yardstick by which project proposals are measured.

As far as resource recovery is concerned, it would also seem to be a waste of time to try to come up with a "made in Victoria" solution as biosolids plants providing combined treatment of sewage sludge and kitchen scraps are already in operation around the world.

Regards

Hans R. Larsen, PEng (retired)

hans@yourhealthbase.com

From: suzettegoldy@gmail.com
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 1:32:03 PM

The following message was received through the form at '<https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:

Suzette Goldsworthy

Your Email Address:

suzettegoldy@gmail.com

Message:

As a resident and voter of the Municipality of Esquimalt I am concerned at the board suggesting a site in Esquimalt that has been out of the picture and not viable for a period of time.

I thought this new board was to bring forward new and innovative ideas but trying to bring forward a non viable site due to land, access, marine setback requirements, tsunami hazard area, only secondary treatment as well as being resolutely and clearly voted down by the voting residents in Esquimalt.

These suggestions are not the most environmentally sound or look toward long term treatment which a tertiary facility would provide. Thus a waste of tax payers money should within a few short years need replacing to meet environmental standards that federal govt will most likely put into place.

So far this board has not presented what was promised of it and know that should this site that is clearly not wanted nor sound as a treatment plant option and Esquimalt will fight this option should have it forced upon us.

As we move forward to be looking at European and new green technology to create a sustainable and efficient treatment system that will last a number of years should be the focus not some rehashed secondary rushed decision that goes against what voters have clearly and very blatantly stated No for. Yet Esquimalt offered up other sites that have totally been rejected by the board.

I hope the board takes into consideration the comments that have been put forward not only by myself but others within my community of Esquimalt. Macaulay and Mcloughlin are not what make sense or are wanted in our community as treatment plant sites.

Regards

Suzette Goldsworthy

Submitted at: 8/31/2016 1:31:57 PM
Submitted via: <https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Linux; Android 6.0.1; SM-G920W8 Build/MMB29K; wv) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/4.0 Chrome/51.0.2704.81 Mobile Safari/537.36 [FB_IAB/FB4A; FBAV/91.0.0.17.68;]

From: KevinRBrown@shaw.ca
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 3:11:44 PM

The following message was received through the form at 'https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:

Kevin Brown

Your Email Address:

KevinRBrown@shaw.ca

Message:

Your interim report of August 24 recommends transporting sewage sludge to Hartland from the 1 or 2 recommended secondary or (hopefully) tertiary wastewater treatment facilities. You state that the options for specific biosolids treatment and IRM at Hartland are still under review.

I strongly encourage the Project Board to keep recommendations for sewage solids processing as open-ended and flexible as possible. The previous plan (2008-2014) to anaerobically digest sludge would have “worked” as a “proven” technology, but did not recover much energy and did not produce a residual product that was beneficial environmentally or economically. Indeed, restrictions on land application of Class A biosolids and a lack of market for the solids as a fuel means that the Saanich Peninsula Wastewater Treatment Plant is now forced to landfill their sewage solids. That is absurd, both environmentally and economically.

Nearly 10 years after the previous regional sewage treatment plan, IRM processing of organic wastes such as sewage sludge has advanced greatly elsewhere in the world. In my earlier comments to the Project Board, I noted that intermediate-temperature pyrolysis is now being used to process sewage sludge, with or without other carbon-containing (food, biomass, plastic) wastes, to produce bio-oil, bio-gas, and biochar, any or all of which can be used directly or to generate electricity. The biochar may be a good soil amendment with potential to increase soil carbon sequestration and soil productivity. This is the type of approach we need to process sewage solids from 2020 onward. Anaerobic digestion is inadequate and not necessarily cheaper.

The Project Board has to be very careful in the type of recommendations it makes with respect to sewage solids processing. Members of the Board are not technical “experts” in the area of IRM processing of sewage solids. Ample discussion at relevant CRD committee meetings indicates that the IRM expertise also lies outside of CRD staff. The Project Board has had little time to review information on IRM processing of solids and undoubtedly has had to rely heavily for that information on staff and on information gleaned from some informal and haphazard information-gathering sessions (e.g., earlier “show-and-tell” sessions, a very few invited presentations at CRD IRM task force meetings, etc.). The problem with a few invited presentations is that it gives committee members a limited and biased view of what is possible and may influence future decisions. Consequently, that approach is no substitute for proper requests for expressions of interest (REOIs) which are widely advertised and provide specific enough criteria to allow thorough evaluation of what IRM options exist. A proper and open procurement process is essential.

Fortunately, the CRD Integrated Resource Management Select Committee, in conjunction with staff, have been working toward developing REOIs for both pilot-scale and region-wide IRM of sewage solids. The Project Board needs to support this effort in order to truly find out what approaches are possible and feasible. If it requires an extra year, so be it. Our choices now set our path for the next 20 or more years.

In summary, I would strongly encourage the Project Board to keep recommendations for sewage solids processing as open-ended and flexible as possible and to endorse an open, transparent, and thorough REOI process for IRM of sewage solids, such as that currently being worked on by the Select Committee and staff.

Sincerely,

Kevin R Brown, PhD, RPBio, PAg

Certified Senior Ecologist, Ecological Society of America

Saanich

Submitted at: 8/31/2016 3:11:38 PM

Submitted via: <https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>

User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64; rv:47.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/47.0

User Host Address: 24.68.106.194

From: Sslobodian@gmail.com
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 10:25:23 AM

The following message was received through the form at 'https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:
Sandra Slibodian

Your Email Address:
Sslobodian@gmail.com

Message:
I have spoken through public meetings, mayoral websites, letters to the editor and it remains the same. No waste water treatment plant at virtual high water mark; not on prized waterfront; not one large site; not old technology; not in Esquimalt.

Submitted at: 8/31/2016 10:25:18 AM
Submitted via: https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPhone; CPU iPhone OS 9_3_5 like Mac OS X) AppleWebKit/601.1.46 (KHTML, like Gecko) Mobile/13G36
[FBAN/FBIO; FBAV/62.0.0.43.141; FBBV/36454510; FBRV/0; FBDV/iPhone7,2; FBMD/iPhone; FBSN/iPhone OS; FBSV/9.3.5; FBSS/2; FBCR/TELUS; FBID/phone; FBLC/en_GB; FBOP/5]
User Host Address: 70.66.171.109

From: sean.uisdin@shaw.ca
To: [cawtpb](#)
Subject: Contact Us - Submission
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 10:55:59 AM

The following message was received through the form at 'https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board'. Neither the name nor the e-mail address can be confirmed as accurate.

.....

Your Name:
Sean MacUisdin

Your Email Address:
sean.uisdin@shaw.ca

Message:
It is inconceivable that the board continues to look at McLoughlin Point as potential for a sole site for a sewage plant when the site was rejected by the municipality a year ago and that the footprint of the site was too small for a single plant and has had its available space shrunk even more by new provincial regulations moving the set back to 30m. It cannot be said enough that this process reeks of political interference and classist pandering as Clover Point with an existing outfall and pump station was conveniently removed while McLoughlin Point with neither and a far small foot print remains.

Submitted at: 8/31/2016 10:55:53 AM
Submitted via: <https://www.crd.bc.ca/contact-us?r=wwproject-board>
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPad; CPU OS 9_3_4 like Mac OS X) AppleWebKit/601.1.46 (KHTML, like Gecko) Mobile/13G35
[FBAN/FBIO; FBAV/62.0.0.43.141; FBBV/36454510; FBRV/0; FBDV/iPad3,4; FBMD/iPad; FBSN/iPhone OS; FBSV/9.3.4; FBSS/2; FBCR/; FBID/tablet; FBLC/en_US; FBOP/5]
User Host Address: 70.66.189.248

From: [surroundings](#)
Subject: Yes to McLoughlin Point, NO to Rock Bay
Date: Friday, September 02, 2016 12:19:05 PM

>> Good afternoon:

>>

>> Yes to McLoughlin Point, No to Rock Bay.

>>

>> The Cook Street Village Business Association (CSVBA) would like to express its support for McLoughlin Point and opposition to Rock Bay as a potential Sewage Treatment Facility for the Capital Region.

>>

>> The Rock Bay site could have a devastating financial impact on both Cook and Bay Street businesses during pipe install. These two streets are strong travel, business, and residential corridors. Businesses along the route will struggle to survive through the estimated two year install. This business interruption represents hundreds of millions of dollars in lost sales, loss of employment, and loss of tax revenue.

>>

>> Furthermore, the McLoughlin Point site is already CRD owned.

>>

>> McLoughlin Point is clearly the logical option. The site has space, it is CRD owned, and the pipes can be installed from Clover Point with minimum impact to the business and residential community.

>>

>> We ask that you support McLoughlin Point as the preferred site for the Capital Region Sewage Treatment Facility.

>>

>> Garry Preston

>> Chairman CSVBA