
**REPORT TO CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 2006**

SUBJECT **CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN – SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW AND AUDIT**

PURPOSE

To respond to the recommendations of the scientific and technical review and audit of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) and to seek approval for the actions proposed by staff.

BACKGROUND

In 2005, the Capital Regional District (CRD) contracted with the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) to establish and manage an independent panel to carry out a scientific and technical review (the Panel) of the LWMP. The work of the panel was completed and submitted to the Board on 12 July 2006.

When the LWMP was approved in March 2003, the minister of environment required that an audit of the commitments in the plan be carried out three years after the plan was approved and every five years thereafter. The audit was included in the terms of reference for the assignment negotiated with SETAC. SETAC commissioned Jacques Whitford Limited to carry out the audit, which was completed in February 2006.

This report presents the staff responses to the recommendations of the scientific and technical review and the audit of the LWMP. A summary of the key recommendations and actions is provided in Attachment 1. Attachment 2 contains the recommendations and actions arising from the scientific and technical review; Attachment 3, the recommendations and actions from the audit.

These reports and the recommendations pre-date the directive from the minister of environment to proceed with wastewater treatment. It is anticipated that the decisions on treatment may impact on the responses to some of the recommendations in the reports. The attached tables identify these items and outline the proposed actions.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the action plan recommended by staff; or
2. Modify the action plan and approve the modified plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Costs for implementing recommendations of the Panel and audit in 2007 are included in 2007 core operating budgets, except for implementation of the management program for onsite systems, which is partially funded by supplementary items in the 2007 budget, and funding for land acquisition for wastewater treatment, which will be partially funded from a capital budget.

Additional activities identified for implementation in 2008 and beyond will be costed and included in capital budgets or operating budget supplementaries.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS

The Panel and Jacques Whitford, in its audit of the LWMP, made several recommendations. This report summarizes the recommendations and the actions recommended by CRD staff.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management committee approve the action plan recommended by staff in response to the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel and of Jacques Whitford in the audit of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan.

Bob Warman, PEng
Assistant Engineer, Technical Projects

Dwayne Kalynchuk, PEng
General Manager, Environmental Services
Concurrence

RWW:wg
Attachments: 3

Summary of Key Recommendations and Actions from the Scientific and Technical Panel Report and Audit of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan

1. Chapter 7 – The Scientific and Technical Review Panel (the Panel) recommended supporting and expanding the Regional Source Control program (RSCP). It is proposed to expand the program by implementing the contaminants management component of the five-year plan (approved by the Core Area Liquid Waste Management committee November 2005) in 2008 to achieve reductions in specific priority pollutants and emerging contaminants.
2. Chapter 9 – The Panel recommended a number of changes and additions to the Marine Environment program. Now that the CRD is planning for treatment, it is proposed to have the Marine Monitoring Advisory group review the monitoring requirements once the type and location of treatment have been determined.
3. Chapter 10 – The Panel noted that the CRD is responsible for stormwater management but lacks the authority to enforce stormwater bylaws. It is proposed that CRD staff initiate discussions with municipalities, to identify any needed changes to CRD or municipal authority to ensure stormwater protection and improvement.
4. Chapter 11 – In order to better coordinate harbours environmental protection and improvement, it is recommended that the same CRD staff member should be the CRD representative on the Greater Victoria Harbour Authority and the Victoria and Esquimalt Harbours Environmental Action Plan.
5. Chapter 11 – To improve the coordination of watershed management, it is proposed that an inter-municipal group be established to discuss integrated watershed management across the region.
6. Risk assessment of landfill leachate – The Panel did not make a specific recommendation about the need for leachate treatment but suggested an evaluation of the risks and the benefits. It is proposed that the CRD undertake a risk versus benefit analysis of leachate treatment as a component of the treatment planning and decision process. One objective would be to determine if leachate treatment at the landfill is warranted or if treatment could occur at the treatment plant.
7. LWMP general – A recommendation of the audit was that the CRD review the appropriateness and necessity of existing commitments in the plan, as well as the need to add new commitments. It is proposed that the plan and the commitments be reviewed at the same time as audits are carried out. It is proposed to carry out the first review in 2008, when the decisions on wastewater treatment are known.
8. LWMP general – One of the issues identified by the audit was the lack of awareness by some municipal staff about the municipal responsibilities that are components of the plan. It is proposed to provide an annual report for municipal staff and directors that outlines the status of the municipal commitments in the plan, starting in the spring of 2007.

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>The Source Control program is well developed and represents the current state of the science. The CRD should continue to support and expand the program.</p> <p>The RSCP has been effective and should be continued.</p>	<p>The RSCP will continue and the five-year plan (approved by the CALWMC November 2005) implemented, including the implementation of a contaminant component to achieve reductions in specific priority and emerging contaminants (e.g., polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, phenols, pharmaceuticals).</p>
<p>Some areas of the CRD have high I&I flows into the sewer system. Reducing these flows is an important component of total sewerage management.</p>	<p>Continue with the current I&I program.</p>
<p>The monitoring program is one of the most comprehensive programs being implemented to evaluate the effects of sewage in marine environments. It is comprehensive and is designed to evaluate the effects of sewage in the marine environment in and around the discharge points. The breadth and scope of the program is impressive, and the</p>	<p>Continue with the current monitoring program.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>Panel commends the CRD for their intent to incorporate the best available science in the monitoring program.</p> <p>The Panel reviewed the Marine Environment program for the current discharge of preliminary treated effluent. They suggested the following changes and possible additions to the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure effluent toxicity • Investigate effects of the effluent on water-column dwelling organisms • Monitoring of far-field effects • Predictive capability for estimating fate and distribution of effluent plumes • Assess overall loadings from both outfalls (i.e., cumulative effects) • Increase the frequency of surface water monitoring for fecal coliforms and use enterococci 	<p>In light of the development of a schedule for treatment, these changes and additions to the program may or may not be necessary. These suggestions are being discussed with the Marine Monitoring Advisory group (MMAG), who will review the monitoring requirements once the type and location of treatment have been determined.</p> <p>Chlorinated pesticides are analyzed as part of the core program and additional investigations (high-resolution chemical analyses). The need to monitor for other compounds will be reviewed in consultation with the MMAG.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>as an indicator of potential human health effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study of micro-layer effects • Potential effects and risks of persistent organic contaminants through food chain transfers • Assess fish tissue contaminants • The panel noted that some of the "traditional" contaminants are missing from the monitoring (e.g., chlorinated pesticides) and their addition should be considered 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel appreciates the CRD's initiative to monitor new compounds of concern, such as pharmaceuticals and endocrine-disrupting compounds, and urges the CRD to include new compounds in the program as 	<p>These investigations are underway.</p> <p>Reference stations for each of the outfalls were added in 2005. The need for additional reference stations in light of the development of a schedule for referred to the MMAG.</p> <p>The MMAG will be consulted on the components of the yearly program and the additional investigations of the WMEP.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference sites for each discharge for use in data comparisons. • Continue with the yearly program and supplement with additional investigations, as appropriate, in consultation with the MMAG. <p>Fundamentally, the Panel is not of the view that the seafloor trigger process will function as designed.</p> <p>The MMAG is an important strength to the program. The Panel encourages their continued involvement, as well as adequate resourcing for the MMAG's function.</p> <p>The Panel is supportive of a rotating review (every six years) of the program, providing it is adequately resourced and can bring in independent specialists.</p>	<p>The seafloor trigger will no longer be needed in light of the development of a schedule for treatment.</p> <p>The MMAG will continue to be funded and be involved in the review of the Wastewater and Marine Environment program (WMEP).</p> <p>Six-year reviews of the WMEP will be undertaken in consultation with the MMAG and other independent experts.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>The Panel's view is that ongoing stormwater monitoring and management by the CRD needs to remain a high priority, regardless of any decision taken by the CRD on treatment of wastewater.</p> <p>The CRD is responsible for stormwater, but only the municipal authorities appear to have the authority to enforce stormwater bylaws. Watershed management plans seem to be approved at a political level. <i>The Panel poses the question to the CRD about whether its effectiveness in delivering on their commitments in the LWMP is hindered by present institutional arrangement.</i></p> <p>While the CRD is responsible for stormwater quality management, it lacks the authority to enforce stormwater bylaws.</p>	<p>The current monitoring program will continue. Options to enhance monitoring and management will be investigated.</p> <p>Initiate discussions with municipalities to identify needed changes to CRD or municipal authority to ensure stormwater protection and improvement.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>Enterococci should be the measurement of choice and is recommended by Canadian authorities.</p> <p>While the CRD's existing stormwater monitoring approach does have merit, it should be augmented with monitoring that describes stormwater quality and quantity with respect to chemical contaminants and consideration of assessing the ecological effects of stormwater, in context with other stressors and overall harbour quality.</p>	<p>Continue with fecal coliform as an indicator at present and consult on the use of enterococci with Vancouver Island Health Authority.</p> <p>In 2007, Stormwater, Harbours and Watershed program (SHWP) staff will review these items, including the re-evaluation of the shoreline rating system. Improvement will be presented following this review.</p>
<p>The CRD coordinates harbour environmental protection and improvement efforts with its partners, but it lacks the authority to enforce related LWMP commitments.</p> <p>The CRD should focus additional attention on coordination efforts, ensuring that the</p>	<p>The current Victoria and Esquimalt Harbours Environmental Action Plan (VEHEAP) partnerships and cooperative approach are working well and progressing on harbours improvements. One area where coordination could be improved is between VEHEAP and the Greater Victoria Harbour Authority (GVHA). It is recommended that the same CRD staff member should be the CRD representative on the GVHA and VEHEAP.</p> <p>Establish an inter-municipal group to discuss integrated watershed management across the region and identify future direction and required resources.</p> <p>Continue work to provide ecological data for the harbours on the Harbours Atlas and Natural Areas Atlas.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>stressors are managed in relative priority to the waterways they affect. While good work is being done, it may be that a (higher level of resourcing and action) is needed.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the CRD's SHWP, in conjunction with VEHEAP members and other CRD programs, should consider the relative priority of different environmental stressors in their work to improve environmental quality (not only with respect to harbours but also with respect to stormwater runoff to the harbour). <i>The goals for protection for the harbours should be clearly stated and agreed in terms of the measurements being made and interpreted by the various stakeholders (for example, benthic community health, food chain transfer of contaminants, stormwater quality, habitat quality,</i></p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>VEHEAP developed the Victoria and Esquimalt Harbours Environmental Management Strategy, which identifies clearly stated goals for the harbour</p> </div> <p>VEHEAP developed the Victoria and Esquimalt Harbours Environmental Management Strategy, which identifies clearly stated goals for the</p> <p>VEHEAP developed the Victoria and Esquimalt Harbours Environmental Management Strategy, which identifies clearly stated goals for the harbours.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, the panel did not review the many reports and baseline studies that have been conducted for the harbours and which were u health of the harbour and helped to establish the priorities (i.e., LGL report Environmental Priorities for Upper Victoria Harbour). These baseline studie data were used to determine the VEHEAP goals and priorities.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p><i>sediment toxicity</i>).</p> <p>The CRD has a program to inventory and manage TLW but does not have the authority to ensure its proper disposal.</p>	<p>Continue with current level of authority for next three to five years, then reassess.</p>
<p>With significant potential to contaminate land and near-shore environments and to expose humans to wastewater, sanitary and combined sewer overflows deserve particular attention from the CRD.</p> <p>Both the CRD and the municipalities should continue with their policies to design or replace trunk sewers, reducing overflows on a prioritized basis.</p>	<p>The CRD and affected municipalities should continue with their programs already in place to repair and/or replace sewers to reduce I&I and overflow. A 2003 letter from the minister of environment requires the CRD and municipalities to develop implementation schedules and cost estimates by 31 March 2004 and the elimination of sanitary sewer overflows consistent with the <i>Municipal Sewer Regulation</i>.</p>
<p>The location of a plant or series of wastewater treatment plants requires careful consideration of the degree of treatment and the space required, and the time period for its operation. The time should be very long (100 to 200 years). Also the capacity and space for potential future</p>	<p>Ideally, sites for wastewater treatment should be selected in accordance with this recommendation. It may not be possible to comply where available land is limited.</p> <p>The CRD Regional Water Supply Commission and Water Services department have made water conservation a high priority. The <i>Decision Informing Process</i> should consider opportunities for water reuse.</p> <p>This has been superseded by the minister's directive and the Core Area Liquid Waste Management committee's decision to proceed with secondary treatment.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>treatment improvements should be planned for.</p> <p>The quality of life in western society is highly influenced by the availability of water to the individual, so retaining this service must be a high priority. Water conservation will impact water consumption and, as a result, wastewater strength characteristics.</p> <p>The decision making process related to the need for wastewater treatment is highly dependent on the trigger process. This should not be the sole mechanism to determine the need for treatment. In the panel's view, this decision-making process should be revisited.</p>	
<p>Collection, treatment and disposal of septage (septic tank contents) is critical to public and environmental health. Assuming septic tank and absorption field designs meet standard</p>	<p>The planned maintenance management program for onsite systems will specifically address maintenance issues and require regular pump-out of septic maintenance of small wastewater treatment plants.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>requirements, maintenance becomes the critical management component.</p> <p>Accepted practice calls for a two- to five-year pump-out requirement. Proposed bylaw development might establish this practice. When population density and geology allow it, the best management is generally to place sewers in the community.</p>	
<p>The Panel did not make specific recommendations concerning the need for leachate treatment or type of leachate treatment. The panel recommended a careful, stepwise and comparative evaluation of risks versus benefits of leachate treatment at Hartland.</p>	<p>The CRD undertake a risk versus benefit analysis of leachate treatment as a component of the sewage treatment planning and decision process. Using a risk versus benefit approach, the objective of the study will be to determine if treatment of leachate at the landfill is warranted or if this treatment should occur at the plant.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
AUDIT OF CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

LWMP COMPONENT	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
Chapter 7 Regional Source Control Program	The procedure for identifying discharge requirements of new businesses to the CRD is an informal system. Currently, municipalities voluntarily distribute waste discharge assessment forms on behalf of the CRD with new building permit applications. The CRD should continue efforts to formalize this system with the municipalities in order to increase the capture rate. This could be accomplished via the annual meetings that are held with the municipalities.	Information on the waste discharge assessment system will be sent out to all municipal licensing and administrative departments annually and the message will be re-enforced at the planned annual meetings with municipal plumbing and building inspection staff.
Chapter 8 Inflow and Infiltration (I&I)	<p>The CRD should continue with their work on the implementation plans for the staged reduction of I&I and with the work of the I&I subcommittee, primarily in the area of sharing information and ideas between the members.</p> <p>The CRD and the municipalities should continue moving forward in gathering and utilizing the information associated with I&I management and planning that will assist in achieving MII3 (<i>measure flows before and after carrying out work on sewers to reduce I&I, to document expenditures and achievements, and to use this information to refine cost benefit curves developed to optimize expenditures</i>).</p>	The CRD and municipalities are continuing with implementation plans and are working together to continue to monitor I&I reduction, where possible, in order to generate information in accordance with the second recommendation. The CRD is planning to complete a draft I&I management report containing cost benefit information in 2007.
Chapter 9 Marine Programs	None.	
Chapter 10 Stormwater	<p>Once the stormwater quality bylaw is revised, the bylaw and its revisions should be communicated to all municipalities.</p> <p>The municipalities should commit to having at least one representative attend each meeting on the model stormwater quality bylaw and have that representative take ownership of bylaw implementation within their respective municipality.</p> <p>The municipalities should review the best management practices (BMP) documents and, if appropriate, adopt and enforce them.</p> <p>The CRD should formalize the process for rolling-out, and tracking, the BMP initiatives within the member municipalities.</p>	<p>The model bylaw is revised, as needed, to respond to changes in municipal needs and provincial and federal regulations. New versions will be made available to municipalities through the Bylaw Working group (BWG).</p> <p>All municipalities are invited to the BWG and CRD staff ensure that those not attending receive meeting minutes, agendas and action lists.</p> <p>This will be discussed at the next BWG meeting.</p> <p>This will be discussed at the next BWG meeting.</p>
Chapter 11 Harbours	None.	

ACTION PLAN
AUDIT OF CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

LWMP COMPONENT	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>Chapter 12 Trucked Liquid Waste (TLW)</p>	<p>The CRD could utilize the information that has been gathered about the TLW issues to redefine commitment MTLW1 in terms of specific deliverables.</p> <p>(MTLW1 = An ongoing program for the coordination of trucked liquid waste management in the core area.)</p> <p>The CRD could increase time and resources allotted to the implementation of commitment MTLW1.</p>	<p>New program commitments have been developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the generators to ensure appropriate disposal of TLW • Work with the private sector to develop proper and affordable treatment/disposal services for all TLW • Work in cooperation with senior governments to ensure coordinated delivery of government services <p>Reassess current level of resources in three to five years. For the next three to five years, an education approach will be used to achieve the LWMP commitments. If, after this time, a need for the CRD regulations is identified, further resources may be required.</p>
<p>Chapter 14 Treatment and Disposal</p>	<p>The CRD should continue with their efforts in securing land at Clover Point and Macaulay Point to hold in reserve for provision of treatment.</p> <p>The CRD should wait to proceed on this issue (acquisition of a site for sludge processing) until the results of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel have been reviewed by the CRD Board.</p>	<p>Clover Point and Macaulay Point are designated sites for wastewater treatment in the LWMP. However, the need for land at particular locations for wastewater treatment or for sludge processing will depend on decisions made following release of the <i>Decision Information Report</i>. Staff of the CRD and the Department of National Defence recently discussed the CRD's continuing interest in the acquisition of land at Macaulay Point and the status of plans for wastewater treatment.</p>
<p>Chapter 16 Infrastructure Upgrading</p>	<p>The CRD should periodically assess their completion of commitments in Table 16.1A and review the feasibility of the items included within the targets for the year. If it is determined that, due to changing circumstances, some of the targets cannot be completed or that they are better addressed through alternate arrangements (i.e., Item 2.2A), then an update should be appended to Table 16.1A that identifies the rationale for these changes.</p>	<p>It is proposed that Table 16.1A be reviewed annually and needed modifications identified along with a rationale for the changes. Depending on the need for and magnitude of the modifications, it is anticipated that the CRD will need to apply to the ministry for an amendment to Table 16.1A every two to three years.</p>
<p>LWMP in General</p>	<p>In general, the CRD has an excellent record of submitting their reports to the ministry within the timelines established within the LWMP. The CRD should maintain this diligence with these reporting commitments.</p> <p>The CRD should continue with its efforts to centralize the information associated with the various programs and provide quarterly reports. It was recognized by the audit team that, without this coordinated effort, it would have been more time-consuming to verify the commitments associated with each program.</p>	<p>The CRD is continuing to meet its commitments for reporting to the ministry.</p> <p>As the LWMP matures, the number of items that need to be reported has diminished and the reporting frequency has been reduced to biannually. However, regular reporting is recognized as a good method of tracking progress with plan commitments and as a means to ensure that important components of the plan are not overlooked.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
AUDIT OF CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

LWMP COMPONENT	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
<p>LWMP in General (cont'd)</p>	<p>The context for some of the commitments seems to have changed since the LWMP was first written in 2001. It is recommended that the CRD review the appropriateness and necessity of the existing commitments, as well as the need to add new commitments to the Plan that reflect changes that have occurred over time.</p> <p>Some commitments contained in the LWMP tend to be general in nature, which can make evaluation complicated. Jacques Whitford (JW) also understands that many of the commitments rely on budgetary approval, which makes it difficult to attach a temporal component. Nonetheless JW recommends reviewing the commitments and applying the principles of the SMART process to commitment development. This process should also ensure that the commitments are within the authority of the CRD and the participating municipalities to complete.</p> <p>As public awareness of the LWMP increases, especially with the pending public review of the audit report, it is recommended that an up-to-date version of the Plan be hosted on the CRD website, and that the amendment and extensions impacting the Plan be included in this document. It is also recommended that the commitments be numbered for reference purposes.</p> <p>Although the municipalities were in the process of implementing the component parts of the LWMP, it was apparent that they were unaware that these components resided within the LWMP itself. The one exception to this was in Oak Bay, where they seemed to be very knowledgeable and aware of the Plan and its commitments. JW attributes this general lack of awareness to the limited involvement that most of the interviewees had with respect to Plan development. It is recommended that, when new individuals are hired into positions with responsibilities for Plan implementation, the CRD holds an information session with them.</p> <p>The regular meetings that are held between the CRD and municipalities are also a useful tool for raising Plan awareness. However, feedback received during the audit indicated that changes to these meetings are required in order to make them more effective. The CRD should assess the frequency and amount of meetings that are held by the various programs and determine how these meetings might be integrated or coordinated. Both the CRD and the municipalities should collaborate on establishing meeting agendas that are beneficial to both parties.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the commitments in the plan should be reviewed periodically. It is proposed that the CRD should review the direction of the Plan, and the corresponding commitments, at the same time as the audit. This recommendation pre-dated the minister's directive; therefore, it is proposed to carry out the first review of the Plan and commitments after 30 June 2007, in light of the decisions made on wastewater treatment.</p> <p>The comment above applies to this recommendation as well.</p> <p>The original plan and the amendments are available on the website. However, it is recognized that a consolidated version would be useful. It is proposed to create a consolidated version after the major amendment associated with wastewater treatment has been submitted to the minister.</p> <p>It is proposed to provide an annual report for municipal staff and directors that outlines the status of the municipal commitments. CRD staff will offer to present the results to municipal councils or to meet with staff of individual municipalities to discuss the results. The first status report will be prepared in the spring of 2007.</p> <p>The CRD will review the number and purpose of meetings that are held to deal with LWMP issues and will convene a special meeting to discuss this issue with senior municipal staff. The issue of municipal attendance at meetings by municipal staff members will be discussed, as well as the process for rolling-out and tracking information collection / dissemination initiatives that rely on the support of municipalities.</p>

**ACTION PLAN
AUDIT OF CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

LWMP COMPONENT	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION RECOMMENDED
	<p>The effectiveness of these meetings could also be increased via a commitment by all municipalities to send one or more representatives to the meetings on a regular basis.</p> <p>The CRD should formalize the process for rolling-out and tracking information collection / dissemination initiatives that rely on support from the municipalities (i.e., stormwater best management practices, source control waste discharge assessment forms). These are examples of tools that can be highly effective for the CRD when supported by a focused implementation process.</p>	<p>See action above.</p> <p>See action above.</p>