



**REPORT TO CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2008**

SUBJECT **CORE AREA AND WEST SHORE WASTEWATER TREATMENT – APPROVAL OF PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

PURPOSE

To consider the opportunity for a peer review process for the core area and west shore wastewater treatment project.

BACKGROUND

The consultant team is in the final stages of developing the wastewater management strategy options for the Core Area Liquid Waste Management committee (CALWMC) to consider during their workshops scheduled for February and March 2009. These workshops will provide the committee an opportunity to review system configuration options.

With projects as large as the core area and west shore wastewater treatment project, a peer review process is frequently used to provide opportunity for an independent panel of experts to respond to questions elected officials may have as they make decisions regarding various system development options and strategies.

The peer review team (PRT) would assist the CALWMC in reviewing the options developed by the consultant team and would provide an independent opinion when the committee is selecting the wastewater treatment strategy to be submitted in the revised Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP).

ALTERNATIVES

1. That the Capital Regional District (CRD) seek proposals from engineering firms to complete the peer review for the core area and west shore wastewater treatment project.
2. That the CRD retain the services of a chair for the PRT who would assist with identifying and selecting suitably qualified PRT members based on the questions to be answered.
3. That a peer review not be conducted for the work completed by the current consultant team.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of the peer review process is estimated at \$300,000 for Alternatives 1 and 2 with completion scheduled for May 2009. The cost would be charged to Bylaw No. 3461.

There would be no additional cost to the project for Alternative 3.

PROCEDURAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Alternative 1 would take approximately two months longer than Alternative 2 and would provide limited opportunity for the CALWMC to engage the PRT prior to the scheduled CALWMC workshops in February and March 2009. The CALWMC, with input from CRD staff, would develop a list of issues in advance of the request for proposal. The PRT experts would generally be individuals from the selected firm. The CRD could request additions or deletions to the proposed PRT.
2. Alternative 2 would allow the CALWMC to have the PRT in place by the end of 2008. The CALWMC, with input from CRD staff, would develop a list of key issues they desire the team to assess, such as project phasing, integrated resource management issues, and system architecture, among others. Once the issues are developed, the team of experts would be assembled by the chair of the PRT for CALWMC approval. The PRT expertise would be tailored to address the issues identified.

It is anticipated that the PRT would be independent of the current consulting team and made up of world class experts from Canada and the United States in the implementation of major wastewater treatment projects. The PRT would engage individuals with specific interest in the project, and provide opportunity to hear from the public

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS

The peer review process will provide the CALWMC with the opportunity to have their issues addressed by an independent consultant team. It will offer the CALWMC a second opinion on the wastewater management strategies developed by the CRD's consultant team and it will assist them in making decisions on the wastewater management strategy to be submitted in the revised LWMP.

Alternative 1 would have a higher risk of exceeding the \$300,000 estimate.

Alternative 2 will give the CALWMC the greatest control in ensuring the expertise of the PRT, with the ability to draw upon experts from across North America.

Alternative 2 would allow the CALWMC to have the PRT in place by the end of December 2008. Alternative 1 would take approximately two months longer than Alternative 2 to have a PRT in place. Alternative 1 would provide limited opportunity for the CALWMC to engage the PRT before the scheduled CALWMC workshops in February and March 2009.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management committee recommend to the Board that a peer review be conducted of the planning work being completed for the core area and west shore wastewater treatment project and the services of a chair for the peer review team be retained by the Capital Regional District.

Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee – 22 October 2008
Re: Core Area and West Shore Wastewater Treatment – Approval of Peer Review Process
Page 3

Tony Brcic, PEng
Project Manager, Wastewater Treatment Project

Dwayne Kalynchuk, PEng
General Manager, Environmental Services
Concurrence

Kelly Daniels
CAO Concurrence

COMMENTS

TB:cl