



**REPORT TO CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY 24 MARCH 2010**

**SUBJECT UPDATE ON THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM – CORE AREA
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROGRAM**

PURPOSE

To update the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee (CALWMC) on the public participation program for the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program.

SUMMARY

At the CALWMC meeting of 24 February 2010, the CALWMC requested staff bring back further options for public participation related to the wastewater treatment project. This report also serves as an opportunity to update the committee on related public participation programs for the project.

Educational and Outreach

Recognizing the complexities of the wastewater program and the significant public interest and growth in the existing engagement program, the need for ongoing education and outreach material will continue to play a role. An informed public is the underpinning concept to good public participation. Newsletters similar to what have already been developed will be developed and sent out to the wider community highlighting key committee decisions such as procurement and siting. At some point, complimentary outreach activities such as public television and radio will also be explored.

Procurement Public Participation

The report of 24 February 2010 documents a series of public participation opportunities for community members to be heard regarding the issue of procurement of the wastewater project. Further opportunities to engage the public on this issue are outlined below.

<i>Technique</i>	<i>What you need to first think about</i>	<i>What can go right?</i>	<i>What can go wrong?</i>
TELEPHONE POLLS/SURVEY Random sampling of population by telephone to gain specific information for statistical validation	Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys	Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend meetings Provides input from cross-section of public, not just those on mailing list Higher response rate than with mail-in surveys	More expensive and labor intensive than mailed surveys

Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee – 24 March 2010
Re: Update on the Public Participation Program – CAWTP
Page 2

<i>Technique</i>	<i>What you need to first think about</i>	<i>What can go right?</i>	<i>What can go wrong?</i>
<p>TOWN HALL MEETINGS</p> <p>A group meeting format where people come together as equals to share concerns</p>	<p>Town meetings are hosted by elected officials to elicit input from constituents</p>	<p>Views are openly expressed.</p> <p>Officials hear from their constituents in an open forum.</p>	<p>The meeting escalates out of control because emotions are high.</p> <p>Facilitators are not able to establish an open and neutral environment for all views to be shared.</p>
<p>MAILED SURVEY / QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>Inquiries mailed randomly to sample population to gain specific information for statistical validation</p>	<p>Make sure you need statistically valid results before making investment</p> <p>Survey/questionnaire should be professionally developed and administered to avoid bias</p> <p>Most suitable for general attitudinal surveys</p>	<p>Provides input from individuals who would be unlikely to attend Meetings</p> <p>Provides input from cross-section of public, not just activists</p> <p>Statistically valid results are more persuasive with political bodies and the general public</p>	<p>Response rate is generally low</p> <p>For statistically valid results, can be labor intensive and expensive</p> <p>Level of detail may be limited</p>
<p>REVOLVING CONVERSATIONS</p> <p>Open meeting that stimulates active participation</p>	<p>Set room up with center table surrounded by concentric circles</p> <p>Requires several people to record</p>	<p>Can be used with 10 to 500 people</p> <p>Works best with controversial Issues</p>	<p>Dialogue can stall or become monopolized</p>

Capital Regional District (CRD) staff reiterate the philosophical and polarizing nature of this issue. Therefore; the public participation techniques which are applied need to be thoroughly considered.

Saanich East Siting Public Participation

The public participation program for siting a wastewater treatment facility in the Saanich East area will begin in late April. Already, there have been a few meetings held between CRD staff, consultants and Saanich staff to discuss and agree upon the process and respective responsibilities. Through public meeting(s) held in the Saanich East neighbourhood, CRD staff will be utilizing a “café style” technique to gather input from residents on the siting location pro’s and con’s and any further options that need to be considered in the siting process. In addition, a stakeholders’ workshop(s) to gather comments and feedback will also be held with key organizations who are potentially impacted, including the University of Victoria, Cadboro Bay Residents Association Board, nearby child care institutions, etc. Finally, as past practices have occurred, there will be an opportunity for residents to provide their input through the wastewater website.

Following the accumulation of these events, a public meeting will be held mid- May to allow for an opportunity to report back to the public the information gathered through the various public processes. This would be considered a validation point in the public process which is based on the principle of transparency.

Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee – 24 March 2010
Re: Update on the Public Participation Program – CAWTP
Page 3

A public participation report will be forwarded to committee by the end of May.

Upper Harbour Siting Public Participation

In the coming weeks, a variety of public participation techniques such as coffee meetings and discussions with community stakeholders and neighbourhood associations will be implemented as the location for a biosolids facility is explored further. This first step in the formal public process will assist and inform staff as to immediate neighbourhood concerns. A formal public participation process will still need to occur at an appropriate later date. In addition, CRD staff and consultants are currently organizing an educational study tour opportunity with key officials and community representatives in an effort to gain a better understanding of the various technologies, meet facility operators to talk about issues and concerns and explore facility design options. The technical support from Stantec will play a key role in the success of the educational study tour.

A report regarding the formal public participation process will be forwarded to the committee at a later date.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee receive this report as information.

Janette Loveys
Manager, Park Operations
Regional Parks

Andy Orr
Senior Manager
Corporate Communication

Dwayne Kalynchuk, PEng
Project Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment
Concurrence

JL:jta