



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee  
Held Wednesday, 12 January 2011 in the Board Room, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

---

**Present:** Directors: J. Brownoff (Chair), D. Fortin (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, S. Brice, J. Herbert (for C. Causton), V. Derman, B. Desjardins, G. Hill), P. Lucas, J. Cullington (for D. Saunders), C. Thornton-Joe, L. Wergeland, and G. Young  
Staff: T. Brcic, K. Daniels, L. Hutcheson, J. Hull, D. Lokken, A. Orr, and N. More (Recorder).  
Also Present: B. Furber, D. Langley, S. Peck, C. Garrett (Stantec), S. Rutherford (West Coast Environmental Law and Stantec)

**Absent:** Director F. Leonard

*The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m.*

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Brice, that the requests to speak from Bob Furber, David Langley and Dr. Shaun Peck be approved, and the agenda be approved as amended.

**CARRIED**

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

a) **MOVED** by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Blackwell, that the minutes of the 10 November 2010 Joint Core Area Liquid Waste Management and Environmental Sustainability committees meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

b) **MOVED** by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Blackwell, that the minutes of the 24 November 2010 Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

**3. Chair's Remarks** – The Chair announced this is her last meeting as Chair of the Committee.

**4. Presentations/Delegations**

- a) Delegation: D. Langley, re item 6—spoke to the budget status report with the view that it should be more comprehensive.
- b) Delegation: B. Furber, re item 6—spoke to the budget status report with the view that the design-build process has been misunderstood.
- c) Delegation: S. Peck, re item 5 and item 6—spoke to the Inflow and Infiltration Progress Report with the view that cost efficiencies have not been proven. Dr. Peck commented on the budget status report with questions about cost sharing and the relationship between capital costs and planning costs. Dr. Peck expressed his pleasure with agenda item 7, with the view that the delay in the audit provides more time for public consultation.

**5. EEE 11-03 Inflow and Infiltration Progress Report for October 2008 to March 2010 – Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan**

L. Hutcheson highlighted the recommendation that a workshop be held for the Committee to go into greater detail on the topic of managing inflow and infiltration (I&I) particularly from private properties. She introduced consultants C. Garrett and S. Rutherford, who gave a presentation on the report by Stantec.

The presentation reviewed that private property sewer laterals are part of the equation in reducing maximum daily wet weather flows as outlined in the core area Liquid Waste Management Plan and the Capital Regional District (CRD) and municipalities do have authority to address private property I&I to accomplish this commitment.

Discussion included comments and questions for the workshop, including the following topics:

- The relative importance of managing I&I
- Costs of I&I to the overall system, including the planned new system
- Examples of programs from other jurisdictions
- Strategies for homeowners and municipalities in managing private property I&I
- Technicalities of flow, loading, and levels of treatment

L. Hutcheson reviewed that the recommendation for a communications plan refers to raising awareness of I&I issues and responsibilities and introducing terminology to the public.

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Hill, that the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee:

- 1) receive this inflow and infiltration progress report for information, and direct staff to proceed with the education and outreach program; and
- 2) direct staff to arrange a workshop for the committee to discuss private property I&I reduction options and cost implications in greater detail.

**CARRIED**

**6. EWW 11-01 Core Area Liquid Waste Management Budget – Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program**

J. Hull spoke to the report and reviewed that the budget includes the final grant installment expected in March once the government is satisfied that particulars have been fulfilled.

Discussion included topics such as the direction of the project, amount of detail, government cost sharing amounts.

**MOVED** by Director Hill, **SECONDED** by Director Saunders, that staff provide a full life-cycle cost analysis on the core area wastewater treatment project.

**CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Director Young, **SECONDED** by Director Hill, that the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee receive this report for information.

**CARRIED**

**V. Derman, B. Desjardins, and D. Saunders opposed.**

**7. Correspondence: Letter from The Honourable Minister Coell re: Liquid Waste Management Plan Audit**

**MOVED** by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Brice, that it be recommended to the Board that the correspondence from The Honourable Minister Coell be received for information.

**CARRIED**

**8. Motions for Which Notice Has Been Given**

**a) Motion to further investigate other potential technologies for biosolids treatment :**  
Director V. Derman

Discussion included the following topics:

- A November 2009 report that looked at a number of biosolids treatment methods.
- The procurement process and the potential effects of hearing a proponent ahead of the process
- The design-build nature of the project
- The expected competitiveness of the project
- Development of the terms of reference for the procurement stage

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Hill, that staff be directed to further investigate Nexterra technology and other potential desirable technologies for biosolids treatment and provide a report on the risk and potential benefits of all technologies investigated.

**DEFEATED**

**B. Desjardins, V. Derman, G. Hill, P. Lucas, D. Saunders in Favour**

**b) Motion to harmonize practices at Hartland landfill with the core area liquid waste strategy:** Director P. Lucas

The Director agreed to having the two parts of the motion split. Discussion on the first part included the following points:

- PenGrow is a commitment of the Liquid Waste Management Plan
- Changes to the program would be a discussion for the Board
- Distribution of PenGrow at Hartland would come under the business of the Environmental Sustainability Committee.

**MOVED** by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Hill, that the following motion be referred to the Environmental Sustainability Committee: *“That the CRD harmonize current and future practices at Hartland landfill with our regional sewage treatment strategy, including negotiating an end to the PenGrow bio-solid soil amendment program currently taking place at Hartland landfill as part of the Saanich Peninsula Waste Management Plan”.*

**CARRIED**

Discussion on the second part revolved around the potential for planning and funding a waste-to-energy facility alongside the sewage treatment project.

**MOVED** by Director Lucas, **SECONDED** by Director Derman, that the CRD continue to explore opportunities to harmonize the Hartland Landfill Waste-to-Energy strategy and associated timelines with the existing Core Area Liquid Waste Committee responsibilities and commitments regarding emergency waste disposal.

**CARRIED**

**Director Blackwell opposed.**

**c) Motion to seek government opinion on environmental concerns regarding dredging option for piping from Esquimalt to Colwood:** Director B. Desjardins

Discussion included the following points:

- A submarine pipeline option would include a long list of necessary assessments to satisfy a number of government regulations and would have attendant costs and take up to two years to complete.
- Viability of accessing Colwood as a site

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Saunders, that staff be directed to enter into discussion with federal and provincial government to determine their concerns with regard to environmental feasibility of the dredging option for piping from Esquimalt to Colwood, allowing further investigation into the viability of a Colwood single site as an option for CRD sewage treatment and resource recovery.

**CARRIED**

**Director Herbert and Director Fortin opposed.**

**9. New Business—None**

**10. Motion to Close the Meeting and Move In Camera**

**MOVED** by Director Young, **SECONDED** by Director Hill, that Committee close the meeting and move *in camera* in accordance with the *Community Charter* Part 4, Division 3, Section 90(1)(e) *the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements* and (2)(b) *the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both*

**Committee moved to in camera session at 12:40 PM.  
Committee rose from in camera session without report**

**11. Adjournment**

**MOVED** by Director Young, **SECONDED** by Director Blackwell, that the meeting be adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

**CARRIED**