



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee  
Held November 14, 2012, and continued on November 27, 2012 in the Board Room,  
625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

---

**Present, November 14: Directors:** D. Blackwell (Chair), L. Wergeland (Vice-Chair), M. Alto, S. Brice, J. Brownoff, C. Coleman (for D. Fortin), C. Cullington (for C. Hamilton), V. Derman, B. Desjardins, J. Herbert (for N. Jensen), G. Hill, B. Isitt, V. Sanders (for F. Leonard), G. Young  
**Staff:** K. Daniels, Chief Administrative Officer; J. Hull, Interim Project Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; T. Brcic, Deputy Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; S. Santarossa, Corporate Officer; N. More, Committee Clerk (Recorder)  
**Also Present:** R. Simm, Stantec

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am on November 14, 2012.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Wergeland,  
That the agenda be approved with the addition of the supplementary agenda.

**CARRIED**

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Herbert,  
That the minutes of the October 10, 2012, meeting be adopted as previously circulated.

**CARRIED**

**3. Chair's Remarks**

Given the large number of delegations, the Chair reminded the delegations of the five-minute speaking limit.

**4. Presentations/Delegations**

- 1) Bryan Gilbert re Item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He spoke of the sewage treatment project as a climate change issue, secondary treatment as unnecessary, not carbon neutral and that it would not remove all toxins. He spoke of the successes of the source control program and felt money spent there would have more justification. He expressed that the federal regulations were an example of bureaucracy winning out over science and outlined ways to contradict or delay the order from the Province. He felt that climate change issues were in need of funding and highlighted storm sewers and transportation. Mr. Gilbert referred to a biological trickling filter system from Napier, New Zealand that he felt was more economical. He urged the Committee to base decisions on peer-reviewed science and to delay the project.\*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> \*Speaking notes, a slide presentation or other written submission were received from the delegation and are on file in Legislative Services.

- 2) Graydon Gibson re Item 7: spoke in favour of the motions and against the decision for a land-based sewage treatment plant. He spoke against the federal regulation, for the effectiveness of the current system and mentioned the lack of health benefits from a land-based system. He expressed concern about the decision-making of the Committee, the costs of the project and the motivations of those who endorsed it. Mr. Gibson urged the Committee to put a temporary hold on the project and re-evaluate its merits.\*
- 3) Derry McDonnell, Open Victoria, re agenda item 7: spoke on behalf of Open Victoria, which he described as a non-partisan group in favour of transparency in decision-making. He expressed concern about the motions, mentioned that the debate has gone on since 2005, acknowledged that the Committee has sought professional opinion, and emphasized that opposition to the project still exists. He announced a town hall dialogue put on by Open Victoria on December 1, and expressed the hope that Committee members would attend to contribute to a balanced discussion. He said the federal by-election in progress had been mentioned as a barrier to attendance by some of the elected officials.\*
- 4) Christianne Wilhelmson, Georgia Strait Alliance, re agenda item 7: spoke against the motions. She said that, as the Executive Director of the Georgia Strait Alliance, she represented thousands of people around the Georgia Basin concerned about the health of the Strait of Georgia. She spoke of her credentials as a decision-maker on public bodies regarding wastewater treatment. Using slides to illustrate main points, she highlighted the environmental concerns and scientific advice about the volume of raw sewage with its toxic elements that gets dumped into the ocean environment, and scientific reports that led to the order from the Province for secondary treatment of sewage for the region. She reviewed the consultation and planning on sewage treatment conducted over the past six years. She expressed that it would be irresponsible to abandon what had been planned at this stage. She highlighted that the money is in place, the laws demand it, sewage is pollution, source control cannot handle all of it, and there is still time to improve the plan. She indicated the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) scientific panel had said dilution was not a long term solution.\*
- 5) Paul Brown re agenda item 7: requested more information be given. He felt taking advantage of a funding opportunity was not a strong rationale for the investment. He expressed unhappiness with the current system but concern that if the plan for secondary treatment is the wrong plan, the money will not be a good investment. He felt, on the other hand, that not going to secondary treatment could be detrimental to the economy if it negatively affected tourism. He said he struggles with the science because he hears sense from both sides of the argument. He expressed that he is prepared to make the investment but relies on the Capital Regional District (CRD) to demonstrate a leadership role, engage the public, educate the public on why secondary treatment is taking place, explain what it is going to mean financially and to the environment, and represent the public to senior government. He urged the Committee to help people like him understand the issue better.
- 6) Dr. Shaun Peck, public health consultant, re agenda items 6, 7 and 8: spoke in favour of the motions and questioned whether having a commission was a condition of funding, as he had not seen documentation. He felt there ought to be a legal agreement for funding and a budget before passing the commission bylaw and was concerned about the financial risks. He spoke in favour of lobbying the federal

government to categorize current sewage practices in the core area as low risk, with compliance set for 2040. Dr. Peck gave reasons such as interpretation of the regulation and where the total suspended solids (TSS) and carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (CBOD) levels were measured. He quoted a 2010 CRD submission that requested the federal government to use an environmental risk assessment approach rather than a single set of standards, and reviewed that the submission had been rejected by the regulators. He expressed that the CRD needs to challenge the law and obtain a waiver, and mentioned the City of San Diego as an example.\*

- 7) Richard Atwell, Stop a Bad Plan!, re agenda items 7 and 8: spoke against the motions and against going to secondary treatment and expressed that SETAC and other reports and regulations do not specifically call for it. He mentioned science and called for an environmental impact assessment. He expressed that the plan is not appropriate to greater Victoria because it will not return a demonstrable benefit and an exemption is necessary. He felt the CRD should press the issue with senior levels of government and challenge the regulations.\*
- 8) Michelle Coburn re agenda item 7: spoke against the motions. She spoke of having a family history in Victoria going back a hundred years and growing up knowing not to swim on polluted beaches and not to eat polluted clams or bottom feeders. She felt the environment has been harmed and Victoria is one of the few communities of its size on the continent that does not have secondary treatment. She felt it is time to clean up the ocean, not dump more sewage into it and expressed that the current system of screening cannot be called treatment. She urged the Committee to take responsibility and stop sewage from going into the ocean now.
- 9) Tony Rose re agenda item 6: spoke in favour of the two motions. He spoke of doubts about the technical viability of the project. He felt there was insufficient engineering design or protocol for a detailed estimate and the current estimate was unsound. He urged the Committee to opt for a staged approach with a series of smaller modular units and staggered investment over 20 years with technology tested first in a pilot plant. He added numbers together to express the amount of debt from the sewage treatment project and the City of Victoria bridge project. He spoke critically of the science, engineering and economics of the sewage treatment plan.\*
- 10) Janet Gray, Greater Victoria Water Watch Coalition (GVWWC), re agenda item 7: spoke against the motion. She spoke of the sewage issue as mandated by the government in 2003 and the work done to inform the public of the Public Private Partnership (P3) aspect of the plan, the 2010 petition and the 4,000 signatures against a P3. She spoke of the pressure for another P3 project. She expressed the GVWWC position that water is a shared legacy and access to clean water a right. She expressed that the scientific facts are flexible. She felt the main concern was the design and build of the plant, the P3 portion for resource recovery, the use of public funds and the number of years of private operation of the project. She requested the Committee insist on a shorter, five-year term for the private operation of the resource recovery portion of the project.
- 11) David Anderson, Hon. Chair, Association for Responsible and Environmentally Sustainable Sewage Treatment (ARESST), re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt the secondary treatment would not produce net benefits to the health of the public or the environment based on scientific views and analysis. He felt that a 2004 marine assessment showed more stress to the Salish Sea from industrial run-off

from Vancouver and Seattle than from Victoria sewage outfalls. He referred to the Clean Water Act of the United States (US) federal government and regulation waivers for ocean-side cities like San Diego, and expressed concern that billions spent on secondary treatment would take away financing from other projects.

- 12) Joan McHardy re agenda item 7: did not appear but submitted a letter via email expressing her views against the sewage plan on the basis of science and cost. The letter is filed at CRD Legislative Services.\*
- 13) Eric Davies re agenda item 7: spoke against the motions and in favour of the sewage treatment plan, and expressed that there is reciprocity between the ocean and the community. He expressed that waste products of 7 million people going into the ocean has consequences. He was concerned the motions would delay treatment until too late.\*
- 14) Tony Gooch re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He spoke of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment cost benefit analysis of municipal sewage plans that showed the benefits of secondary treatment and which led to the Canada-wide regulations. He felt there was sufficient difference between Victoria and the municipalities studied that the risks and benefits would be significantly different for Victoria and therefore, the regulations should not apply.\*
- 15) Donald Ife re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions and introduced his background and experience in medicine and hygiene in the Royal Canadian Navy. He expressed that some cities located near coastal waters could take advantage of the tremendous power of ocean tidal action and currents for adequate disposal of wastewater, that Victoria was such a city and that a thorough analysis of the present sewage discharge method was justifiable.
- 16) Bob Furber, concerned citizens, re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt the federal wastewater regulations had been forced on the region and the Committee ought to challenge them. He spoke of the decades of monitoring and study that showed compliance in terms of guidelines for threat to fish, fish habitat and risk to human health by fish consumption. He felt the objectives of the federal regulations were disconnected from their prescriptions. He felt the Committee could challenge the regulations on the basis of undetectable environmental benefits and avoid the drain of money. He requested that the Committee have the federal government designate the current sewage practices as low-risk, or say no to the regulations.
- 17) Susan Low, Esquimalt-Royal Roads Green Party Constituency Association, re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. She expressed a concern that the CRD had been pressed into land-based secondary treatment by the provincial government without proof of its necessity or benefit. She was concerned about decisions made without a cost-benefit analysis and the lack of an assessment of the net environmental impacts of resource recovery. She felt the proposal was unscientific and the Committee ought to buy some time to examine it and challenge the federal regulations. She referred to scientific studies and expressed the view that no conclusive argument for secondary treatment had been made, that dilution is not a long-term solution but a short-term solution with no scientific basis ought to be rejected.\*
- 18) Heather Murphy re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. She felt there were many reasons to stop the process and apply to the government for an exception, such as concerns about cost and the likelihood of minimal benefits. She felt there were

more reasons to stay with the present system and go more cautiously into the next steps.

- 19) Brian Burchill re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He expressed that the Canada-wide regulation does not stipulate the method but instead speaks of secondary treatment or equivalent. He referred to the nation-wide US Clean Water and Environmental Protection acts, community objections in the US and resultant court cases, waivers and regulation reviews. He spoke against the use of a single standard and in favour of the treatment capability of some coastal waters, which he felt was a proven, sustainable and reliable system.\*
- 20) John Farquharson re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt the treatment project should be halted until a whole environmental assessment and cost analysis had been done. He felt the Committee had been cajoled and threatened with the regulations rather than used science to determine the need for secondary treatment, and the funding should not be taken if the project had no merit.
- 21) Dr. Michael J. Platts re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt that the project would be a waste of money, make the ocean and environment worse, and was a political decision. He felt there was excellent treatment already in place using natural means and replacing it with a man-made method would mean optics won out over science. He mentioned global warming and ocean warming and acidity, and felt that the proposed sewage treatment would increase carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere during construction. He was concerned about piping sewage uphill. He mentioned daily tidal flows and Victoria outfall discharges, which he felt rarely reached the shores of the state of Washington in the US. He characterized the project as a fiscal and environmental disaster and urged the Committee to prevent it.
- 22) Ray Zimmermann, Sea to Sea Greenbelt Society, re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He highlighted the society's concern for watershed protection. He felt there had been no environmental assessment or cost benefit analysis of the project, the benefits would be minimal or had not been proven, and that expenditure without benefit was irresponsible. He expressed that the money would be better spent on reducing pollution at source and influencing the industrial sector on source control.
- 23) Andria Tetlow, ARESST, re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt that the sewage treatment project was harmful, not needed and should be stopped. He felt science supported the present system. He was concerned about debt, tax dollars, and added CO<sub>2</sub> during construction leading to acidification of the seas. He felt the real threats were stormwater, sanitary sewer overflows into surface waters and harbours, and the deterioration of old sewer pipes.
- 24) John Bergbusch, ARESST, re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He mentioned advocating for the public good and spoke of values, fiscal and environmental responsibility as a moral issue, competing but common goods and ethical decisions on affordable housing, parks, safe and abundant water supply, trail networks, and the CRD recycling program. He mentioned the poorest and most vulnerable and the earth itself, wasteful resource impacts, and the low priority of a land-based sewage treatment system. He felt there were better ways to protect the environment and the Committee ought to challenge the federal government on the basis of scientific evidence and the need for an environmental impact assessment and cost benefit analysis.\*

- 25) John Motherwell re agenda item 8: spoke in favour of the motions. He spoke as an engineer and mentioned a 1999 environmental award for the sewage outfall at Port MacNeill. He felt there was no evidence of harm in the marine environment. He was concerned about the noise and road disruption of the planned construction, and expressed that the location of the underwater pipe was unsatisfactory and risky. He mentioned community disruption and the geological fault line, highly noxious sewage sludge, blasting, pressure, overflow, and contamination.\*
- 26) Don Monsour re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt the presence or absence of secondary treatment would not affect tourism, the plan for secondary treatment was based on optics, the ocean could treat the sewage, and the present system was adequate.
- 27) Colin Nielsen re agenda item 7 and 8: spoke in favour of the motions. He expressed that the CRD was about to embark on the largest, publicly funded infrastructure project in the history of Greater Victoria and if it could not be justified using the best available science, then it must be halted and a science based analysis done. He spoke of cost overruns and the capped amount of federal and provincial funding contributions. He was concerned for the taxpayers and wanted to know that the resulting system would have a significant and measureable environmental benefit before embarking on project.\*
- 28) Eric Manning re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motions. He felt scientific fact was being ignored, partly because of the unpleasantness of sewage. He urged the Committee to listen to ocean scientists and make evidence-based decisions.\*
- 29) Deborah Dickson re agenda item 7: spoke in favour of the motion. She referred to "The Path Forward" as a flawed plan. She expressed that there had been no meaningful public consultation and that the process was flawed because in the "The Path Forward", public consultation was planned for the final phase. She was concerned about potential environmental harm and future effects and the cost to taxpayers. She felt public consultation was needed prior to any further studies.

The Committee took a ten-minute break at 11:35 a.m.

## **5. Wastewater Technologies – Rob Simm, Stantec**

R. Simm, of Stantec, a consultant to the wastewater treatment project, reported on wastewater treatment past and present, regulatory shifts from public health to environmental protection, emerging technologies and their slow path to commercialization. Topics included:

- More stringent regulations
- Maximization of resource recovery
- Impact of molecular biology on treatment optimization
- Contaminants of emerging concern
- Add-on processes after secondary treatment

### ***Adjournment***

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Herbert, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Sanders,  
That the meeting be adjourned at 12:05 p.m. and be continued at the next available date.

**CARRIED**

***Chair Blackwell reconvened the meeting at 10:32 am on November 27, 2012.***

**Present, November 27: Directors:** D. Blackwell (Chair), L. Wergeland (Vice-Chair), M. Alto, S. Brice, J. Brownoff, V. Derman, B. Desjardins, D. Fortin, C. Hamilton, G. Hill, B. Isitt, N. Jensen, V. Sanders (for F. Leonard), G. Young

**Staff:** K. Daniels, Chief Administrative Officer; J. Hull, Interim Project Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Environmental Sustainability; R. Lapham, General Manager, Planning & Protective Services; T. Brcic, Deputy Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; G. Harris, Senior Manager, Environmental Protection, Environmental Sustainability; S. Santarossa, Corporate Officer; N. More, Committee Clerk (Recorder)

## **6. Motions for Which Notice Has Been Given (EWW 12-73)**

J. Hull spoke to the report, which addressed issues brought up in the motions and included a letter from Environment Canada showing no exceptions or exemptions. He covered the following points in a PowerPoint presentation:

- Evidence from science shows that the ocean is not effectively treating sewage and that contaminants are remaining in the environment and entering the food chain.
- Secondary sewage treatment effectively reduces a variety of contaminants.
- The British Columbia Environmental Management Act and the Canadian Wastewater Systems Effluent Regulations (part of the Fisheries Act) provide legal obligations around sewage treatment.
  - Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan Amendment No. 8, approved in 2010, was a significant departure from Amendment No. 7, which had reflected the Path Forward plan.
  - Federal and provincial governments agreed to fund the program, as represented by Amendment No. 8, up to \$501 million.
- Legal implications of breaching governing legislation include risk exposure and litigation from third parties.

The presentation also highlighted procurement and cost control, emerging technologies and information about wastewater treatment in San Diego. It summarized support for secondary treatment along with an effective source control program.

The Committee discussed the information in the report and presentation, including the scientific evidence, the levels of treatment from primary to tertiary, impact assessments and advantages of land-based treatment, the world-wide trend to protect the marine environment amidst concern for water scarcity, the number of municipalities in Canada moving from primary to secondary treatment with land-based approaches, the adaptability of the planned system to go to tertiary treatment in the future, the siting and impact studies available on the CRD wastewater website, the current, base plan as being ready for innovation from the public sector through the procurement process.

## **7. Motions for Which Notice Has Been Given**

- 1) Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program – Director Derman

On the motion, the Committee discussed scientific and regulatory factors, planning with the Regional Growth Strategy in mind, costs, benefits, financing and the design process. The Committee discussed the guiding principles adopted at the beginning of the project and the evolution of attitudes toward the environment and sustainability, as well as the history of the work done by the Committee over the past six years, the role of the Committee to build the secondary treatment plant in compliance with regulations as opposed to debating the pros and cons of secondary treatment, and how to ensure a good plan or improvements to the plan. Other topics of discussion included stormwater, public engagement, financial risk from delays, and the responsibility to act now.

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Desjardins,

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee:

1. Suspend further action on the current sewage treatment project titled: *The Path Forward*.
2. Commit to development of a plan for sewage treatment that:
  - a. Optimally contributes to global and local environmental issues particularly those involved in climate change.
  - b. Contributes to a sustainable financial environment for regional, provincial and federal taxpayers by substantially reducing or eliminating the life cycle costs involved in the current project.
  - c. Responds to changes in the region anticipated by the Regional Growth Study (RGS)
  - d. Positions itself to take advantage of emerging technology such as microbial fuel cells which promise very considerable environmental benefits at greatly reduced or net positive life cycle costs.
3. Based on extensive scientific and health assessments that indicate minimal harm and risk, lobby the federal government, at both the staff and the political level, to categorize current sewage practices in the Core Area as "low risk". Such a characterization would require compliance with federal regulations by 2040.
4. Based on extensive scientific and health assessments that indicate minimal harm and risk, lobby the provincial government, at both the staff and the political level, to modify the order to treat so that is consistent with the minimal risks presented by current core area sewage practices.

**DEFEATED**

**Blackwell, Wergeland, Alto, Brice, Brownoff, Fortin, Isitt, Jensen, Sanders, Young**

**OPPOSED**

2) Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program – Director Desjardins

On the motion, the Committee discussed the potential for a pause in the process to reflect on the plan and build consensus on a better plan. Topics included new technology, public consultation, the RFP process, the Commission, resource recovery, and the representative nature of the current design.

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee request a re-evaluation of the federal environmental standing of the Capital Regional District (CRD) and request an exemption in the federal wastewater regulations.

And that the CRD engage the prominent scientists who are united in their opinion that we are not harming the environment, and that we have the wrong plan.

**MOVED** by Director Jensen, **SECONDED** by Director Hill,  
That the motion be divided into two parts.

**CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Director Jensen, **SECONDED** by Director Desjardins,  
That the first part of the motion be amended to insert the words “and provincial” to read  
“...request a re-evaluation of federal and provincial environmental standing...”

On the motion to amend, the Committee discussed the amount of negotiation already  
accomplished with the federal and provincial governments, the approval of Amendment  
8 by the government, and delays to the project.

**DEFEATED**

**Blackwell, Wergeland, Alto, Brice, Brownoff, Fortin, Isitt, Sanders, Young** **OPPOSED**

The question was called on the first part of the motion.

That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee request a re-evaluation of the  
federal environmental standing of the Capital Regional District (CRD) and request an  
exemption in the federal wastewater regulations.

**DEFEATED**

**Blackwell, Wergeland, Alto, Brice, Brownoff, Fortin, Isitt, Jensen, Sanders, Young**  
**OPPOSED**

The question was called on the second part of the motion.

That the CRD engage the prominent scientists who are united in their opinion that we  
are not harming the environment, and that we have the wrong plan.

**DEFEATED**

**Blackwell, Wergeland, Alto, Brice, Brownoff, Fortin, Isitt, Jensen, Sanders, Young**  
**OPPOSED**

The Director from Oak Bay read out a motion he had previously sent to the Committee  
by email and the Chair ruled that he should make a notice of motion at the following  
meeting.

**MOVED** by Director Jensen, **SECONDED** by Director Desjardins,  
I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The Chair immediately put forth, “Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?”

**CARRIED**

**Hill, Hamilton, Derman and Desjardins** **OPPOSED**

**8. Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program Commission Bylaw (EWW 12-72)**

J. Hull introduced the report. He noted that changes to the Bylaw were highlighted to show where the Committee or Board have input to the decisions being made. Some examples included that the Committee will appoint the Commission, the CRD Procedures Bylaw will apply to Commission meetings, the Commission must respond to the Committee within a reasonable time on issues raised by the Committee, the Commission must liaise with the Committee on the appointment of the Project Director, and others.

On the main motion, the Committee discussed the provisions of the Bylaw for the Committee to maintain oversight of the project.

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Hill,  
That Bylaw No. 3851 be amended to strike out section 14, Delegation.

**DEFEATED**

**Blackwell, Wergeland, Alto, Brice, Brownoff, Fortin, Hamilton, Jensen, Sanders,  
Young OPPOSED**

The Committee continued to discuss the draft Bylaw, and on the second motion to amend, focused on the balance of authority between the Committee and the Commission, budgetary and financial control, terms such as “review”, “liaise” and “coordinate”, the power to determine the terms of the request for qualifications (RFQ) and the request for proposal (RFP) to ensure innovative technology, and the role of professional and technical expertise compared to the responsibilities of elected officials.

**MOVED** by Director Alto, **SECONDED** by Director Hill,  
That Bylaw No. 3851 be amended to replace the word “review” in section 10.1 (a)(i) with “approve,” and that the Committee chair and vice chair meet with the Provincial Minister directly.

**CARRIED**

**Young OPPOSED**

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,  
That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That Bylaw No. 3851, “Core Area Wastewater Treatment Commission Bylaw No.1, 2012”, as amended above, be introduced and read a first time and second time, read a third time and adopted.

**CARRIED**

**Isitt, Hill, Hamilton, Derman OPPOSED**

**9. New Business – There was no new business.**

**10. Motion to Close the Meeting**

**MOVED** by Director Fortin, **SECONDED** by Director Jensen,  
That closed portion of the meeting be postponed until the meeting scheduled for November 28, 2012.

**CARRIED**

**11. Adjournment**

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Herbert, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Sanders,  
That the meeting be adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

**CARRIED**

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE CLERK