



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee  
Held Wednesday, November 13, 2013, and continued on November 28, 2013,  
in the Board Room, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

---

**Present: Directors:** D. Blackwell (Chair), S. Brice, V. Derman, B. Desjardins, S. Gudgeon (for D. Fortin), C. Hamilton, J. Herbert (for N. Jensen), G. Hill, B. Isitt (9:38) P. Madoff (for M. Alto), D. Murdock (for J. Brownoff, Vice-Chair), L. Seaton, V. Sanders (for F. Leonard), L. Wergeland, G. Young

**Staff:** R. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer; J. Hull, Interim Program Director, Seaterra Program; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks and Environmental Services; T. Robbins, General Manager, Integrated Water Services; A. Sweetnam, Program Director, Seaterra Program; T. Brcic, Deputy Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; S. Henderson, Manager, Real Estate Services; C. Neilson, Senior Manager, Human Resources; A. Orr, Senior Manager, Corporate Communications; R. Sharma, Senior Manager, Finance; S. Santarossa, Corporate Officer; N. More, Committee Clerk (Recorder)

**Also Present:** D. Harper, Tera Environmental Consultants

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

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

**CARRIED**

**2. Chair's Remarks:** There were none.

**3. Presentations/Delegations**

- 1) Carole Witter, re agenda item 4: expressed concerns about environmental and social reviews and questioned past decisions due to the process involving the Technical and Community Advisory Committee (TCAC).
- 2) Beth Burton-Krahn, re agenda item 5: spoke of the difference between mitigation measures and community benefits.
- 3) Fred Haynes, Prospect Lake District Community Association, re agenda item 7: expressed concerns about environmental impacts and the public consultation process and read out a motion from the Association to postpone the treatment plant project until more studies can be done; and expressed concerns about cost estimates. The delegation provided speaking notes which are on file at Legislative Services.
- 4) John Newcomb, re agenda item 4: spoke about hazard, danger and safety in relation to the triple bottom line analysis and expressed doubt of the need for the treatment plant project.
- 5) Meagan Klassen, Lyall Street Action Committee, re agenda item 5: expressed concern about the five-year agreement in relation to bargaining and disruptions during construction. The delegation provided speaking notes which are on file at Legislative Services.

- 6) Richard Atwell, Sewage Treatment Action Group, re agenda item 4: read out a letter written by him to the provincial government expressing concerns about past TCAC process and decisions and the impact on the wastewater management plan.

#### **4. Technical and Community Advisory Committee Review of Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan Draft Amendment**

L. Hutcheson spoke to the report. A version of Draft Amendment No. 9 – Summary revised by the TCAC was distributed to the Committee. In the revision, the phrase “in a manner that is consistent with CRD policy” replaces wording in the sections of the amendment related to biosolids processing and energy recovery.

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,  
That the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee request changes to draft Amendment No. 9 to the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan prior to forwarding it to the Board for approval and the Minister of Environment for approval.

On the motion, the Committee discussed the use of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) instead of an Environmental and Social Review (ESR) and how the budgeted funds for the ESR were allocated. D. Harper provided information, including that the EIS covers the same ground as an ESR but with additional scope. The Committee discussed the role of staff compared to the Committee in the decision-making process.

The Committee also discussed the following points:

- minor compared to major amendments in relation to scope of public consultation
- satisfaction of Province that draft Amendment 9 is a minor amendment
- wording in draft Amendment 9 that simplifies previous wording on climate change while retaining the same intent as in Amendment 8
- need for stronger wording around climate change
- terms of reference for TCAC, including membership
- approval by the Province of the use of EIS
- more environmental impact studies to come
- TCAC to review the amendments, not the whole plan
- Hartland area outreach in progress and the broader public consultation to come
- Macaulay and Clover points pump stations design, budget and partition screens
- public trust in the process and the decisions being made
- broad public interest balanced with response to neighbourhood impacts
- energy recovery from biosolids, the links between solid and liquid waste management, and wording that has changed from prescriptive to more general to allow for innovation
- whether the simplification or generalization of wording around climate change takes away from the concern to be carbon neutral, reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the community and improve the ecological footprint

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,  
That the main motion be amended as follows:

- 1) That staff be directed to report back on the following points:
  - the difference between an Environmental and Social Review (ESR) and an Environmental Impact Study (EIS);
  - an accounting of the decision to use an EIS instead of an ESR and how the budget was allocated;
  - an explanation of the Clover Point pump station upgrades in relation to the budget, Amendment 8 and draft Amendment 9;
  - the make-up and role of the Technical and Community Advisory Committee;
- 2) That the revisions referring to climate change be deleted and the wording stay the way it was in Amendment 8.

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Madoff, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,  
That further consideration of the matter be postponed until the next meeting and staff be directed to bring back a report on the Environmental and Social Review and Environmental Impact Study differences and decision, the Clover Point expansion, the make-up of TCAC, and wording around climate change.

**CARRIED**

Staff also received direction to bring back a separate report outlining the public consultation process planned or in progress for the neighbourhoods affected by the Hartland location.

The Committee recessed at 11:13 am and returned to session at 11:18 am.

## **5. McLoughlin Point Rezoning**

J. Hull noted that in the report, the beginning of the final paragraph on page 3, about height and setback provisions, should read “none of the design concepts” instead of “not all of”.<sup>1</sup> As well, in attachment 5 at the bottom of page 6, in paragraph 3.11 (b), the words “based on actual costs” should be inserted after the figure of \$200,000.

The Committee discussion included the following topics:

- details of the mitigation and benefits, how they fit into the budget, difficulty of assigning monetary value to benefits overall, opportunity for Esquimalt to generate revenue from heat recovery, ordinary compared to extra-ordinary mitigations and benefits, development of public amenities on McLoughlin site in the absence of permission for public to access through Department of National Defence property
- the lack of cost estimates for building a dock or using barges instead of trucks, the effect on competitiveness of cement producers due to travel by barge, and the concept of establishing an upset price so if the cost is over that price, negotiate an amount to give Esquimalt for other mitigations such as bike paths.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the CALWMC meeting of 12 February 2014, the Committee wished to highlight this verbal correction of the staff report as it relates to the third bulleted discussion point.

- height and setback restrictions not consistent with what was established in the design guidelines and none of the proponents can accommodate the restrictions without the CRD seeking a development variance permit
- confidence in the design panel review process that led to the design guidelines

Alternate Director Murdock left the meeting at 12:00 pm.

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Wergeland,  
That staff be directed to negotiate a revised bylaw and agreements with two provisions:  
reduce the total amenity and mitigation costs and remove the requirement for the barging of materials.

On the motion, the Committee discussed the following topics:

- rezoning negotiations with the Township of Esquimalt and the CRD as an applicant in the process
- the cost, scheduling impacts and uncertainty/risk of the barging stipulation
- difficulty of expressing community amenities or mitigations in dollars and thus of reducing them by any amount
- installing a dock depends on getting approvals and permits from senior government

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Madoff, **SECONDED** by Director Isitt,  
That the motion be amended so that the agreement includes height and setback requirements consistent with design concepts.

On the motion to amend, the Committee discussed the following points:

- participants in the design process
- principles in the design guidelines would reasonably take care of height and setbacks
- local responsibilities of the Esquimalt jurisdiction
- development variance permit process

The question was called on the amendment.

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

On the amended main motion, discussion included the following points:

- barging impacts such as: dock regulatory requirements, pilings, barge size and escort, crews, costs, only about four large ramp barges available from Vancouver, the truck to Davis St., loading and unloading, time and money, equipment rental, longshoremen costs if using Ogden Pt., weather delays.
- staff continue to negotiate and report back on result
- have a bonus on barging rather than take it out
- potential benefit to the region to have a dock, development of taxpaying buildings compared to non-taxpaying buildings, vision of the property for future development if not a treatment plant there

- if community offered enough money for compensation, would they agree to trucking instead of barging

**MOVED** by Director Wergeland, **SECONDED** by Director Young,  
That the main motion be amended by deleting the provision to reduce the total cost of amenities and mitigations.

**CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Wergeland,  
That staff be directed to negotiate a revised bylaw that removes the requirement for the barging of materials and includes the setbacks that are consistent with the design guidelines.

Discussion on the motion included the following points:

- the impact on the roads of trucking has already been addressed in the RFP: proponents have to return roads to same condition.
- barging extremely difficult to price, so consider setting an affordable number on how much to pay for not barging
- proposed agreement already includes \$950,000 item for amenities along Lyall St., essentially an offset to the social impacts of trucking. Esquimalt will be repaid that way for putting up with the trucks over the period of construction.
- authorize staff to negotiate around the design guidelines and removal of barging

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,  
That further consideration of the main motion be postponed to a future meeting and staff be directed to report back with approximate costs around the barging issue and whether an amount of money could be offered in place of the barging requirements.

**CARRIED**  
**Director Isitt OPPOSED**

The Committee recessed at 1:05 pm.  
Alternate Director Gudgeon left the meeting at 1:05 pm.  
The Committee meeting resumed at 1:17 pm.

***Notice of Motion***

by Alternate Director Madoff:

That staff be requested to provide a report on workplan implications and timing to develop a community impact mitigation and fee principle policy that would apply to all future CRD projects and initiatives.

***Adjournment***

**MOVED** by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,

That the meeting be adjourned at 1:20 pm and continue at a date and time to be determined.

**CARRIED**

***The meeting was reconvened on Wednesday, November 28, 2013, at 1:00 p.m. in the same location, with attendance as shown below:***

**Present: Directors:** D. Blackwell (Chair), J. Brownoff (Vice-Chair), M. Alto, S. Brice, V. Derman, J. Cullington (1:05 pm, for C. Hamilton), D. Screech (for G. Hill), L. Hundleby (for B. Desjardins), B. Isitt (1:02 pm), J. Herbert (for N. Jensen), F. Leonard, P. Madoff (for D. Fortin), L. Seaton, L. Wergeland, G. Young  
**Staff:** R. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer; J. Hull, Interim Program Director, Seaterra Program; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks and Environmental Services; D. Lokken, General Manager, Corporate Services; T. Robbins, General Manager, Integrated Water Services; A. Sweetnam, Program Director, Seaterra Program; T. Brcic, Deputy Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; S. Henderson, Manager, Real Estate Services; C. Neilson, Senior Manager, Human Resources; S. Santarossa, Corporate Officer; M. Montague (Recorder)

## **6. Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program & Budget Update**

Director Isitt arrived at 1:02 pm.

D. Lokken spoke to the report. She noted that a description on the implications of the project coming up and schedules with regard to the budget are included in the report. The budget information was presented to the Committee of the Whole with a more updated version of the document, and the update will be presented to the Committee at the next meeting.

Alternate Director Cullington arrived at 1:05 pm.

The Committee discussed the process in terms of the budget, including the following points:

- timeline for Committee review of the budget
- items included in the budget update
- need for an anaerobic digester and funding requirements

On the motion, discussion included:

- process for achieving and approving cost savings
- other options for resource recovery

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,

That the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program & Budget Update be received for information.

**CARRIED**

**Directors Isitt and Derman and Alternate Director Hundleby OPPOSED**

**7. Hartland North Resource Recovery Centre – Site Acquisition**

D. Lokken spoke to the report. The report was presented to the Environmental Services Committee and provides an update on the status of the site acquisition for the Hartland North Resource Recovery Centre.

The Committee discussed the following points:

- land requirements
- timing of the land swap
- meaning of the environmental implications and logistics

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,  
That the Hartland North Resource Recovery Centre – Site Acquisition report be received for information.

**CARRIED**  
**Director Alto OPPOSED**

**8. Service Plans Review Process, Core Area Liquid Waste Service**

T. Robbins spoke to the report. The CRD embarked upon a three year budget and business planning cycle last year and 2013-2015 represents the first three year term of this new approach. The service plan presented relates to areas supporting the Core Area Liquid Waste Service.

**MOVED** by Director Seaton, **SECONDED** by Director Brownoff,  
That the Service plan for the Core Area Liquid Waste Service be approved.

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Hundley, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,  
That the main motion be amended as follows:

That the financial implications of the Service Plan and any other budget items as required be discussed and considered by the Committee on a monthly basis.

B. Lapham advised that staff are currently reporting monthly on the financial progress of the Seaterra budget and to track progress on the implementation of the broader service delivery would be a significant undertaking.

The question was called on the amendment.

**DEFEATED**  
**Directors Blackwell, Brownoff, Brice, Derman, Isitt, Leonard, Seaton, Wergeland and Young and Alternate Directors Cullington, Herbert, Madoff and Screech OPPOSED**

The question was called on the main motion

**CARRIED**

**9. Motion to Close the Meeting**

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,  
That the Committee close the meeting in accordance with the *Community Charter* Part 4,  
Division 3, Section 90(1) (m) a matter that, under another enactment, is such that the public  
may be excluded from the meeting.

**CARRIED**

The Committee moved to the closed session at 1:58 p.m.  
The Committee rose from the closed session at 2:46 p.m. without report.

**10. Adjournment**

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Seaton,  
That the meeting be adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

**CARRIED**

---

CHAIR

---

RECORDER