

Meeting Minutes
Core Area Liquid Waste Management
Committee

Wednesday, March 9, 2016

9:00 AM

6th Floor Boardroom

PRESENT:

DIRECTORS: L. Helps (Chair), R. Atwell (Vice-Chair), M. Alto, S. Brice, D. Blackwell, J. Brownoff, V. Derman, B. Desjardins (Board Chair), C. Hamilton, B. Isitt (9:04), N. Jensen, C. Plant, Chief R. Sam (9:02), D. Screech, L. Seaton, Chief A. Thomas, G. Young (9:21)

STAFF: R. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks and Environmental Services; D. Lokken, General Manager, Finance and Technology; T. Robbins, General Manager, Integrated Water Services; S. Henderson, Manager, Real Estate; D. Telford, Senior Manager, Environmental Engineering; B. Reems, Corporate Officer, and N. More, Committee Clerk (Recorder)
ALSO PRESENT: Alternate Directors C. Day and L. Hundleby; E. Lee, Urban Systems; C. Houghton, Aurora Innovations

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,
That the agenda be approved with the supplementary agenda.

MOVED by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,
That the agenda be amended to hear item 4 ahead of item 3.
CARRIED

MOVED by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,
That item 4 be heard ahead of item 2 and the agenda be approved as amended
with the supplementary agenda.
CARRIED

2. Adoption of Minutes

There were no minutes for adoption.

Item 4 was considered ahead of item 2.

4. Motion to Close the Meeting

4.1. [16-397](#) Motion to Close the Meeting

MOVED by Director Screech, **SECONDED** by Director Seaton,
That the meeting be closed in accordance with the Community Charter Part 4,
Division 3, 90 (1) (i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege,
including communications necessary for that purpose.
CARRIED

The Committee moved to the closed session at 9:02 a.m.

The Committee rose from the closed session at 9:21 a.m. without report.

3. Chair's Remarks

Chair Helps remarked on being practical, flexible and reasonable, and on the March 2 meeting. She informed the Committee of a meeting between herself, Board Chair Desjardins, and senior government Ministers Polak and Fassbender, and on the Province being willing to help find a solution by providing facilitation.

5. Presentations/Delegations

- 16-414** Delegation: Bart Reed, Cook St. Village Business Association, re: item 6.1
- Bart Reed, representing the Cook Street village Business Association, outlined the disruption and business losses that could result from trenching on Cook St. to add pipes for conveying wastewater to a Rock Bay plant. He spoke against Rock Bay as an option. The delegation provided a written submission, on file at Legislative and Information Services.
- 16-415** Delegation: Alison Glasbergen, re: items 6.10 and 6.11
- Alison Glasbergen spoke in favour of making use of existing infrastructure, the best technology, and a distributed system. She was concerned with taxes and Oak Bay storm flows.
- 16-416** Delegation: Elise Schopper-Brigel, re: item 6.9
- Elise Schopper-Brigel spoke against the current options, in comparison to the already-approved plan for a centralized plant at McLoughlin Point, and against a Clover Point plant.
- 16-417** Delegation: P. Potent, re: items 6.1 and 6.2
- Phillip Potent was concerned with the process and the purchase of land at the Rock Bay site.
- 16-418** Delegation: Rick Illi, President, CUPE Local 1978, re: item 6.1
- Rick Illi, as President of CUPE Local 1978, spoke in favour of publically-owned and operated wastewater treatment, whichever option was selected, against expanding P3 funding for integrated waste management, and for establishing a procurement policy that would guide the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Commission to maintain transparency, accountability and cost effectiveness, and eliminate further privatization of public services. The delegation provided a written submission, on file at Legislative and Information Services.
- 16-419** Delegation: Russ Smith, re: item 6.1
- Russ Smith spoke in favour of the options that now included tertiary treatment and a somewhat distributed system, but was concerned there was no mechanism for broadening scope. He felt the procurement process should be

more open and there should be a business case analysis comparing pipe conveyance to truck conveyance of sludge, or to the potential for expanding use of existing pump stations.

16-420 Late Delegation: Michelle Coburn, Victoria Sewage Treatment Alliance, re: item 6.1

Michelle Coburn referenced the Greater Victoria Water Watch Coalition, the Sewage Treatment Alliance, and the public consultation process that was part of the past McLoughlin plan. She spoke in favour of the McLoughlin Point site, advanced oxidation, and shared responsibility by all municipalities. The delegation provided a written submission, on file at Legislative and Information Services.

16-421 Late Delegation: Ian Back, re: item 6.1

Ian Back felt going to tertiary treatment was an unnecessary cost and that parallel cost numbers for secondary treatment should be developed before a decision is made.

6. Committee Business

6.1. [16-353](#) Options Analysis and Recommendation - Core Area Wastewater Treatment and Resource Recovery

L. Hutcheson provided highlights of the report and summarized the two base cases with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

The Committee discussed Macaulay Plain as opposed to Macaulay Point. The Committee sought clarification on technical details about all the locations, including:

- flows, effluent quality and capacity over time
- federal lands, land costs, and land use besides treatment plant
- upgrading Macaulay pump station
- cost deferrals
- tsunami wall
- trenching
- funding agreements
- participant funding provisions for future West shore solution
- cost comparison of trucking vs pumping through pipelines
- clarity of secondary vs tertiary costs
- anaerobic digestion vs gasification
- wastewater treatment regulations on flows and capacity
- 2030 and 2045 capacity
- operation of one or more plants
- configuration of flows and pump stations
- the process outlined in item 2 of the staff recommendation
- the role of the Technical Overview Panel or its replacement

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

1. That a conditional Liquid Waste Management Plan Amendment No. 10 be prepared as a basis for approval and submitted to the Minister of Environment with the following elements:
 - a) A tertiary wastewater treatment plant at Clover Point, servicing all flows currently directed to Clover Point, up to 2030 (see Note 1, below), and;
 - b) A tertiary wastewater treatment plant at McLoughlin Point, servicing all flows currently directed to Macaulay Point outfall, up to 2030, and;
 - c) Provision for a Westside wastewater treatment plant for future growth, at a location to be determined
 - d) Hartland Landfill as the preferred site for biosolids processing with technology to be confirmed by the process below.
 2. That included within the Plan amendment is a process under which the CRD would invite the submission of project concepts to achieve the goals of the Project Charter. The submissions would include sufficient detail to allow for meaningful evaluation of the project concepts against each other and against the base case, including details regarding sites, technology, a feasibility assessment, demonstration of compatibility with current infrastructure, compliance with provincial and federal requirements and demonstration of significant fiscal advantages and/or environmental advantages over the base case, including financial backing.

The submissions could demonstrate solutions for:

 - a) A Rock Bay/Westside combination.
 - b) A tertiary wastewater plant at either McLoughlin Point or Macaulay Point as an alternative to Rock Bay, a tertiary wastewater plant at Clover Point, provision for a tertiary plant on the Westside.
 - c) The treatment of biosolids at Hartland, possibly in combination with food scraps, municipal solid waste and wood waste.
 - d) Other feasible alternatives that demonstrate compatibility with current infrastructure, compliance with provincial and federal requirements and demonstration of significant fiscal advantages and/or environmental advantages and financial backing.
 3. That the preferred approach be formally communicated to all senior levels of government involved in funding the project, including the Province, 3P Canada and Infrastructure Canada.
 4. That a referral be made to both Esquimalt and Victoria Councils seeking approval in principle of the proposed sites as locations for tertiary wastewater treatment plants.
 5. That staff be directed to continue working with Colwood, Songhees and Esquimalt First Nations on issues related to purchased capacity and cost considerations for those system users and report back to Committee.
- Note 1: Facility footprint to accommodate 2045 flows with tender process to incent longest-term capacity.**

The Committee briefly discussed enlarging the footprint of the CRD land at Macaulay Plain by engaging with the federal government for a land swap involving the Department of National Defence.

The amendment to the main motion was put on the table and the Committee sought clarification on the issue of federal Crown land status and First Nation consultation.

Chief Sam, representing Songhees Nation, recused himself from the meeting at 11:55 a.m., citing potential conflict of interest related to his Nation's active negotiation in the BC Treaty process.

The Committee discussed the potential for cost savings and GHG reductions if a plant on Macaulay Plain was an option.

**MOVED by Director Isitt, SECONDED by Director Plant,
That the main motion be amended in section 1.b), after the words "plant at
McLoughlin Point", to add the words "or Macaulay Plain."**

CARRIED

OPPOSED Blackwell, Desjardins, Hamilton, Seaton, Thomas

The Committee discussion on the main motion as amended included the following topics:

- the referral to Esquimalt and Victoria councils
- the costs for two plants compared to one
- funding
- a distributed model in stages
- language in the current Liquid Waste Management Plan regarding tertiary treatment

On the motion to amend the amended main motion, the Committee discussed secondary, tertiary and equivalent to tertiary treatment, advanced oxidation and other methods, environmental benefits, having comparative costs, clarification on part 1 and part 2 of the motion, and the language describing levels of wastewater treatment in the Provincial regulations.

**MOVED by Director Blackwell, SECONDED by Director Seaton,
That the main motion be amended so that in parts 1.a) and 1.b), "tertiary
wastewater treatment" is revised to "secondary, tertiary, or equivalent to tertiary
wastewater treatment".**

CARRIED

OPPOSED Alto, Desjardins, Isitt, Plant, Thomas

**MOVED by Director Atwell, SECONDED by Director Plant,
That the meeting be extended beyond three hours.**

CARRIED

The Committee discussed the pros and cons of the main motion as amended and sought clarification on the interplay of part 1 and part 2 of the motion.

On the motion to amend the motion, the Committee discussed the wording of the motion carried at the March 2, 2016, meeting.

**MOVED by Director Atwell, SECONDED by Director Plant,
That the main motion be amended to replace the word "tertiary" to "advanced
(tertiary)".**

CARRIED

**MOVED by Director Atwell, SECONDED by Director Plant,
That the question be called on the main motion as amended.**

DEFEATED

**OPPOSED Alto, Blackwell, Brice, Brownoff, Hamilton, Helps, Isitt, Jensen,
Thomas**

The Committee discussed the mention of Rock Bay in part 2 of the motion. On

the motion to amend the main motion, the Committee discussed keeping the process described in part 2 open-ended for sites.

**MOVED by Director Blackwell, SECONDED by Director Seaton,
That the main motion be amended to remove item 2.a).**

DEFEATED

**OPPOSED Jensen, Alto, Desjardins, Hamilton, Helps, Atwell, Thomas, Isitt, Brice,
Screech, Brownoff**

MOVED by Director Jensen, SECONDED by Director Isitt.

**That the main motion be amended so that 2.b) reflects the changes made in part
1.**

CARRIED

The Committee sought clarification on the meaning of submitting the conditional Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) amendment to the Province and the timing of the process described in part 2 in relation to part 1, and if there were implied commitments to the base cases.

On the motion to amend the main motion, the Committee sought further clarification on the term "conditional", the steps with the Province, the process described in part 2, and the agreement with the funders. Staff clarified that if an amendment to the current LWMP was not submitted, the project for a one-site plan at McLoughlin, already approved in Amendment 9, would remain. The Committee discussed that the motion would be going to the Board that afternoon in any case, and the extra wording did not add further clarity.

**MOVED by Director Jensen, SECONDED by Director Blackwell,
That the main motion be amended as follows:**

**That in item 1. after the words "as a basis for approval", the words "by the
Capital Regional District Board and then subsequently" be added.**

DEFEATED

**OPPOSED Atwell, Alto, Brice, Blackwell, Brownoff, Derman, Desjardins,
Hamilton, Plant, Screech, Seaton, Thomas**

Upon defeat of the amendment to the motion, the Committee discussed the implication of item 4 in the motion, and the flexibility of the process, the change that has occurred to the base case as Macaulay/Clover, and the need to move forward.

Chair Helps called the question on the main motion as amended.

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

**1. That a conditional Liquid Waste Management Plan Amendment No. 10 be
prepared as a basis for approval and submitted to the Minister of Environment
with the following elements:**

- a) A secondary, advanced (tertiary) or equivalent to advanced (tertiary)
wastewater treatment plant at Clover Point, servicing all flows currently directed
to Clover Point, up to 2030 (see Note 1, below), and;**
- b) A secondary, advanced (tertiary) or equivalent to advanced (tertiary)
wastewater treatment plant at McLoughlin Point or Macaulay Plain, servicing all
flows currently directed to Macaulay Point outfall, up to 2030, and;**
- c) Provision for a Westside wastewater treatment plant for future growth, at a**

location to be determined

d) Hartland Landfill as the preferred site for biosolids processing with technology to be confirmed by the process below.

2. That included within the Plan amendment is a process under which the CRD would invite the submission of project concepts to achieve the goals of the Project Charter. The submissions would include sufficient detail to allow for meaningful evaluation of the project concepts against each other and against the base case, including details regarding sites, technology, a feasibility assessment, demonstration of compatibility with current infrastructure, compliance with provincial and federal requirements and demonstration of significant fiscal advantages and/or environmental advantages over the base case, including financial backing.

The submissions could demonstrate solutions for:

a) A Rock Bay/Westside combination.

b) A secondary, advanced (tertiary) or equivalent to advanced (tertiary) wastewater plant at either McLoughlin Point or Macaulay Plain as an alternative to Rock Bay, a secondary, advanced (tertiary) or equivalent to advanced (tertiary) wastewater plant at Clover Point, provision for a secondary, advanced (tertiary) or equivalent to advanced (tertiary) plant on the Westside.

c) The treatment of biosolids at Hartland, possibly in combination with food scraps, municipal solid waste and wood waste.

d) Other feasible alternatives that demonstrate compatibility with current infrastructure, compliance with provincial and federal requirements and demonstration of significant fiscal advantages and/or environmental advantages and financial backing.

3. That the preferred approach be formally communicated to all senior levels of government involved in funding the project, including the Province, 3P Canada and Infrastructure Canada.

4. That a referral be made to both Esquimalt and Victoria Councils seeking approval in principle of the proposed sites as locations for tertiary wastewater treatment plants.

5. That staff be directed to continue working with Colwood, Songhees and Esquimalt First Nations on issues related to purchased capacity and cost considerations for those system users and report back to Committee.

Note 1: Facility footprint to accommodate 2045 flows with tender process to incent longest-term capacity.

CARRIED

OPPOSED Brice, Brownoff, Isitt, Jensen, Thomas, Young

On the motion to provide an updated costing for comparison with the Amendment 9 project and the subsequent amendments, the Committee discussion included the following points:

- different engineering firms between then and now
- secondary treatment in Amendment 9 project
- sufficiency of existing information

MOVED by Director Jensen, **SECONDED** by Director Isitt,

That as part of the Provincial offer to assist in finding a solution we direct staff to provide the Province with an updated costing to permit a comparison between the Amendment 9 project and the proposed Amendment 10 project.

MOVED by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Plant,
That the motion be amended to add after the word "Province" the words "and the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee".
CARRIED

MOVED by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Isitt,
That the amendment be amended to add after "Amendment 9 project" the words, "including information for advanced (tertiary) treatment".
CARRIED
OPPOSED Alto, Atwell, Derman, Desjardins, Derman, Hamilton, Thomas

MOVED by Director Jensen, **SECONDED** by Director Isitt,
That as part of the Provincial offer to assist in finding a solution we direct staff to provide the Province and the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee with an updated costing to permit a comparison between the Amendment 9 project including information for advanced (tertiary) treatment and the proposed amendment 10 project.
DEFEATED
OPPOSED Alto, Atwell, Derman, Desjardins, Hamilton, Plant, Seaton, Thomas

Due to time constraints, item 9 was heard before item 6.2, and items 6.2 through 8 were not heard and will be brought forward to the next meeting.

9. Motion to Close the Meeting

9.1. [16-398](#) Motion to Close the Meeting

MOVED by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Hamilton,
That the meeting be closed in accordance with the Community Charter Part 4, Division 3, 90 (1) (a) personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the regional district or another position appointed by the regional district.
CARRIED

The Committee moved to the closed session at 1:19 p.m.

The Committee rose from the closed session at 1:25 p.m. without report.

- 6.2. [16-189](#) Fairness and Transparency Advisor Reports - January and February, 2016
- 6.3. [16-184](#) 2016 CRD Board Standing Committee Terms of Reference and Work Programs (CALWMC)
- 6.4. [16-199](#) Available Funding Options - Core Area Wastewater Program
- 6.5. [16-206](#) Regional Water System - Supply and Demand
- 6.6. [16-373](#) Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program and Year End Budget Update No. 31

- 6.7. [16-387](#) Core Area Sewage and Resource Recovery System 2.0 - Budget Update No. 4
- 6.8. [16-364](#) Sustainability Development Technology Fund
- 6.9. [16-49](#) Motion with Notice: Accountability and Representation in Governance of Components of Eastside and Westside Sub-systems
- 6.10. [16-257](#) Motion with Notice: Mechanism for Future Options (Derman, Plant)
- 6.11. [16-258](#) Motion with Notice: Compliance with Charter Goals (Derman, Plant)
- 6.12. [16-201](#) Westside Wastewater Treatment and Resource Recovery Select Committee Agenda Packages and Motion
- 6.13. [16-280](#) Eastside Wastewater Treatment and Resource Recovery Select Committee Agenda Package for Information

7. Correspondence

- 7.1. [16-302](#) Correspondence from Harbour Resource Partners, 18 Feb. 2016, re: Harbour Resource Partners Affordable and Bylaw Compliant Solution for the CRD CALWMP Liquid Treatment Plant
- 7.2. [16-303](#) Correspondence from Esquimalt and Songhees Nations, 19 Feb. 2016, re: CRD Sewage Treatment Facility-Rock Bay Lands
- 7.3. [16-304](#) Correspondence from Burnside Gorge Community Association, 22 Feb. 2016
- 7.4. [16-342](#) Correspondence from Tourism Victoria to CRD Directors, 25 Feb. 2016, re: Sewage Treatment
- 7.5. [16-354](#) Correspondence Between Chair of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee and Esquimalt Mayor, re: Core Area Wastewater Treatment
- 7.6. [16-375](#) Correspondence Between Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee Directors, 23 Feb. 2016, re: Comments on IRM for Feb. 24
- 7.7. [16-388](#) Correspondence from Harbour Resource Partners, 3 March 2016, re: Harbour Resource Partners Affordable and Bylaw Compliant Solution for the CRD CALWMP Liquid Treatment Plant
- 7.8. [16-393](#) Correspondence: Washington State Legislature to Mayor of Victoria, 03 March 2016, re: CRD Sewage Treatment

8. New Business

10. Adjournment

MOVED by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Brice,
That the meeting be adjourned at 1:25 pm.
CARRIED

CHAIR

RECORDER