



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Capital Regional District Board  
Sitting as Committee of the Whole  
Held Wednesday, October 30, 2013, in the Board Room, 625 Fisgard Street, Victoria, BC**

---

**PRESENT: Directors:** A. Bryson (Chair), D. Blackwell (Vice Chair), M. Alto, J. Brownoff, L. Cross, J. Cullington (for C. Hamilton), T. Daly, V. Derman, B. Desjardins, D. Fortin, P. Gerrard (for S. Brice), D. Howe, M. Hicks (10:05), B. Isitt, N. Jensen (1:25), W. McIntyre, W. Milne, J. Ranns, K. Roessingh (for J. Mendum), V. Sanders (for F. Leonard), D. Screech (for G. Hill), L. Seaton (9:44) , L. Wergeland and G. Young  
**Staff:** B. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer; J. Hull, Interim Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; A. Sweetnam, Program Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment Program; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks and Environmental Services; D. Lokken, General Manager, Corporate Services; T. Robbins, General Manager, Integrated Water Services; M. Rachwalski, Acting General Manager, Planning and Protective Services (Item 6); G. Harris, Senior Manager, Environmental Protection; S. Hallatt, Manager, Aboriginal Initiatives (Item 6) A. Orr, Senior Manager, Corporate Communications; S. Norton, Deputy Corporate Officer; S. Asdal and N. More (Recorders)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:33 am.

**1. Approval of the Agenda**

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Roessingh, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Sanders, That the agenda and supplementary agenda be approved.

**CARRIED**

**2. Adoption of Minutes of July 3, 2013 and Amendment of Previously Adopted Minutes of June 5, 2013**

**MOVED** by Director Brownoff, **SECONDED** by Director Fortin, That the minutes of the meeting of July 3, 2013 be adopted; and that the previously adopted minutes of the meeting of June 5, 2013 be amended to add the words "the current plan for" on p. 2, item 3.1, after the words "spoke against".

**CARRIED**

**3. Presentations/Delegations**

- 1) Dr. Sally Brown, University of Washington re Item 4 - advised she was present to answer questions of a scientific nature. She spoke in favour of land application of biosolids citing research that demonstrates their ability to restore metal contaminated sites and beneficial results when used as a soil amendment. Samples of Class A biosolids and a soil amendment containing biosolids were provided.

- 2) Philippe Lucas, Biosolids Free BC, re Item 4: spoke against land application of biosolids noting it would result in contaminated lands, surface and groundwater and result in irreversible consequences to plant, animal and human health.
- 3) Ana Simeon, Sierra Club BC, re Item 4: spoke against land application of biosolids due to pollution that would occur from contaminants and recommended that the ban be maintained on a provisional basis with biosolids to be stored and tested on an ongoing basis and the CRD conduct an independent review of the current sewage treatment project. The delegation provided speaking notes which are on file at Legislative Services.

Director Seaton entered the meeting at 9:45 am.

- 4) Richard Atwell, Sewage Treatment Action Group re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids due to a proposed treatment system that will return toxic contaminants to the environment.
- 5) Beth Burton-Krahn, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids questioning why CRD reports contain limited information regarding other processing technologies such as gasification.
- 6) Mrs. Deborah Dickson, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids noting it would risk the health of the public and the environment. The delegation provided speaking notes which are on file at Legislative Services.
- 7) Lana Popham, MLA, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids noting that public opposition in 2011 was strong and as the MLA representing the area proposed for the biosolids facility, expressed concern regarding the lack of consultation with her and her constituents.

Director Hicks entered the meeting at 10:05 am.

- 8) Jane Baigent, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids due to the risk of contamination to land, crops and water from toxic chemicals contained in sludge.
- 9) Larry Wartels, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids showing a National Film Board of Canada video on biosolids and the risks due to contaminants left behind by the treatment process.
- 10) Janet Riddell, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids noting that markets for the biosolids have not been adequately researched or identified.
- 11) Grace Jackson, UVic Environmental Law Centre, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids providing a summary of North American cases regarding legal liabilities that have arisen since biosolids were applied to land. The delegation provided speaking notes which are on file at Legislative Services.

- 12) Thomas Maler, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids citing the risk of contamination of water, land, plants, animals and traditional food supplies and supported the use of gasification to produce energy.
- 13) John Lavery, SYLVIS Environmental Services Inc., re Item 4 – spoke in favour of land application of biosolids noting their beneficial organic matter and the importance of allowing the consideration of diverse beneficial uses for biosolids within the upcoming resource recovery centre qualification and proposal processes.
- 14) Marsha Henderson, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids due to pollution risks to land and water and inadequate studies on long-term use of biosolids.
- 15) Filippo Ferri, re Item 4 – spoke against land application of biosolids due to contaminants and expressed support for a waste to energy gasification facility.

#### 4. Review of Regional Biosolids Management Policy

L. Hutcheson introduced the presentations. The Committee discussed the Seaterra Program Commission's role regarding the review of the biosolids management policy.

The Committee recessed from 10:43 -10:48 am.

Director Milne left the meeting at 10:43 am.

- a) PowerPoint Presentation: Robert Simms of Stantec provided an overview of the production and treatment process of biosolids, trends and practices and beneficial reuse options and then responded to questions.

The ensuing discussion included the following topics:

- How to encourage innovation in the request for proposal process
- Waste-to-energy technologies
- Research on potential markets
- Methods used to apply biosolids to forested lands
- Biosolids as fuel in cement kilns
- Research studies on the impact of the land application of biosolids on human health
- Impact of weather patterns on the land application of biosolids
- Restrictions regarding land application of biosolids
- Request for proposal process and timeline for the resource energy centre.

In response to an earlier question, R. Simms confirmed that he was the author of the Stantec report attached to the staff report entitled *CRD Biosolids Management, Land Application Technology, Background Document*, and it was submitted October 15, 2013.

- b) PowerPoint Presentation: Brenda Eaton, Chair, Seaterra Program Commission provided information on the practice of the land application of Class A biosolids in Canada and worldwide. She reviewed the implications of the current policy on the wastewater treatment program.

The Committee discussion included the following topics:

- The diversity of uses for land application of biosolids
- Costs associated with drying biosolids and construction of a waste-to-energy facility
- Impact of the current biosolids management policy on wastewater treatment facilities within the CRD
- Details on the request for qualification process and timeline for the resource recovery centre
- Integration of liquid waste management with solid waste management
- The daily volume of tanker trucks needed to distribute sludge to the biosolids processing facility.

In response to questions, B. Eaton confirmed that the Commission had asked Dr. Brown to attend in order to answer questions on behalf of P. Elardo.

Director Milne returned to the meeting at 12:45 pm.

Director Cross left the meeting at 12:45 pm.

- c) Video Presentation: a video by Pam Elardo, Commissioner, Seaterra Program Commission, who was unable to be present, was shown providing information on King County's Loop Program which produces a soil amendment made from biosolids.

In response to questions, B. Eaton advised that staff had not been involved in the preparation of the video, and that the Commission had covered Dr. Brown's travel expenditures.

Director Isitt asked staff which line item in the Commission's budget would cover Dr. Brown's travel expenses. The Chair ruled the question out of order as the intent of the discussion was to inquire about the accuracy of the presentation information and that the expenditure question could be asked during budget discussions.

Director Isitt challenged the Chair.

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Screech, **SECONDED** by Director Blackwell,  
That the Chair be sustained.

**Desjardins** **CARRIED**  
**OPPOSED**

The Committee recessed at 12:55 pm and reconvened at 1:25 pm.

Director Jensen entered the meeting at 1:25 pm.

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,  
That it be recommended to the CRD Board that the current policy, adopted July 13, 2011, regarding the banning of the land application of biosolids be confirmed.

On the motion, the Committee discussion included the following topics:

- The need for public consultation
- The need for studies on long-term use of biosolids and the impacts on land and waterways
- The need for more research on potential markets
- Potential risks to agricultural land, groundwater and riparian areas
- Integration of liquid and solid waste management
- The need for a business case
- The potential of metal accumulation and associated liability

Alternate Director Cullington left the meeting at 1:55 pm.

Director Hamilton entered the meeting at 2:00 pm

Discussion continued regarding:

- Juan de Fuca Electoral Area First Nations' opposition to land application of biosolids
- Potential impacts on ecotourism
- The opposition of environmental groups to land application
- Risk of toxic chemicals migrating into waterways
- Potential for less profit to be made from crops using a soil amendment due to public's perception of biosolids

The question on the motion, as follows, was called:

That it be recommended to the CRD Board that the current policy, adopted July 13, 2011, regarding the banning of the land application of biosolids be confirmed.

**CARRIED**

**Blackwell, Bryson, Jensen, Sanders, Young** **OPPOSED**

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Isitt,

That it be recommended to the CRD Board:

That staff be directed to provide a report to the Committee of the Whole looking at the ability, business case and opportunity for integration of biosolids management and kitchen scraps management; and that this should be done prior to making further decisions on either issue which would limit this consideration.

On the motion, the Committee discussed the following topics:

- Residuals of kitchen scraps and biosolids could be used for waste-to-energy
- Concerned with mixing kitchen scraps with biosolids and affecting the quality of the compost product
- Difficulty with solid waste and liquid waste being regulated under different legislation
- Integration of the two waste streams in a waste-to-energy process
- Staff research into waste-to-energy options
- Impact of the motion on the request for proposal process for the resource recovery centre.

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Brownoff,

That the motion be amended to read:

That it be recommended to the CRD Board that staff be directed to identify possible linkages between the region's liquid waste and solid waste management systems, and report to the Environmental Services Committee.

The intent of the amendment was to make the direction less prescriptive and to report to the Environmental Services Committee prior to consideration by the Committee of the Whole.

The question on the amendment was called.

**Fortin, Hicks, Howe, Jensen, McIntyre, Sanders, Young** **CARRIED**  
**OPPOSED**

The question on the main motion, as amended, was called, as follows:

That it be recommended to the CRD Board:

That staff be directed to identify possible linkages between the region's liquid waste and solid waste management systems, and report to the Environmental Services Committee.

**Fortin, Hicks, Howe, Jensen, McIntyre, Sanders, Young** **CARRIED**  
**OPPOSED**

**MOVED** by Director Fortin, **SECONDED** by Director Hicks,

That item 6 be considered before item 5.

**CARRIED**

## 6. Update on Aboriginal Initiatives

Alternate Director Gerrard left the meeting at 3:14 pm.

Staff was requested to refer the staff report to the Te'mexw Treaty Advisory Committee.

**MOVED** by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,

That the new reporting framework be approved and staff be directed to proceed with implementation.

**CARRIED**

## 5. Regional Transportation Plan

**MOVED** by Director Desjardins, **SECONDED** by Director Milne,

That Item 5 be postponed to the next meeting.

**Brownoff, Bryson, Hicks, Howe, Isitt, Jensen, Milne, Roessingh, Sanders, Screech, Seaton, Wergeland, Young** **DEFEATED**  
**OPPOSED**

Alternate Director Gerrard returned to the meeting at 3:20 pm.

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Jensen,  
That it be recommended to the CRD Board:

- 1) That the draft Regional Transportation Plan report be received for information, and staff be directed to circulate the report for final comment to municipalities, electoral areas, Victoria Regional Transit Commission, BC Transit Board of Directors, and Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, prior to consideration for adoption in March 2014.

**CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Director Isitt, **SECONDED** by Director Jensen,  
That it be recommended to the CRD Board:

- 2) That in the interim, staff be directed to initiate the Terms of Reference for service feasibility study to enable the potential establishment and funding of an expanded and consolidated regional transportation service

Director Hicks left the meeting at 3:23 pm.

On the motion, concern was expressed regarding the desire to have the transit authority brought to the CRD table. Staff advised that the feasibility study recognizes the current governance structure with BC Transit but does not preclude looking at this possibility for the future.

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Screech, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Sanders,  
That, because of time constraints, the above motion be postponed to the next meeting.

**CARRIED**

## **6. Update on Aboriginal Initiatives**

Considered after item 4.

## **7. New Business – None**

## **8. Motion to Report to CRD Board**

**MOVED** by Director Howe, **SECONDED** by Director Derman,  
That the Committee of the Whole report to the Capital Regional District Board at the special meeting immediately following this meeting on items 4, 5 (recommendation 1) and 6.

**CARRIED**

9. Adjournment

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Gerrard, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Screech,  
That the meeting be adjourned at 3:29 pm.

**CARRIED**

---

**CHAIR**

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

---

**CORPORATE OFFICER**