

**Meeting Minutes
Committee of the Whole**

Friday, October 23, 2015

9:00 AM

6th Floor Boardroom

(Special Continued Meeting from Sept. 30, 2015: Regional Growth Strategy)

Present:

Directors: N. Jensen (Chair), M. Alto, D. Blackwell, S. Brice, J. Brownoff, V. Derman, B. Desjardins, B. Gramigna (for J. Ranns), C. Hamilton, F. Haynes (for C. Plant), L. Helps, M. Hicks, B. Isitt (9:42), M. Lougher-Goodey (for S. Price), D. Screech, L. Seaton, C. Stock (for A. Finall), M. Tait, K. Williams, R. Windsor and G. Young

Staff: R. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer; T. Robbins, General Manager, Integrated Water Services; K. Lorette, General Manager, Planning and Protective Services; S. Bagh, Senior Manager; Regional and Strategic Planning; S. Santarossa, Corporate Officer, and S. Norton, Deputy Corporate Officer (Recorder)

Absent: Directors: R. Atwell, D. Howe, W. McIntyre

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 am.

1. Approval of Agenda

Chair Jensen noted that as a continued meeting, it was not necessary to approve the agenda. He advised that the meeting would begin with agenda item 3.3. Regional Growth Strategy Water Service Policy Options, and that the postponed motion was on the floor.

2. Chair's Remarks

2.1. 15-1174 Chair's Presentation - Water Service Policy Options

Chair Jensen noted that the intent of the decisions today was to give instructions to staff to prepare an updated Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) document to be considered by the Board in the spring of 2016.

In a PowerPoint presentation, Chair Jensen reviewed the following with respect to agenda item 3.3 RGS Water Service Policy Options:

- the postponed motion and defeated motions from the September 30 meeting
- the three water service policy options being considered:
 1. No water service policy
 2. Policy with conditions for service expansion
 3. Policy restricts service expansion

As part of the presentation, S. Bagh reviewed the other growth management policies that would be available if water servicing is not used as a growth

management tool, i.e. options 1 and 2:

- restrict sewer
- limit growth to OCP provisions
- prioritize investment in growth centres
- financing mechanisms (user pay, full-cost accounting)

Staff responded to questions regarding:

- application of sewer restrictions to urban sewers only
- estimated cost to bring CRD water servicing to the community of Shirley, in the Juan de Fuca Electoral Area (JDF); how it would be financed; which commission would make the decision
- the change to JDF Official Community Plan (OCP) approval process without the water servicing policy in the RGS
- current zoning policies for Shirley and process required for a major rezoning
- difference between current approval process for municipalities to change their Regional Context Statements versus JDF amending its OCPs.

Director Isitt entered the meeting at 9:42 am.

3. Committee Business

3.3. 15-1020 Regional Growth Strategy Water Service Policy Options

The following points were raised during ensuing discussion on the postponed motion of September 30, which called for no water servicing policy in the updated Regional Growth Strategy (RGS):

- the intention of the policy change is to allow communities in the JDF to have the same access to water as the municipalities in the region and to make the approval process for the JDF EA under the RGS more equitable with the municipalities
- the policy change is in alignment with the David Suzuki Foundation's Declaration Recognizing the Right to a Healthy Environment which included the right to drink clean water, and which the CRD Board and many municipalities endorsed
- the current policy and the approval process seems punitive to JDF EA
- concerned with long-term growth and the need to limit urban sprawl as OCPs offer limited protection over time and from council to council
- concerned that if the water servicing policy is not available as a growth management tool, there is limited ability to control future development
- concerned that we do not have enough information on how user pay and full-cost accounting for water servicing could help manage growth
- sewer restrictions may not be as effective in the future as smaller sized treatment plants are now economically viable for smaller developments
- equity should not be relevant since there is no symmetry amongst the municipalities regarding land use planning nor between the municipalities and JDF

During the discussion, it was also pointed out that the provision of water and sewer infrastructure can have cost impacts on the region as a whole, and therefore an amendment was put forward to require a 2/3 majority vote at the Board for changes to water access. Currently, such a change would require a

majority vote at the Board on an amendment to a municipal Regional Context Statement or unanimous municipal approval of an RGS amendment for the JDF.

On the amendment:

- a legal opinion is needed to see if this would be allowed under legislation
- this would apply to both municipalities and the JDF EA

The question was called on the amendment to the main motion.

**MOVED by Alternate Director Haynes, SECONDED by Director Helps,
That the motion be amended to add:**

C. To protect the access to water in a balanced manner and respect existing OCPs, that any changes to a Regional Context Statement or Juan de Fuca Official Community Plan would require a 2/3 majority vote.

CARRIED

OPPOSED Alto, Blackwell, Desjardins, Lougher-Goodey, Seaton, Tait

The question was called on the main motion from September 30, 2015, as amended:

**MOVED by Director Hicks, SECONDED by Director Blackwell,
That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:**

A. That staff be directed to prepare a servicing policy for the updated Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) that would apply to both municipalities and the CRD that is silent with respect to the expansion or provision of water services. The policy would thereby focus exclusively on liquid waste systems as the servicing tool for managing growth and would read as follows:

- i. Restrict extension and/or expansion of regional/municipal liquid waste systems outside the Growth Containment Area unless there is a pressing public health, public safety or environmental issue for existing development;**
- B. That staff be directed to prepare a growth management policy for the updated RGS that would apply to both municipalities and the CRD that incorporates the Growth Containment Area and that limits subdivision and development in rural areas (Rural/Rural Residential Lands and Renewable Resource Lands Policy Areas) to not exceed subdivision and development limits set out in an Official Community Plan at the time of adoption of the updated RGS; and**
- C. To protect the access to water in a balanced manner and respect existing OCPs, that any changes to a Regional Context Statement or a Juan de Fuca Official Community Plan would require a 2/3 majority vote.**

CARRIED

OPPOSED Isitt, Screech, Stock, Williams, Young

3.4. 15-1021

Supplemental Information Relating to the Regional Growth Strategy

Speaking to the staff report, S. Bagh described the approach used by staff to update the structure of the RGS with new content from the draft Regional Sustainability Strategy (RSS) document. Starting with Appendix A, she noted that sections 5, 6 and 7 were new content in relation to the RGS.

During the discussion, Committee commented that it was very difficult to do a direct comparison between the two documents unless they were side by side. Staff noted that the two documents were very different in approach, scope and

level of detail. It was suggested that staff start with the 2003 RGS document and show the minimum required legislative changes.

**MOVED by Director Isitt, SECONDED by Director Helps,
That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:**

1) That staff be directed to bring back the RGS in its current format that depicts the required legislative updates as tracked changes.

Discussion continued on how to include the new content from the RSS document, which was developed after extensive public consultation. Staff advised that taking the RGS document and including the content of the RSS as tracked changes would make a very unwieldy document with most of the RGS crossed out. It was suggested that the new content could be included as appendices to the updated RGS document.

**MOVED by Director Isitt, SECONDED by Director Blackwell,
That the motion be amended to add:**

2) That staff report back on options for incorporating elements of the RSS into subsidiary documents that could address policy areas.

CARRIED

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

That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

1) That staff be directed to bring back the RGS in its current format that depicts the required legislative updates as tracked changes.

2) That staff report back on options for incorporating elements of the RSS into subsidiary documents that could address policy areas.

CARRIED

Discussion continued on how to capture input received since the RSS document was drafted, e.g. from Central Saanich and the Roundtable on the Environment.

MOVED by Director Isitt, SECONDED by Director Helps,

3) That staff provide any remaining RSS information that is not captured in the RGS, in a format for the Board to review for possible inclusion.

CARRIED

The Committee recessed from 10:32 to 10:39 am.

3.1. 15-1018 Intent Leading to Regional Growth Strategy (2003) and Current RGS Legislative Requirements

MOVED by Director Brownoff, SECONDED by Director Tait,

That the Committee of the Whole receive for information report PPS-RSP-2015-24 titled, Intent Leading to Regional Growth Strategy (2003) and Current RGS Legislative Requirements.

CARRIED

3.2. 15-1019 Regional Growth Strategy Actions 1.1.5 and 1.1.6

MOVED by Director Brownoff, SECONDED by Director Tait,

That the Committee of the Whole receive for information report PPS-RSP-2015-18 titled, Regional Growth Strategy Actions 1.1.5 and 1.1.6.

CARRIED

4. Motion with Notice

4.1. 15-1133 Motion with Notice: Review Cost Benefit of Water Reclamation (Director Desjardins)

Speaking to the motion, it was noted that given the drier, longer summers, water reclaimed from Core Area Wastewater Treatment facilities could be a benefit to the whole region.

Director Tait left the meeting at 11:32 am.

**MOVED by Director Desjardins, SECONDED by Alternate Director Haynes,
That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the CRD Board:
That staff be requested to provide a report to review the cost benefit of water reclamation by the core for the region and to make an addition to the RGS to pursue water reclamation where feasible.**

During the discussion, it was pointed out that a cost benefit analysis may require additional consulting services. Also, that the Core Area Liquid Waste Management would need to discuss this, including making reclaimed water available to non-participants in the wastewater treatment project.

Director Hicks left the meeting at 11:33 am.

It was agreed to split the motion into two parts.

**The question was called on part 1:
That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the CRD Board:
That staff be requested to provide a report to review the cost benefit of water reclamation by the core for the region.**

**MOVED by Director Young, SECONDED by Director Helps,
That part 1 be referred to the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee.
CARRIED**

Director Helps left the meeting at 11:44 am.

Discussion continued on part 2 of the motion, and how it could fit into the previous motions related to updating the RGS, (Item 3.4):

- important to keep the words "if feasible" as this would apply differently in each municipality and the JDF EA; also, it could be interpreted as something that will be done
- would need to include Island Health in the discussion since this is looking at potable versus non-potable water
- water reclamation is costly
- should not be injected right into the RGS but added to the list of additional items that could be included in the RGS

**The question was called on part 2:
That the Committee of the Whole recommend to the CRD Board:
That staff be requested to make an addition to the RGS to pursue water reclamation where feasible.**

MOVED by Director Williams, **SECONDED** by Alternate Director Haynes,
That the motion be amended to add the word 'review' after 'RGS'.
CARRIED

The question was called on part 2, as amended:
That staff be requested to make an addition to the RGS review to pursue water
reclamation where feasible.
CARRIED

5. Motion to Report to CRD Board

5.1. 15-1135 Motion to Report to CRD Board

MOVED by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,
That the Committee of the Whole report to the Capital Regional District Board at
the special meeting immediately following this meeting, on items 3 and 4.
CARRIED

6. New Business

6.1 Notice of Motion - Hierarchical Framework for RGS - Director Derman

Director Derman distributed the following Notice of Motion at the meeting, which
will be considered at the next meeting:

**That the Committee of the Whole ask the CRD Board to direct staff to use the
process described and the outline provided as a basis for creating a hierarchical
framework which clearly defines priorities and key action areas in the revised
RGS.**

7. Adjournment

MOVED by Director Brice, **SECONDED** by Director Alto,
That the meeting be adjourned at 11:45 am.
CARRIED

CHAIR

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

CORPORATE OFFICER