



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee  
Held Wednesday, August 12, 2009, in City of Victoria Council Chambers,  
#1 Centennial Square, Victoria, BC**

---

**Present:** Directors: J. Brownoff (Chair), B. Desjardins (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, P. Gerrard (for S. Brice), J. Herbert (for C. Causton), V. Derman, L. Hunter (for D. Fortin), F. Leonard, P. Lucas, D. Saunders, C. Thornton-Joe, L. Wergeland, G. Young.

Staff: D. Kalynchuk, S. Norrington, and H. Raines (Recorder).

**Absent:** Director: G. Hill.

*The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.*

### 1. Approval of Agenda

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Herbert, **SECONDED** by Director Saunders, that the agenda and supplementary agenda be approved.

**CARRIED**

### 2. Chair's Remarks

Chair Brownoff noted that this meeting was an opportunity for public to speak to the committee about siting in Saanich East – North Oak Bay and she reminded the public that the 5 minute speaking rule applied. Chair Brownoff also reminded the committee of the special meeting of August 19 at Emmanuel Baptist Church from 7 to 10 p.m.

### 3. Delegations regarding Saanich East – North Oak Bay Sites

- a) **Gerry Gabel** – spoke in favour of sewage treatment, but is against the three proposed sites. Presentation included three alternatives to proposed sites (identified on the paper copy of his presentation), including land owned by the Queen Alexandra Foundation, land owned by the Sisters of St. Anne and the Saanich-owned portion of Haro Woods.
- b) **Steven Alpert** – spoke against Haro Woods development and was concerned about the length of pipe for the Haro Strait outfall, as well as impact on marine life. He suggested the best option is University of Victoria land.
- c) **David Langley** – resident at 4040 Haro Road, spoke against all Saanich East – North Oak Bay sites.
- d) **Harry Drage** – resident at 2761 McColl, proposed an alternative site at the University of Victoria compost site (see copy of presentation). He urged the committee to consider UVic sites (signed petition in 2008). He was against all Saanich East – North Oak Bay sites.
- e) **Tom Turner** – is the president of #44 Village Park Estates beside the McCoy/McKenzie proposed site. He spoke against the McCoy/McKenzie site, and suggested the best site is Haro Woods.

- f) **Bob Wilson** – suggested that the committee consider the site with the best opportunity for resource recovery. Of the three proposed sites, he suggested that resource recovery would be optimized at the UVic site and the one adjacent to the Queen Alexandra Hospital.
- g) **Chris Johnson** – represented the Vancouver Island Community Forest Action Network. He asked the committee why the Saanich-owned Haro Woods site was not being considered as an option. He does not approve of any of the proposed sites in Saanich East – North Oak Bay.
- h) **Andrea Frost** – was concerned with the site selection methodology and the selection of Finnerty – Arbutus as a proposed site. She requested that the committee give a higher weighting to environmental impact - when considering the triple bottom line and suggested that decisions on treatment be based on environmental impact.
- i) **Michelle Coburn** – is a resident of Oak Bay and expressed concern about the ability of the three sites to expand to tertiary treatment in the future.
- j) **Jamie Godfrey** – represented a University of Victoria class in biological oceanography. The class was concerned that, given the tight provincial timeline, proper study into the environmental impact of the three sites had not been considered, as well as the possibility for future water reclamation.
- k) **Karen Lightbody** – expressed concern over the speed of the site selection process and the environmental impact of the three sites. She stressed the importance of saving trees from being cut down at any of the three sites.
- l) **Richard Tennant** – represented Vanport Sterilizers. Chair Brownoff advised Mr. Tennant that this particular meeting was only to hear speakers on the topic of the siting of a treatment plant in Saanich East – North Oak Bay and, therefore, there was no opportunity to speak to the matter of Vanport's proposal at this time.

#### 4. Motion to Receive Correspondence from Clare Attwell

**MOVED** by Alternate Director Herbert, **SECONDED** by Director Thornton-Joe, that the correspondence from Clare Attwell, dated July 31, 2009 regarding the Finnerty – Arbutus site be received.

**CARRIED**

*On motion, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.*

---

Chair



Making a difference...together

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee**  
**Held Wednesday, August 19, 2009, at Emmanuel Baptist Church,**  
**2121 Cedar Hill Cross Road, Victoria, BC**

---

**Present:** Directors: J. Brownoff (Chair), B. Desjardins (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, S. Brice, V. Derman, D. Fortin, F. Leonard, P. Lucas, D. Saunders, C. Thornton-Joe, L. Wergeland and G. Young.

Staff: D. Kalynchuk, T. Brcic, A. Orr, S. Norrington and T. Alton (Recorder).

**Absent:** Directors G. Hill and J. Herbert (for C. Causton).

*The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.*

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** by Director Derman, **SECONDED** by Director Brice, that the agenda be approved as circulated.

**CARRIED**

**2. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Brownoff thanked everyone for attending, with a reminder that this meeting was an opportunity to speak to the committee specifically about siting in Saanich East – North Oak Bay and the five-minute speaking rule applied. She encouraged each speaker to submit speaking notes for the record.

**3. Delegations regarding Saanich East – North Oak Bay Sites**

- a) **David Blundon** – spoke against siting at Haro Woods as it is a coastal Douglas Fir biogeoclimatic zone with an imperiled ecosystem of conservation concern. He indicated that the current triple bottom line analysis is a business tool weighted toward social and capital factors rather than environmental. In the application of the triple bottom line analysis, he felt that Haro Woods is negatively associated in terms of habitat.
- b) **Susan Kotturi** – stressed that stewardship of the environment should be a primary concern in land-based treatment. She pointed out that since the University of Victoria would contribute and benefit from a treatment site on its grounds, logically and environmentally, the re-examination of the former “Oak Bay compost site” would be the best option.
- c) **Eric Nielsen** – spoke in support of Haro Woods as a treatment site because the plant would be situated out of view and could be most economically developed. He noted the environmental need to stop dumping raw sewage into the ocean and requested a quick site selection that would allow wastewater treatment to begin as soon as possible.

- d) **Phil Lyons, Greater Victoria Watch Coalition** – spoke in favour of further investigation of a decentralized model with many smaller, purpose-built sites to maximize funds available from resource recovery. He pointed out that researching this option would not eliminate the current site options but would increase the number of small sites used in this area which could be of long-term economic benefit.
- e) **Jim Robertson** – Not present.
- f) **Deborah Dickson** – spoke against Haro Woods as a treatment site. She noted that Haro Woods has long been identified as an area the community wanted to protect and preserve as green-space. She requested the committee to remove Haro Woods as a site option for the sake of the environment and the surrounding community.
- g) **Mary Thompson-Fox** – spoke against Haro Woods as a treatment site. She pointed out that Queen Alexandra serves children with a variety of special needs and that environmental disturbances could greatly affect these children. She indicated her neighbourhood was not truly consulted and felt the decision has already been made for Haro Woods and requested the committee to reconsider.
- h) **Harry Drage** – spoke against Haro Woods as a site option, from a technical standpoint. He deemed the analysis to contain conflicting information and to be weighted toward cost rather than environmental factors and asked the committee to preserve Haro Woods.
- i) **William Dancer** – requested full, meaningful engagement of the public in site development, including plant location, outfall route and odour control. He indicated that the business case timeline may be too short to accurately assess costing and encouraged a timeline extension request if necessary to ensure accuracy.
- j) **John Newcomb** – questioned the environmental benefits of land-based treatment. He noted the environmental responsibility to preserve Haro Woods and the need to incorporate resource recovery into early site selection and planning. He suggested that a site closer to the University of Victoria, possibly the MacKinnon Gym parking lot, would be optimum.
- k) **Mary Fox** (*same as Mary Thompson, speaker 'G' above*)
- l) **Dorothy Clippingdale** – indicated that the chosen treatment site should have the capacity for tertiary treatment along with resource recovery opportunities by having smaller sites to allow more recovery and aesthetic design, as evidenced in Sweden. From a resource recovery perspective, she did not feel the Finnerty-Arbutus appeared suitable. She stressed that this project should remain fully public, under CRD control and fully accountable to citizens.
- m) **Alex Murdoch** – expressed concern regarding the need for treatment in this area, and the proposed application of membrane bioreactor secondary treatment which leaves biosolids disposal an unresolved issue. He indicated that interception at source, to keep toxins out of the system rather than removing them later, is potentially the most efficient, cost-effective method of implementing a treatment program.

- n) **Ron Warmald** – spoke in favour of preserving Haro Woods as a natural park. He outlined his concerns regarding project-cost overruns, potential odours from the plant, decreased property values, and loss of valued environmental green-space. He requested consideration of the former composting site off Cedar Hill X Road or a similar site as far from homes as possible.
- o) **Michael Eby** – indicated that the factors in the triple bottom line analysis weighting seemed arbitrary and it appeared a facility at Haro Woods was already determined. Should that be the case, he listed several factors that could assist community acceptance, including designating the remaining area of Haro Woods as undeveloped parkland.
- p) **Julia Day** – expressed concern regarding the noise during the two-year development phase which would have significant impact on children in the Queen Alexandra, schools and preschools in the surrounding community.

**MOVED** by Director Lucas, **SECONDED** by Director Young that the meeting be adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

**CARRIED**

---

Chair