Comox Valley REGIONAL DISTRICT

Agenda

Notice of meeting of the
LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (LWMP)
JOINT TECHNICAL AND PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TACPAC)
Monday, November 18, 2025
Via Zoom only
10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Item, Time	Description	Owner
3.1 10:00	Call to Order	Allison Habkirk
3.2 10:00-10:05	June 16, 2025 Meeting Minutes	Allison Habkirk
3.3 10:05-11:15	Overview of the Site Master Plan and Cost Estimate *Please note the costs have been included within Section 10.1 and Appendix M of the attached version of the Site Master Plan* ***Make a recommendation to Comox Valley Sewage Commission to proceed with the Site Master Plan as proposed***	Kris La Rose, CVRD
Break		
3.4 11:20-11:40	Overview and Discussion on Inflow and Infiltration	Mike Desilets, WSP
3.5 11:40-12:00	Next Steps and TACPAC Engagement	Kris La Rose, CVRD
3.6 12:00	Adjournment	Allison Habkirk

Attachments

1. June 16, 2025 LWMP TACPAC Meeting Minutes
2. Site Master Plan, Carollo, October 2025 *(attached separately due to size)*

More information on the Stage 1 & 2 LWMP and the South LWMP Addendum can be found on the CVRD's website.

Comox Valley REGIONAL DISTRICT

Minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the Comox Valley Sewer Service (CVSS) Stage 3 Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) Joint Technical and Public Advisory Committee (TACPAC) held on Monday, June 16, 2025, in the CVRD Civic Room at 770 Harmston Avenue, Courtenay, and via Zoom commencing at 9:01 am

PRESENT:

A. Habkirk, Chair and Facilitator	Facilitator
M. Rutten, General Manager of Engineering Services	CVRD
K. La Rose, Senior Manager of Water/Wastewater Services	CVRD
R. Sellentin, Manager of Wastewater Services	CVRD
Z. Berkey, Senior Engineering Analyst	CVRD
M. Briggs, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD
M. Desilets	WSP
P. Galvagno	Carollo
C. Davidson, City of Courtenay	TAC
S. Ashfield, Town of Comox	TAC
M. Hall, Island Health	TAC
L. Johnson, Ministry of Health	TAC
J. Keller, K'ómoks First Nation	TAC/PAC
W. Cole-Hamilton, City of Courtenay Elected Official	PAC
M. Swift, Town of Comox Elected Official	PAC
I. Munro, Electoral Area A Alternate Director	PAC
B. Mills, Association for Denman Island Marine Stewards	PAC
N. Prins, BC Shellfish Growers Association	PAC
T. Clarke, Comox Valley Chamber of Commerce	PAC
C. Pierzchalski, Comox Valley Conservation Partnership	PAC
S. Carey, City of Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
L. Paulovich, City of Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
J. Dacombe, City of Courtenay Resident Representative (Alternate)	PAC
K. van Velzen, Town of Comox Resident Representative	PAC
M. Crilly, Town of Comox Resident Representative	PAC
K. McPhail, Town of Comox Resident Representative	PAC
N. Prince, Area A (Craigdarroch) Resident Representative	PAC
T. Donkers, Area A (Royston) Resident Representative	PAC
K. Newman, Area A (Royston) Resident Representative (Alternate)	PAC

J. Elliott, Area A (Union Bay) Resident Representative	PAC
J. Steel, Area B (CVWPCC) Resident Representative	PAC
M. Schaffer, Area B (CVWPCC) Resident Representative (Alternate)	PAC
M. Lang, Area B (Croteau Beach) Resident Representative	PAC

Item	Description
2.1 9:01 – 9:09	**Call to Order and Territorial Acknowledgement** The meeting was called to order at 9:01 am. The CVRD acknowledged that the committee is meeting on and the Comox Valley Sewerage Service (CVSS) is operated on the traditional unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation. The committee members introduced themselves to the committee.
2.2 9:09 – 9:13	**December 2, 2024 Meeting Minutes** MOTION: Adopt the minutes of the December 2, 2024 CVSS Stage 3 LWMP Joint TACPAC meeting. – I. Munro SECONDED: W. Cole-Hamilton CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY K. La Rose provided an overview of the meeting agenda.
2.3 9:13 – 9:33	**Update on LWMP Process and Work Underway** K. La Rose provided a summary of the LWMP purpose and process so far. Noted that conveyance was split out of planning process and approved through AAP, with the LWMP now focused on treatment. Ministry of Environment and Parks (Ministry) provided response to Stage 1&2 LWMP and recommendations for Stage 3 LWMP two years ago. Now working on Stage 3 LWMP report and site master planning process and engaged with process expert regarding treatment level. Q: Is the Stage 3 report the final report submitted for approval? A: Yes. K. La Rose described the requirements for the Stage 3 report requested by the Ministry. Today's meeting focused on sharing information and to seek feedback from the committee on the site master plan (executive summary), outfall planning component and source control planning. Full site master plan to be submitted to the committee for review and feedback during the summer. Formal approval of LWMP expected a

	year from now at final meeting but want to familiarize committee with material beforehand and seek feedback. Provided an overview of the Stage 3 LWMP submittal process and the work currently underway, with authorization sought from Ministry for upgrades, borrowing and updated operational certificate. Shared additional details on the process optimization process, to be incorporated into the site master plan. Q: Has the provincial mandate to build more housing had any impact on this plan? A: Key part of planning process is developing estimates for flows and loads that will need to be managed by the plant in the coming decades. Worked extensively with the municipalities to adjust regional growth projections. Estimates have increased and have been incorporated into planning process. Q: What is confidence level of the Class B cost estimates? A: Class B requires roughly 60 per cent detailed design and provides +/- 15 per cent accuracy. Will be bringing forward increasingly accurate cost estimates as we go through process. Will provide Class C or D cost estimates later in year, with Class B expected in spring.
2.4 9:33 – 10:55	**Review of Draft Site Master Plan** P. Galvagno presented on the draft site master plan. Provided an overview of the sewer system, including service participants and treatment process, as well as the LWMP process and site master plan objectives. Q: How is this plan being adjusted during planning process? Been going on for several years. Has the end date been adjusted? A: LWMP process has been going on for seven years, while site master plan started only last year. Site master planning process has already been adjusted due to changes to population forecasts because of Bill 44 and from working with the process optimization expert. Q: Are there any more planned change or are you confident that planning process will be more stable? A: Site master plan is mostly about implementation, while the Stage 1&2 LWMP process was more drawn out and focused on goals and objectives. Site master plan confirms direction but also speaks to timing. If there are changes to how development occurs, it will affect

timing of upgrades but not direction. Can't be certain that population will grow as determined in projections and just serve as starting point for planning. If population grows faster than projected, will just move phasing up a few years. Will need to continue monitoring load to the plant and adjust phasing every few years.

B. Mills joined the meeting at 9:42 am.

P. Galvagno shared population projections for the service, which accounts for organic growth, Bill 44 and the Sewer Extension South Project.

Provided a more in-depth analysis of the treatment process and managing wet weather flows, sharing examples of how wet weather flows can exceed dry weather flows and the unpredictability of those flows, which by volume make up only 2.5 per cent of the total flow. Discussed options and strategies for addressing wet weather flows, including chemically enhanced primary treatment (CEPT) during peak wet weather flows or CEPT with additional wet weather treatment strategy such as wet weather flows bypassing the bioreactor.

Q: Inflow and infiltration (I&I) previously discussed as major issue. Does any of this address I&I? This seems focused on treatment rather than stopping I&I from entering the system.
A: This discussion includes I&I. Managing wet weather flows wouldn't be required if can address I&I at source. Upgrades as proposed to address peak flows as a result from I&I while also providing flexibility with staging and timing of infrastructure if improvements in I&I are realized. Ministry had asked to include how to address I&I in Stage 3 LWMP. Further work is underway to develop more detailed plan.

Q: Retention ponds are used for stormwater, but why don't we have pools of raw sewage waiting to be treated during peak flows.
A: If we had ponds to store sewage, would want to draw volume over 24 hours. Could size for multiple days, but estimated volume of stored sewage would be over 40,000 m^3 and require large, covered basin, which would be expensive to build.

Q: Volumes involved in retaining stormwater would be greater than liquid waste, so flow of stormwater is greater than flow of liquid waste.

	Why not have retention ponds for stormwater across region and control flows of liquid waste into plant much further back in system? A: Stormwater pond would provide more flexibility but limited by downstream conveyance infrastructure rather than treatment capacity. Stormwater ponds can also be open, but liquid waste ones need to be closed and pumped. Adding ponds across region would be expensive, so would be cheaper to address at plant. Comment: Wanted to point out the issue of odour. Current plant is in residential area and anything that happens at the treatment plant would impact residents. Odour from a retention pond would impact neighbours. Q: Regarding climate change and extreme events, what would a 100-year event do to the plant? Rainfall data from airbase shows average rainfall in December is 0.6 cm in 24 hours, while highest recorded is 11 cm. A: Did look at 100-year return period in data projections and may meet 200-year return period criteria. Already seeing climate change impacts in existing data and confident system being presented is resilient enough to accommodate much higher peak flows. Comment: Sewer and stormwater are not a combined system, so stormwater is not being collected and put into system but is leaking in. Inflow could be caused by sump pump in houses and might be another area to look at. Was mentioned that population growth would allow for more I&I into system and wondered why new construction would add I&I to system. I&I source control will need to play major role in process and as part of LWMP. Lots of small things that can be done to identify sources of I&I. Response: Part of future work would be to look at where I&I is coming from. A lot of population growth will be densification, so hard to separate out new construction and settled on conservative approach. Staff will have more detail on I&I at next meeting. Province had requested additional work on how to address I&I. Site master planning process does include analysis of how schedule of work would be affected by different levels of success of addressing I&I, to help inform decision makers when setting commitments. W. Cole-Hamilton left the meeting at 10:07 am.

	Q: What portion is I&I contributing to the maximum load compared to population growth? A: Everything above dry weather flow is I&I. Could be caused by sump pumps, downspouts connected to sanitary system, leaks in pipes and manholes, etc. Looking at other jurisdictions and how they've addressed I&I. Q: After the primary clarifier is a large tank to hold additional flows. Do these plans get rid of that storage pond? Is it a $2 million expenditure that did not work out? A: The site master plan considered converting use of the basin for diurnal equalization and improve plant performance. However, for this option the basin would need to be covered. Diurnal equalization allows for evening out peak flows into bioreactor, which if not evened out results in performance issues and operational challenges, especially during wet weather flows. The equalization basin was built for when peak flows align with high tides to address outfall capacity until infrastructure is upgraded. Site master plan addresses wet weather flows coming into system, and it was determined that conversion of the equalization basin to a diurnal equalization basin would be challenging. The equalization basin will remain in its current configuration and continue to be a critical part of risk mitigation to avoid plant overflow during peak rain events coinciding with high tides. Q: So the equalization basin would remain, but would put in some form of equalization tank for wet weather flows? A: Yes, one option is for diurnal equalization with a concrete tank in the future. Q: How does Option 2 affect the final effluent quality into the Salish Sea? A: Bypass with filter isn't unconventional and other jurisdictions have used this approach. Only 2.5 per cent of volume is going to be bypassed and filtered during peak wet weather flows, but for remainder of year all effluent will be filtered and be of higher quality. P. Galvagno shared modelling of peak wet weather flows and impact of increased quality of effluent. Comment: Bypassed wastewater will be diluted by stormwater from I&I, but without bypassing treatment process, will also wash out solids and effect quality of effluent.

	Response: Secondary clarifiers need to be sized for peak flows to prevent washes. Bugs in bioreactor get washed out during high flows, so secondary clarifier helps retain biological sludge used for treatment. If secondary clarifier is undersized, will be washed out into outfall. Q: Is putting covers on the equalization basins part of this process? A: Did look at cover for equalization basin but not practical to add cover based on amount of usage. Basins work well as last resort when tides are high and usually only used once a year. Have investigated adding closed concrete tank for diurnal process. Q: Has CVRD done monitoring of sewage outflow at various areas in service? A: All flows are pumped to treatment plant and can track at pump stations to compare flows. Flows are fairly consistent across regions. P. Galvagno provided additional details on upgrade staging for treatment options and the additional infrastructure required for each option, as well as provided a cost comparison and summary of the results and findings for the treatment options. K. La Rose highlighted that option 2 provides for additional growth beyond 2060 on current site, while baseline will require use of most of existing site footprint. Q: Is there any implication to the tax rate by advancing capital costs? Does that change how rates are calculated? A: Front-loading of capital projects will impact rates but will be only small impact. Have high level cost estimates at this point but will have higher accuracy later in process. Q: If tax increases included earlier on, would that lead to tax decreases later? A: Would likely lead instead to lower increases in the future brought on by inflation. Q: Has there ever been wide-spread monitoring program proposed? Would it be worth focusing on other end of system? Lots of monitoring systems available for wide-spread cities. A: Definitely could see as part of long-term I&I program. Would not be able to address quickly enough though to avoid upgrading treatment plant, but Ministry required I&I to be addressed within LWMP plan. A future program may delay later upgrades.

	Q: What timelines are in place for any sort of monitoring program? Are there any set dates for upgrades? A: Working with consultants and project partners, reporting back in fall and winter in more detail on commitments embedded into LWMP. Comment: Anticipate I&I is in municipal systems and not regional system, so there is a jurisdictional split. Response: Mostly true. Regional system did add gravity mains that may contribute to I&I, but 98 per cent of gravity systems are within municipal boundaries. Most of regional system is pressurized and would not have I&I. Engagement with municipalities is key and they will have to do most of the work to address I&I. Part of LWMP process includes performing analysis to help municipalities build business case for addressing and reducing I&I. Q: For tertiary filtration, does that need odour control? A: Doesn't usually need odour control. Most odorous processes are already covered. Tertiary treatment filters are submerged and treated effluent is moving through process. Q: Thought that flows would bypass bioreactors during peak flows, coming from primary clarifiers and bypassing bioreactors? During normal days would go through regular process, but during peak flows would bypass bioreactors. A: That would be for additional wet weather flows over two times average dry weather flow, with bulk of flows still going through full treatment process. Staff working to finalize good neighbour agreement, including operational odour limit. If determined that new process does not meet odour limit, will take action. Q: Don't want to end up in situation where bypass is installed and neighbours end up with odour. What are the odour expectations? Do you have a sense of what will be included in agreement? A: Don't have number at the moment, but following odour sampling in summer will engage with community in fall. Outcome will help guide final designs for upgrades at the facility. Outcome of good neighbour agreement may impact level of odour control required. Q: Do we need the good neighbour agreement if operational certificate will include odour limits? Operational certificates don't have to speak to odour, but most jurisdictions have included language on odour. A: Operational certificate doesn't speak to odour. Will investigate what other jurisdictions have done and will look into if can include in permit

	instead of good neighbour agreement. Will also ask design team to look into potential odour issues for bypass. Q: Is there currently UV at the plant? Is it one of first upgrades? A: Was included and approved in earlier stage of LWMP. Part of baseline and will be included in any proposed upgrades. P. Galvagno provided an overview of solids management and proposed upgrades. Proposing to replace centrifuges in 2040, improve ventilation in centrifuge room and add additional storage in 2045. Q: Centrifuges are 20 years old. Is there a manufacturer's recommendation for lifespan on these systems? Are we taking a risk? A: We are taking a risk, but there are two centrifuges so there is redundancy. Compared replacing earlier versus continuing using existing ones. Conducting major upgrades this year and will have spare parts on hand, as lead time on ordering parts has been largest delay. Redundancy alleviates risk. Q: Where does the H_2S go and how is it treated? A: H_2S goes to odour control facility where two wet scrubbers treat H_2S by oxidizing it and then put air from scrubber through carbon filter before being sent to stack.
	Break The committee broke for recess at 10:55 am and reconvened at 11:10 am.
2.4 11:10 – 11:36	**Review of Draft Site Master Plan (continued)** P. Gavalgno presented on resource recovery options, including heat recovery, reclaimed water, anaerobic digestion and thermal drying of biosolids. Most options have high costs and minimal cost recovery but grant funding may impact decision on which options to pursue. Dewatered sludge currently composted and sold as SkyRocket. Q: Have there been talks with FortisBC as they've been interested in naturally produced methane? Is that a possibility? A: Yes it is. Metro Vancouver currently has process where biogas is run through filters and then improved to standards for utility use. FortisBC will purchase and upgrade biogas from landfills and other sites. Doesn't make sense for the treatment plant right now as not at scale to make it worthwhile, but might be reconsidered during next stage of

upgrades in 2045. Best to focus on high priority upgrades first and then consider other less pressing options later.

Comment: Regarding composting anaerobic sludge, would assume level of metals would be higher. Trying to meet copper and selenium requirements of the *Organic Matter Recycling Regulation* may be difficult.
Response: Good point and worth highlighting. Might be neutral as some metals may be filtered out through treatment process.

Q: Know of some dairy farmers who harvest methane and it is pretty cost effective. If too expensive to upgrade for FortisBC, why can't we use it for on-site energy requirements?
A: Could use in raw form in boiler but need to be careful when burning it due to sulfur. Because of scale of supporting process equipment required, may be too costly. Regulations do not allow for any discharge of methane, so need a lot of redundancy. Population threshold typically used to determine if economical to re-use methane, and the service is currently at bottom end of threshold.

Q: Do these options differ in amount of CO_2 emission to atmosphere? Are carbon credits a consideration for any of these options?
A: Biogas can be sold to FortisBC, so it reduces methane emissions and carbon footprint. Dryer is also good option but it needs heat source so larger carbon footprint.

P. Gavalgno summarized the staging plan for the proposed phases of upgrades. Phase 4 plan includes upgrades to be completed by 2030, including new electrical services and headworks, UV disinfection, tertiary filtration, bioreactor and effluent pump upgrades, administrative building retrofit and additional odour control. Outfall reaching capacity, but analysis determined that increased pumping capacity could extend lifespan. Phase 5 includes upgrades to be completed by 2040, Phase 6 includes up to 2045, and Phase 7 includes up to 2060. More detail to be provided at later date.

Q: Any assessment of tax impact of these upgrades?
A: Will include cost estimates in information presented to committee in fall or winter.

	Comment: Pleased to see inclusion of UV disinfection. Good step forward towards addressing impact on shellfish industry. Q: What is the timing of the centrifuge upgrades? Would it involve replacement? Piero: Included in Phase 5 for 2040. Yes, would involve full replacement of centrifuges.
2.5 11:36 – 12:10	**Stage 3 LWMP Scope – Source Control** M. Desilets provided an overview of the Stage 3 LWMP scope, focusing on source control to reduce problematic pollutants entering the sewer system. Mostly driven by Ministry and resident comments and LWMP guidelines and regulations. Detailed approaches to source control, including educational and regulatory options such as septic education and sewer use bylaws, as well as how these options can address what is put into the system. Have conducted background review and now working towards finalizing commitments. Q: Mentioned implementing source control through sewer use bylaw. Has there been any changes implemented? A: Addressed later in presentation. Q: Would septic system education be sent to staff regulating septic systems? Discussed septic systems at previous meeting and how there are many systems out there with minimal oversight. A: CVRD has looked at how to manage septic systems in rural area. Island Health regulates septic systems, but CVRD can work with them to implement changes such as mandatory maintenance. CVRD has focused on providing septic education program and will continue to do so going forward. Have investigated mandatory septic regulation program but have not implemented anything. Q: Would you be able to proceed with regulation or do you require legislative delegation? A: Would require approval from province and elector assent to create new service. Not currently suggesting pursuing that option but have investigated. There is overlap with LWMP scope as treatment plant processes septage from septic systems, but activity on septic regulation is done outside scope of LWMP. Education is most important part in relation to LWMP, as it speaks to what can go into the system. Comment: Have heard examples of poor management of septic systems and wondering if this can be addressed in future.

	Response: CVRD extending sewer to properties with septic is one way of addressing within scope of LWMP. Q: Both examples of educational options are embedded within webpages that require residents to seek them out. Are there more active ones, like how the fire departments remind people to replace smoke alarm batteries on Halloween? Could we have more active programs tied to specific dates? A: Yes, could implement more active programs. TACPAC input could help define what educational programs might look like. M. Desilets shared statistics on different types of users that could potentially be discharging problematic pollutants to system, noting that most industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) development in region is light industrial. Detailed outcomes and benefits of additional source control measures, presenting recommendation to develop framework for source control program and include commitment in LWMP to improve or add source control measures, which would include harmonizing existing sewer use bylaws, developing educational campaigns focused on domestic users and surveying ICI users to assess compliance with sewer use bylaws. Will Cole-Hamilton rejoined the meeting at 12:10pm.
	Lunch The committee broke for lunch at 12:10 pm and reconvened at 12:37 pm. T. Clarke joined the meeting at 12:17pm.
2.5 12:37 – 12:59	**Stage 3 LWMP Scope – Source Control (continued)** M. Desilets summarized the source control component of LWMP and opened the meeting to questions. Q: Is there any plan to expand facilities to manage disposal of hazardous waste? Only option now is to take it to the landfill and residents may find it easier to pour chemicals down the drain. A: Hazardous waste management typically handled by private businesses. CVRD can coordinate with solid waste department to make process more convenient. Q: What have other municipalities done successfully for enforcement of source control?

	A: Capital Regional District and Regional District of Nanaimo have most comprehensive source control programs. Can't speak to extent that they are enforced, but enforcement is critical towards realizing benefit of the program. Metro Vancouver heavily enforces source control bylaws due to presence of heavy industry, requiring industrial users to apply for a permit before discharging to sanitary system. Important to follow up with regular enforcement of sewer use bylaws. Comment: Regarding the CVRD's education program for septic systems, there is the potential for reminding people annually. May be advantageous to follow up with septic haulers, as they are picking up the materials and disposing at treatment plant. Can remind haulers that certain types of waste are not permitted. Response: For source control, when have set group involved, can engage directly with them. Most local governments with strong source control programs have codes of practice tailored to specific groups in the community. Committing to framework is key at this stage but will require additional planning into the future. Q: Do the operators have an idea of which pollutants are the major problem? Focus should be on targeting industries or organizations causing the issue. A: Conducting Environmental Impact Study that involves sampling raw sewage coming into plant and determining if unknown pollutants are getting into the system. Hard to quantify impact of what we don't have data on like microplastics or PFAS. Issues for general day-to-day operations includes fats, oils and greases, as well as flushables and small things like dental floss that don't break down in system. Q: Is there a testing program for sampling in sewer system? Is it regular, like once a week or month, or just a special project done only once in a while? A: Wastewater regularly sampled going into treatment plant. Collections systems are owned and operated by municipal partners. Not aware of what testing the City of Courtenay (City) and Town of Comox (Town) are doing. CVRD tests at inlet of treatment plant. Aware of some issues at smaller lift stations, but no analytical data collected outside treatment plant. Comment: Might be useful information to request from City and Town.

	Q: Is there an idea of what the mechanisms for monitoring inspections for ICI for the source control bylaws would be, what it would look like and what the general goals would be? There are implications that there will be permits for industrial users, but would there be site inspections to ensure compliance? A: Would be up to CVRD, City and Town to determine how to carry out source control. Many local governments use federal framework for source control bylaws. Bylaws usually require self reporting from industrial users and include provisions for inspections, with requirements and timing also included in bylaw. Q: Is there an expectation for certain level of agreement between local governments when working on sewer use bylaws? A: Plan is to create greater harmonization between City and Town source control bylaws. Did investigate option of regional source control bylaw, but after consultation with municipalities decided to proceed with adjusting existing sewer use bylaws. Q: Huge strides could be made on education. There are many things that most residents don't know, such as what to do with chemicals and hazardous waste. Residents may pour chemicals down drain if they don't know the correct option for disposal. Can the system handle such chemicals, or do they end up in the sludge? A: There is definitely a case for a broader education program for source control. Q: Is the system designed to handle gallons of oil-based paint? A: No.
2.6 12:59 – 1:18	**Update on the Outfall Path Forward and Results of Condition Assessment** K. La Rose provided an update on the outfall, including results of the condition assessment and the proposed path forward. Provided an overview of the existing outfall and associated challenges and summarized the key decisions and recommendations from the Stage 1&2 LWMP process, with upgrading or replacement of the outfall projected by 2030. Recommend proceeding with infrastructure upgrades and a modest pressure increase to extend outfall capacity by 10 years and include scope of this work within Phase 4 upgrades.
2.7 1:18 – 1:28	**Sewer Extension South Update** M. Rutten provided an update on the Sewer Extension South Project, including the status of the Union Bay Estates development. Kensington Union Bay Properties is undergoing foreclosure, with the property listed for sale by court order. CVRD cost estimates were based on

	partnership with K'ómoks First Nation and Union Bay Estates, so working on finding alternatives to proceed with project, including pursuing additional grant funding or rephasing project, with options for rephasing still being investigated. Open to discussing funding agreement with future owner of land, who will be bound by existing Master Development Agreement. Q: Funding arrangement was fundamental to approval of Sewer Extension South addendum. How does this affect overall LWMP as addendum is now effectively invalid? Does it need to be removed from the process and reinserted at a later date? Don't feel comfortable proceeding if the addendum is no longer valid. A: Can only continue with existing LWMP if project scope remains unchanged, including funding. If Union Bay Estates manages to provide funding or new owner accepts a similar funding arrangement after acquiring property, project could proceed but seems unlikely. May need to withdraw Stage 1&2 LWMP addendum and redo. Q: Is there a timeline on when that decision will be made? A: Nothing definitive, but within approximately next four months. Q: How many septic systems are in Union Bay, what would the cost for tie-in be and what would the cost per individual connection be? Instead of providing tie-ins, were incentives ever considered for helping residents upgrade their septic systems instead? A: One key reason for pursuing a community sewer for Union Bay is that it is designated as a growth node, close to treaty settlement lands and large developments, and is expected to see dense development that would be most appropriately serviced by a community system. Have done more in-depth investigation into higher standard of septic systems; however, ground conditions and Baynes Sound as the receiving environment do not support septic systems for dense, urban style development. Q: Is voter assent still needed from residents in Union Bay to proceed? A: One feature of the LWMP is that once it is approved, an elector assent process is not required. The LWMP process counts as the elector assent process, as it requires a comprehensive planning process and in-depth public consultation. Q: When is the update on the status of Union Bay Estates and its impact on the Sewer Extension South Project to be announced

	formally? When will the residents of the affected communities be notified? A: Have updated project page and are planning to distribute letters to community but figuring out right timing first.
2.8 1:28 – 1:38	**Next Steps and TACPAC Engagement** K. La Rose summarized the next steps for the project and the TACPAC. Will share full site master plan in summer and encourage members to share comments via email prior to fall meeting. Aim for three more meetings, one in fall 2025 to discuss final LWMP components and Class D/C cost estimates, one in winter 2026 to review the draft Stage 3 LWMP report and Class C/B cost estimates, and another in spring 2026 to review and vote on approval of the final Stage 3 report and Class B cost estimates. K'ómoks First Nation will be engaged prior to winter 2026 and public consultation will occur between winter and spring 2026. Q: What's currently happening with the Sewer Conveyance Project? A: Well over 80 per cent completion of pipe installation. Project split between two contractors and was constrained by jurisdictional boundaries. Currently working on Comox Hill to connect into line installed through Comox, with last section to be installed through IR#1 and small section near Jane Place. Forcemain should be complete in fall, with construction of surface works for Town of Comox to occur in fall and winter. Q: When do you expect the new conveyance pipe to go live? A: First section from Comox Pump Station to treatment plant to go live in late fall or early winter. Rest of system to go online in 2026.
2.9 1:38	**Adjournment** The committee adjourned at 1:38 pm.

GENERAL:
The next CVSS Stage 3 LWMP Joint TACPAC meeting will be scheduled for fall 2025 and will be hosted in the CVRD Civic Room at 770 Harmston Avenue, Courtenay, and via Zoom.

TERMINATION:
The meeting terminated at 1:38 pm.