

Minutes of the meeting of the Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) Joint Technical and Public Advisory Committees (TACPAC) Meeting #3 held on Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at the Native Sons Hall located at 360 Cliffe Ave, Courtenay, BC, commencing at 9:00am

PRESENT:

A. Habkirk, Chair and Facilitator	
P. Nash, LWMP Project Coordinator	
M. Rutten, General Manager of Engineering Services	CVRD
M. Imrie, Manager of Wastewater Services	CVRD
C. Wile, Manager of External Relations	CVRD
J. Boguski, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD
A. Idris, Engineering Analyst	CVRD
A. Bennett	WSP
W. Bayless	WSP
M. Swift, Town of Comox Councillor	PAC
A. Hamir, Lazo North (Electoral Area B) Director	PAC
C. McColl, K'ómoks First Nation	PAC/TAC
T. Ennis, Comox Valley Conservation Partnership	PAC
D. Winterburn, BC Shellfish Growers Association	PAC
S. Wood, Comox Business Improvement Association	PAC
S. Carey, Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
T. Serviz, Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
K. vanVelzen, Comox Resident Representative	PAC
D. Jacquest, Comox Resident Representative	PAC
R. Craig, Comox Resident Representative	PAC
M. Holm, Area B Resident Representative	PAC
M. Lang, Area B Resident Representative	PAC
L. Aitken, Area B Resident Representative (Observer)	PAC
D. Cherry, VIHA	TAC
R. O'Grady, City of Courtenay Engineering	TAC
S. Ashfield, Town of Comox Engineering	TAC
G. Bonekamp, Department of National Defence Engineering	TAC

ITEMS:

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
3.1	Call to Order.	Allison Habkirk
3.2	<p>Presentation by WSP – Planning Horizons</p> <p>Walt Bayless presented on effluent discharge criteria and regulations, reclaimed water regulations and planning horizons. The floor opened for questions after the presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not build to over-capacity? (P. Nash) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Too large of pipe creates flow issues where the waste cannot flow fast enough to keep solids in suspension, also the sewage can become septic. The operational costs of building to over-capacity are also greater. (W. Bayless) 	Walt Bayless

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are costs the reason for not twinning the sewer transmission mains? (T. Servizi) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Typically that decision is driven by money, also necessity. • At what point does climate change rising sea levels take over Jane Place and Beaufort Ave? (D. Jacquest) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A possible solution is to intercept earlier in the conveyance and move Jane Place to higher elevation. Then Beaufort properties may need to be locally serviced. • Would locally servicing Beaufort Ave be the municipality of Comox's issue? How long until sea levels rise? (D. Jacquest) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes it would be Comox's issue to locally service Beaufort Ave. We don't know the exact timeline or effect of the sea level rising to Jane Place. However, potential effects of climate change should be considered. (W. Bayless) • Courtenay may be worse off with climate change because of the rivers leading to the sea. Moving forward we need to consider those risks. (D. Jacquest) City of Courtenay is currently working on climate change mitigation and asset protection. In conjunction with this, the City is working to obtain provincial grant funding for these projects. (R. O'Grady) 	Walt Bayless
3.3	<p>Presentation by Paul Nash – Goals and Options Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this weighting process fair? Because one person could put all their votes on one topic. (K. van Velzen) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The results are being reported to you as they were recorded. ○ If the committee feels it is warranted, we can refine the results today as a group. (P. Nash) • There are more PAC votes than TAC votes, are they equally represented? (T. Servizi) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The TAC and PAC votes were recorded and kept separately on purpose. It is true that there were more PAC members who voted than there were TAC members. Considerations were made in terms of which committees vote should carry more weighting depending on goal category when the proposed percentages for each goal and goal category was developed. For instance, the votes from the TAC members' carry more weight than the PAC members' votes for the Technical goals. On the other hand, PAC members' votes carry more weight for the Social Benefits goals as they better understand the community's needs and interests. (P. Nash) • Will we amend Official Community Plans if necessary to obtain goals? (D. Jacquest) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potentially, but that does not seem necessary at this point. (P. Nash) • Is asset management required for the LWMP? (A. Gower) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, but it is a requirement to obtain grant funding in the future. (R. O'Grady) 	Paul Nash

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does governance fit in to the LWMP? (R. O’Grady) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Those issues sit outside of the LWMP. Whether or not changes happen may or may not affect this process. (P. Nash) • The LWMP should clearly outline the scope and boundary of the service. (R. O’ Grady) • If we have to plan for 50 years, should we not be planning for new governance structure and boundary expansions? Should the LWMP consider long term flows from outside the current sewer service such as Area B and South Sewer project area?(R. Craig) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The adaptability goal would be critical for the system whereby it can easily be expanded in the future should capacity expansion be required for service area expansion or to accommodate growth. Expansions would have to be known for reasonable planning. (W. Bayless) • The Regional Growth Strategy outlines expansion nodes. Council members need to push the agenda of community expansion in order to more accurately plan. (A. Gower) • This committee should remain technical and focused on the current service area not attempt to predict the future. (M. Rutten) • Consultants determine the size of pipes, pumps and the treatment plant. My understanding is that this committee’s mandate was to explore options for best solutions for conveyance, treatment and resource recovery aspects of the wastewater treatment system and not to concern itself with the technical and governance structure details. (M. Imrie) 	Paul Nash
3.4	<p>Christianne Wile presented – Public Feedback on the Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were there any goals identified in the public sessions? (K. Van Velzen) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, but there were no goals that differed significantly from what was presented. Some participants wanted to bring forward potential solutions but the time for gathering that input will be at the next round of workshops when we discuss the long list. • Are the public engagement results expected to improve? Should we be doing anything different?(S. Wood) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PAC members can connect with their networks to help engage the public. We are utilizing our online engagement tools along with public workshops and promoting through online, radio and newspaper., (C. Wile) • What would you consider a significant sample of public engagement? (M. Swift) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is no industry standard for this type of community engagement. However, PAC members are representative of their communities and we look to you to tell us if you are comfortable with these results based on what you are hearing in your networks. 	Christianne Wile

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How often are we going to engage the community? (A. Hamir) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have planned to have three more engagement opportunities, for the long list results, short list results, and preferred option. (C. Wile) • This may be too much of a time commitment to ask the public to attend multiple workshops and take part in online consultation activities. Is it possible to skip the long list development stage and engage the public only in the shortlist stage? (A. Hamir) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engaging the public only in the shortlisting of goals is something we can certainly consider if that is what the committee wants. However, we advise that we allow the public an opportunity to engage with us on the long list in the event there are options that may be brought forward which have not been considered. We have had lots of input from the public so far, it is expected that more responses will come further along in this process. (C. Wile) ○ Public input is screened in the same manner as input from the committee. (P. Nash) <p>In terms of numbers, it is important to keep in mind that regardless of how many people take part in these public workshops or online consultation, the sample is not totally random and therefore cannot be projected as a representative of the general public. (D. Jacquest)</p>	Christianne Wile
3.5	Break	
3.6	<p>Evaluation of the Goals Matrix - Conveyance</p> <p>Paul Nash presented the initial results from scoring of the treatment, conveyance and resource recovery goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important from the Chamber of Commerce’s perspective to look at the affordability goal category from the lens of economic benefits as local consultants and contractors contribute to affordability of the system through localized equipment and staff, property taxes, utility taxes, etc. (A. Gower) • The significant bump up of the affordability weightings is concerning. (M. Lang) • Under the environmental group, it should be considered that there are some regulated requirements set in place. (A. Gower) • We are concerned about bumping up the proposed weighting of affordability goal category while down grading the proposed weighting for environmental benefits category. (D. Winterburn) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This matrix is a guideline and should not be viewed as set in stone. We need to come to an agreement in advance to determine what is considered to be a tie (example: +/- 20 per cent). (A. Habkirk) • Should we add a goal to emphasize benefit to local businesses? One example being local construction/consulting jobs. <p>The committee engaged in a discussion about how to redistribute the weightings of the conveyance goals. Proposed changes were voted on by a show of hands. The proposed weightings, as presented, and the final weightings, as decided, are shown in the attached tables.</p>	Paul Nash

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
3.6	In the discussion about weightings, the technical consultants advised the TACPAC that scoring is not the final arbiter of the “Winning Option”. For this system, if two options are within ten per cent, they should be considered as a tie, and then carefully compared to each other to make a decision.	Paul Nash
3.7	<p>Due to running out of time the committee was unable to discuss the weightings of the treatment and resource recovery goals and this task was determined to be completed at the next CVSS LWMP Joint TACPAC meeting commencing January 24, 2018 at the Comox Valley Regional District Boardroom. The January 24, 2018 meeting will be extended to 3:00pm in order to complete all agenda items.</p> <p>There was not sufficient time to visit the compost facility during the December 4 and 7, 2018 sewer system tours. A new tour date of the compost facility will take place Tuesday, January 15, 2019, from 10:00am to 12:00pm. The tour will start and end at the CVRD Boardroom. Members are asked to RSVP by email to jboguski@comoxvalleyrd.ca no later than Monday, January 7, 2019.</p> <p>Delegates were encouraged to consider their ideas for conveyance, treatment and resource recovery over the holidays, and bring them to the January 24 meeting.</p>	
3.8	Meeting adjourned at 12:05pm	

Attachments:

Table of Revised Conveyance Goals

Table of final Conveyance Evaluation System

CONVEYANCE – Consolidation of Goals

Category	Goals and Category	PAC %	TAC %	Proposed Revised Goals	Public %	Proposed Final %	Description, Comment
Technical	Resiliency to climate change, natural disasters and seasonal impacts	11%	12%	Resilience to External Factors	10%	15%	Includes climate change, natural disasters, seasonal impact
	Enhance operational resilience	9%	15%	Resilience to Internal Factors	10%	15%	Operational simplicity and reliability, minimise risk of failure
	Maximize use of existing infrastructure	9%	10%	Maximize use of existing infrastructure & road ROW's	6%	0%	This is not an end goal in itself, but an action to achieve other goals , such as reducing capital cost and project complexity
	Plan for long term	7%	21%	Long term solution	10%	10%	Provides asset life, and possibly capacity, beyond the minimum planning horizon.
				Flexibility to accommodate future changes		5%	Technical consultants to elaborate
	Innovation in Design	3%	2%	Innovation	8%	0%	This not an end goal in itself, but is an action to achieve other goals, such as attract grant funding, or reduce operational complexity.
Technical Total		38%	61%		44%	45%	
Affordability	Minimize lifecycle costs	9%	8%	Minimize lifecycle cost	7%	14%	Net present value of capital, operational and replacement cost, period is to the planning horizon
	Long Term financial Implications	8%	2%	Long term value	0%	4%	Provides asset life and capacity beyond the design planning horizon
				Attract grant funding	8%	0%	This is an action to offset capital cost, but needs to be evaluated separately as there is a probability factor involved. Offset = grant% x capital cost x probability
Affordability Total		17%	10%		15%	18%	
Economic Benefits	Maximize local economic benefits	3%	1%		0%	0%	Not a focus at all of the Conveyance component
Economic Total	Benefit to local business	3%	1%		0%	2%	
Environment Benefits	Minimize impacts, and risk of impacts, to sensitive environment	12%	7%	Minimize risk of impacts to sensitive environment	10%	12%	Example action - remove forcemain from estuary, but must also consider risks/impact of new location
	Mitigate climate change impacts (Energy and GHG's)	7%	9%	Minimize resource consumption and carbon footprint	9%	6%	Reduce use of external resources, e.g. energy, chemicals. Most energy reductions reduce GHG's, but not all GHG reductions reduce energy.
Environment Total		19%	16%		19%	18%	
Social Benefit	Minimize noise and odour impacts	12%	3%	Minimize noise, odour and visual impacts in operation	6%	10%	

				Minimize community disruption during construction	9%	3%	
	Maximize community and recreational infrastructure	8%	2%	Maximize community and recreational amenity value	7%	4%	Best example is recreational trails above a pipeline, but there might be other opportunities
	Maximize public health benefit	3%	8%	Maximize public health benefit		0%	Include this in the specification for this component, relates to Internal resilience- risk of failure
Social Total		23%	13%		22%	17%	
Grand Total		100%	100%		100%	100%	

Proposed Final Goal and Evaluation Matrix – Conveyance

Component	Conveyance	
Category	Proposed Revised Goals	Proposed %
Technical	Resilience to External Factors	15
	Resilience to Internal Factors	15
	Long term solution	10
	Flexibility to accommodate future changes	5
Technical Total		45%
Affordability	Minimize Lifecycle Cost	14
	Long Term Value	4
	Attract Grant Funding (evaluate to offset capital cost)	0
Affordability Total		18%
Economic Benefits		0
Economic Total		2%
Environmental Benefits	Minimize risk of impacts to sensitive environment	12
	Mitigate climate change impacts (Energy, and GHG's)	6
Environmental Total		18%
Social Benefit	Minimize noise, odour and visual impacts in operation	10
	Minimize community disruption during construction	3
	Maximize community and recreational amenity value	4
Social Total		17%
Grand Total		100%