

Minutes of the meeting of the Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) Joint Technical and Public Advisory Committees (TACPAC) Meeting #5 held on Friday, February 8, 2019 at the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) Boardroom, commencing at 9:00am.

PRESENT:

A. Habkirk, Chair and Facilitator	
P. Nash, LWMP Project Coordinator	
K. La Rose, Senior Manager of Water/Wastewater	CVRD
M. Imrie, Manager of Wastewater Services	CVRD
J. Boguski, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD
A. Idris, Engineering Analyst	CVRD
W. Bayless	WSP
M. Swift, Town of Comox Councillor	PAC
W. Cole-Hamilton, City of Courtenay 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
A. Gower, Comox Valley Chamber of Commerce	PAC
S. Carey, Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
T. Serviz, Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
K. Niemi, Courtenay Resident Representative	PAC
K. vanVelzen, Comox Resident Representative	PAC
D. Jacquest, Comox Resident Representative	PAC
M. Holm, Area B Resident Representative	PAC
M. Lang, Area B Resident Representative	PAC
R. O’Grady, City of Courtenay Engineering	TAC
S. Ashfield, Town of Comox Engineering	TAC
G. Bonekamp, Department of National Defence Engineering	TAC
L. Aitken, Area B Representative Alternate (Observer)	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
5.1	Call to Order Allison called the meeting to order at 9:10am	Allison Habkirk
5.2	Review of Minutes of Meeting #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A disconnect with the agenda and report item 4.3. – K. vanVelzen • A typo in the description of Treatment Option No. 2. – K. van Velzen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The disinfection criteria reads “fecal coliforms not to exceed 200FC/1900mL”, and should be corrected to read 200FC/100mL. MOTION: That the minutes of meeting #4 be adopted – A. Hamir SECONDED: M. Lang CARRIED	Allison Habkirk
5.3	LWMP Process from Here Paul gave a quick overview of the remaining process for the evaluation to short list and preferred options and the LWMP report itself.	Paul Nash

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
5.3	The meeting schedule was presented, noting that some future meeting dates may change.	Paul Nash
5.4	<p style="text-align: center;">Reclaimed Water</p> <p>Paul gave a quick presentation about the need to identify potential uses of reclaimed water as part of the resource recovery study. This is of equal importance as the technical study of producing the water.</p> <p>A brainstorming exercise was conducted to identify potential users, uses and locations for reclaimed water use. This will be incorporated with the reclaimed water options study.</p>	Paul Nash
5.5	<p style="text-align: center;">Public Feedback on Long List Options</p> <p>Kris provided an overview of the feedback sessions about the long list options.</p>	Kris La Rose
5.6	<p style="text-align: center;">Deciding the Long List –Conveyance Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the proposal from Electoral Area A being considered? – M. Swift <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WSP is undertaking separate work to analyze the impacts of including sewer from the south region to the infrastructure as was mandated by the Comox Valley Sewage Commission. - K. La Rose • Are other service areas (adjacent to sewer infrastructure) being considered? – A. Gower <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, sewer system plan area is not part of the LWMP scope. – K. La Rose • More clarification should be provided to the public on what stage in the process they are providing feedback on (inform, consult, and involve stages). – M. Lang <p>MOTION: That in-series pump station Options 1C and 2B be removed due to high risk – M. Lang SECONDED: A. Gower/A. Hamir</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the costs and benefits of the options proposed to be removed? What is the actual risk and is it worth removing these options now? Can redundancies be implemented to mitigate the risks? – K. vanVelzen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It would be premature to eliminate options containing Comox No. 2 Pump Staton, the decision to eliminate them would open the process to criticism that not all options were considered. – K. La Rose • How common are in-series pump stations implemented? – W. Cole-Hamilton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The in-series option is avoided wherever possible. – W. Bayless <p>MOTION DEFEATED</p> <p>MOTION: In recognizing the technical consultant’s opinion as “not technically feasible”, that conveyance Option 6 be removed. – A. Gower SECONDED: K. Niemi CARRIED</p> <p>MOTION: That conveyance Options 1A, B and C be removed. – T. Ennis SECONDED: M. Lang/C. McColl</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion took place as to whether these options should be removed at this stage in the planning process. 	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
5.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation to the risks of Options 1A, B and C are possible but can also increase the maintenance costs and issues. – W. Bayliss • Digging along the Dyke Road raises concerns as this in an archaeological site. There are also greater spill risks and concern with the sensitive work area with regard to tides and ecosystems. • These options should be carried through the evaluation process and explored further, they could be more cost effective. – S. Ashfield • All options should be explored to build a case on decisions made to create the short list. – D. Winterburn <p>MOTION: That Option 5, decentralized treatment, be removed. – D. Jacquest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are only looking to remove technically non-feasible options at this point. – K. La Rose <p>MOTIONS DEFEATED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A modification to Option 4 to convey through McDonnald Road to Idiens/Hudson should be looked at. This option had previously been supported by the public. – S. Ashfield. <p>Approval by consensus to revise Option 4 to create 4A and 4B to conveyance options.</p> <p>MOTION: That Options 1 through 5, including all their variants, be forwarded to the Comox Valley Sewage Commission - A. Gower</p> <p>SECONDED: M. Lang</p> <p>CARRIED</p>	
5.7	<p>Deciding the Long List – Treatment Options</p> <p>MOTION: That all options for treatment be forwarded to the Comox Valley Sewage Commission. – M. Lang</p> <p>SECONDED: W. Cole-Hamilton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When considering treatment options, studies should be more based on future projections of the requirements rather than historical. (Example: future temperatures and tides). – T. Enns <p>CARRIED</p>	
5.8	<p>Deciding the Long List - Resource Recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term “fertilizer pellets” should be changed to “Enhanced Nutrient Recovery” to be a more broad term. Also it should be noted that nutrient recovery is in addition to bio-solids removal to produce SkyRocket. <p>MOTION: To remove hydroelectric turbine option. – D. Jacquest</p> <p>SECONDED: R. O’Grady</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All options should be brought forward for consideration and removed later in the process if found necessary. – T. Serviz, W. Cole-Hamilton <p>MOTION DEFEATED</p> <p>MOTION: That all options for resource recovery be forwarded to the Comox Valley Sewage Commission.</p> <p>SECONDED: D. Jacquest</p> <p>CARRIED</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	OWNER
5.9	<p>Technical Update #4, Costing, Conveyance Hydraulics</p> <p>Walt provided an overview of the terminology and formulation of classes of cost estimates. For the long list options, estimates will be Class D – conceptual and for the short list will be Class C – indicative.</p> <p>A brief explanation of conveyance hydraulics was given, with an explanation of terminology and the meaning of a key term -“Hydraulic Grade Line”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market volume and volatility impact costing greatly and must be considered. – A. Gower • At what point are lifecycle costs considered? – M. Lang <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They are considered in parallel with project costs. – W. Bayliss 	Walt Bayless, WSP
5.10	<p>Future meeting structure was considered. The Technical Advisory Committee will meet separately prior to TACPAC meeting No. 6, to facilitate in-depth technical discussions on the options. The summary of these discussions will be provided to the TACPAC.</p> <p>Meeting No. 6 will be extended to adjourn at 3:00pm to not rush the process.</p>	Paul Nash
5.11	<p>The meeting adjourned at 12:05pm</p>	