

South Sewer Project & South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan

Public Communications & Engagement: Report and Summary

Presented to the Comox Valley Regional District Prepared by ZINC Strategies December 2016



CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Project Phases	3
1.2	Communication Highlights	3
2.0	Phase 1: South Sewer Project Launch	4
2.1	Background	4
2.2	Communication Goals	4
2.3	Materials/Tools	5
2.4	Summary of Feedback/Results	7
3.0	Phase 2: South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan	B
3.1	Background	8
3.2	Communication Goals	8
3.3	Materials/Tools	9
3.4	Summary of Feedback/Results 1	2
4.0	Phase 3: South Sewer Project Referendum12	3
4.1	Background 1	3
4.2	Communication Goals1	3
4.3	Materials/Tools1	4
4.4	Summary of Feedback/Results 1	5
4.5	Post Referendum Communications1	5
5.0	Conclusion	6
6.0	Appendix	7

1.0 Introduction

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is committed to exploring wastewater management options for the Royston and Union Bay areas, also referred to as the "south region" of the CVRD. During the 2013 – 2016 period this work involved launching the south sewer project (SSP), which was followed by the development of a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for the south region, and culminated in a public referendum vote in June 2016.

This document outlines communications and public engagement activities undertaken by the CVRD related to these three project phases. It is intended to act as a log of communications efforts, events, materials, tools and approaches that were used to inform the public. This report can serve as a reference for staff and elected representatives as they consider future wastewater steps in Royston/Union Bay or other areas of the CVRD.

1.1 PROJECT PHASES

This graphic represents the three phases of the project from March 2013 to December 2016:



1.2 COMMUNICATION HIGHLIGHTS

Through each phase of the project, the CVRD project team remained committed to proactive public communications. The result was a well-informed community who engaged regularly, shared feedback, and were prepared to take part in the referendum vote.

This communications effort involved the use of many materials and approaches. The following list highlights some of this work, which is expanded upon in this report:

- **Visual Identity:** The SSP and LWMP were given a clear visual identity that made project-related materials easy to find.
- Face-to-Face Opportunities: Six open houses/info sessions were held, along with weekly open office hours, targeted "walk about" community tours for proposed pump station locations and regular updates for community stakeholders.
- **Online Engagement:** Online consultation tool PlaceSpeak was selected to host public discussions about the project in part due to its geo-verification tool that could confirm that participants resided or owned property in the project area.
- **Consistent Outreach:** Public communication about the project was fact-based, regular and consistent, creating a standard that residents came to rely on.

2.0 Phase 1: South Sewer Project Launch

2.1 BACKGROUND

In March 2013, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD), with partners Village of Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation (KFN), was awarded \$17-million by the Union of BC Municipalities Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund and the CVRD's Community Works Fund to develop a regional wastewater solution that would service Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland.

This news marked a significant step in the progress of the south sewer project and effectively launched the formal planning process for a centralized wastewater collection, treatment and discharge system that had long been discussed in the CVRD's south region.

Recognizing the need for significant communications during this potentially large – and expensive – multi-partner, multi-year infrastructure project, the CVRD engaged communications consultants ZINC Strategies. ZINC assisted with public communications planning and roll-out, with work beginning in June 2013.

The following outlines the public communications goals, approach and activities from June 2013 – July 2014.



2.2 COMMUNICATION GOALS

The focus of communications during this phase of the project was to inform and educate the public, with a specific focus on property owners in the proposed service areas.

The communications goals for the south sewer project team during this period included:

- Update project information materials including online (website) and offline: Ensuring that the most current information was made clear and simple for residents/owners in different forms.
- Establish a name and visual identity for the project: By establishing a project identity, target audiences would be able to easily find and recognize updates on planning.

- Create a communications calendar of materials, public events, and outreach: By outlining a clear process and timeline for the creation and distribution of updates, the project team could stay current with providing information to the public.
- Create an easy-to-follow visual project timeline (infographic): An easy-to-follow infographic chart was developed and used by each partner, to explain the multi-year, multi-decision point process.

2.3 MATERIALS/TOOLS

The following materials and tools (included in the Appendix) were developed to share information about the project:

A. Wordmark/Project Brand

• A project brand was developed to establish the south sewer project as a critical and recognizable project for the CVRD and residents of Royston/Union Bay.



B. Information Sheets

- A series of foundational infosheet documents were created to inform the community about project elements, including a glossary and frequently-asked questions.
- A template was created for future information sheets to ensure all public documents would share a consistent visual identity for the project.

C. Infographic

• A timeline graphic was created to reflect the high-level decision points and processes that each project partner was facing.

D. Webpage Content

- A project-specific webpage with a specific project URL was created (www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer), establishing a go-to source for information.
- A project-specific email was created to receive public inquiries and questions: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

E. Newsletter

- A template was created for project newsletters, which included regular features such as "You Ask, We Answer" and "What is Happening Now".
- Three issues of the newsletter for property owners and the public were produced during this period; delivery was via direct mail as well as posting online.

F. Open House and InfoBoards

- One open house was held during this phase of the project in May 2014, which also marked the opening of the south sewer project office in Royston.
- Eight info-boards were created for this event, providing an overview of the proposed liquid waste management planning process, and of integrated resource management examples.
- This event confirmed the open house as a valuable and popular outreach tool.

TABLE 1.1: OPEN HOUSES: PHASES AND ATTENDANCE

DATE	OPEN HOUSE	ATTENDEES
Phase 1: South Sewer Project		
May 15, 2014	Overview of project	60
Phase 2: South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan		
July 17, 2014	LWMP Intro	50
January 21, 2015	Discharge Scenario	160
March 23, 2016	WWTP & pump station location, Intro to P3	190
Phase 3: South Sewer Project Referendum		
May 25, June 1, June 15, 2016	InfoSessions	120

SSP/ROYSTON OFFICE OPEN HOUSE - MAY 15, 2014: PHOTOS



2.4 SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK/RESULTS

As residents in the Royston/Union Bay area came to understand more about the potential for a community wastewater system and the process for planning, the following themes emerged from the collected feedback:

Key Themes:

A. Costs of the Project:

Many expressed strong concern about the cost of the project, with questions about payment options, sharing of costs, and confidence in the price estimate.

B. Questions about Construction:

Given the general understanding that a community wastewater service is needed, key questions were raised about construction and the logistics of construction (ie: What will be required for existing septic tanks? Where will the collection pipes run? Where will the treatment plant be located?).

C. Impact to the Environment:

Questions around the environment were divided into two segments: vocal support for a wastewater system that will reduce the existing impact of failing septic systems and concern about the Baynes Sound environment and potential impact of an outfall into those waters.

3.0 Phase 2: South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan

3.1 BACKGROUND

In spring 2014, after assessing potential planning approaches for a community wastewater system in Royston/Union Bay, the CVRD decided to develop a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for the area. The South Region LWMP would assess and select options for moving forward, lead and encourage ongoing community engagement and, if ultimately approved by the province, provide electoral assent.

A Public Consultation Plan was developed and approved by the CVRD, laying out a comprehensive plan to engage with the community. This engagement, with recorded feedback, was critical to evaluation and selection of options and to ensuring the potential for successful completion of an LWMP. This phase ran from July 2014 to April 2016.



3.2 COMMUNICATION GOALS

The focus of communications during this phase was to inform the community about the options and involve them in the decision-making process.

The key goals for the south sewer project team during this project phase were:

- **Provide timely information with clear opportunities for public involvement:** With the foundation of clear, proactive communications set in Phase 1 of the project, the focus remained on continuing to provide consistent updates as well as expanding to include the community and engage their feedback.
- Meet LWMP requirements for meaningful input: Engaging the community and demonstrating efforts to consider and adopt feedback is key to a successful LWMP process. Creating a communications plan that reflected this priority was critical.
- Use complementary engagement methods and tools: By using multiple outreach tools, the CVRD aimed to create a web of options intended to prevent feedback fall through. Each resident was given the opportunity to provide comments and input in a way that worked for them: written, in person, by phone or online.

3.3 MATERIALS/TOOLS

A. Revised/Updated Wordmark:

- A new wordmark was developed to identify the South Region LWMP as a separate process from the South Sewer Project.
- The wordmark maintained consistency with the already-developed SSP wordmark and allowed for continued use of templates with visual differentiation from Phase 1.





B. Website

- Web text was revised to introduce the community to the LWMP process and the highlight engagement opportunities.
- Calendars, online comment forms and links to any material shared at in-person events were all highlighted to create a comprehensive opportunity for residents to review information and provide comments.

C. Social Media

- Weekly social media posts provided information updates and directed people to online-focused engagement/feedback opportunities.
- More than 70 social media posts were shared via CVRD Facebook and Twitter accounts during this stage.



D. Open Houses and Public Events

- Three open houses were held during this phase: each at key stages of the LWMP development process (see Table 1.1).
- Combined, these events saw an estimated 400 people attend.

- Feedback from these events combined with comments/input submitted via alternate communications routes were key in informing decisions about the preferred discharge location and site for the wastewater treatment plant.
- In addition to the large open houses, smaller neighbourhood-centered 'site tours' were held at proposed pump station locations. These were well attended, with between 20-30 people attending the tours held in Royston (Marine Drive) and Kilmarnock areas.

LWMP OPEN HOUSE - JAN. 2015: PHOTOS



E. Newsletter

- The project newsletter remained a key update tool for the community during this period and highlighted opportunities to provide comment/feedback.
- It was produced quarterly, with an extra issue in Jan. 2015. In total, seven newsletters were produced during this phase of the project.
- Roughly 1,000 people are on the newsletter mailing list combining both letter mail and e-mail.

F. Project Office Drop-In Hours

- The project team hosted weekly drop-in office hours to make regular updates easily accessible for individuals.
- These opportunities were particularly popular shortly after public updates (such as the newsletter) were distributed, and for people who had specific circumstances regarding their property that they wished to discuss.
- It's estimated that 235 people used this opportunity to engage with the project team.

G. Information Materials

- Regularly updated information materials, including backgrounders during specific stages of the project development, were key to keeping the broader community informed.
- These infosheets lived in an online library on the project webpage. Attention was drawn to new/updated materials via newsletters, open houses, social media posts etc.

H. Comment Sheets/Phone Logs

- Records of all comment sheets, phone calls and office visits were logged in an regularly-updated file.
- Summaries of these comments were provided by the CVRD's project team administrative assistant.

I. Traditional Media

- To clearly identify opportunities for the community to engage in the LWMP process traditional media both earned and paid was used.
- During this period, six news releases were distributed, and roughly 60 media clippings were collected about the project. Samples of these clippings can be found in the Appendix to this report.

J. Public Advisory Committee (PAC)

- A public advisory committee was created, made up of roughly 12 people representing specific neighbourhoods and local stakeholder organizations.
- Invitations to join the PAC were distributed throughout the community via paid ads, newsletters, news release and more.
- The resident members of the PAC were regularly updated about the project progress and served as information ambassadors in their communities, collecting questions/feedback and relaying information/answers through the planning process.

K. Online Consultation

- PlaceSpeak was selected as an online consultation tool for the project.
- A specific discussion page was created at placespeak.com/southregionLWMP and allowed an additional forum for engagement in the LWMP Process
- Surveys, discussion topics and resources pages were particularly popular portions of the webpage. A collated copy of these discussions is included in the Appendix.

TABLE 2.1: PLACESPEAK ENGAGEMENT

BY THE NUMBERS: PLACESPEAK		
Number of connected participants	95	
Number of discussion posts	145	
Number of Views	1,932	
Example Results:		
Percentage of respondents most concerned with cost in deciding WWTP location	30%	
Percentage of respondents who said environmental protection was the most important factor in wastewater planning for the region	88%	

3.4 SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK/RESULTS

As planning for a community wastewater system developed with the community's input, key themes emerged from the collected comments during this period.

A. Cost of the Project:

Given the significant price tag associated with this work, it is little surprise that cost was a primary focus for feedback from the community. Questions weren't only about the degree of cost, but also covered issues such as payment options, sharing of costs with developers/other communities, and confidence in the current estimate.

B. Concerns Around Routing and Construction:

Given the general understanding that a community wastewater service is needed, many of the comments and questions were about the construction and the logistics of construction (ie: decommissioning requirements for existing septic tanks, location of collection pipes, etc.)

C. Impact to the Environment without New Service:

Throughout this period, there was general support and understanding that a wastewater system would reduce the existing impact of failing septic systems on the environment. While the urgency of comments depended largely on people's direct experience with poor-performing on-site systems, it was a small minority of respondents who did not feel a system was needed at all. Where there were comments about not needing to participate, it was largely because the property owner had recently installed a new on-site system.

D. Clear preferences for Discharge and WWTP Locations:

There was vocal concern about the Baynes Sound environment and potential impact of discharging treated effluent into those waters. The balance of feedback also weighed clearly in favour of a treatment plant located at the southernmost location proposed – on K'ómoks First Nation land.

4.0 Phase 3: South Sewer Project Referendum

4.1 BACKGROUND

In late Spring 2016, as the LWMP process continued to progress, additional funding opportunities became available that would have significantly reduced the cost for residents of a new wastewater collection/treatment system. This became particularly important after the Village of Cumberland voted to withdraw from the proposed SSP as a result of feedback from their community about cost to residents.

A potential funding opportunity via P3 Canada could have offered \$13.3-million in additional support for the service construction. Due to the tight deadlines for applications, it was determined that a referendum would be required to gauge the public's position on the proposed project in a timely manner. The decision was supported by ongoing feedback from residents that another referendum (following the one held in 2006) would be important to secure community support.

The CVRD, working with ZINC, adapted its communications planning to focus on the referendum, its potential results and following steps.



This phase of the project ran from roughly April to December 2016.

4.2 COMMUNICATION GOALS

The focus of communications during this phase of the project was to inform the community and motivate them to action.

The key goals for the south sewer project team during this project phase were:

• **Provide the information/answers needed to cast an informed vote:** Making informational accessible and understandable for the community to allow for better understanding was critical to a successful process. It was also important to provide individualized answers for residents making a decision based on their personal circumstances.

Encourage turnout at referendum polls: To feel confident in the will of the community (in either direction), it was important for the CVRD that there be a reasonable turnout at the polls on voting day.

- Make clear that change was needed, and that the proposed option was sound: Because the referendum had a significant cost implication, it was important for the CVRD to emphasize why they felt this referendum needed to occur and their reasons for presenting this option.
- **Prepare for communicating outcomes and next steps:** A significant amount of planning was undertaken during this period to ensure that outcomes of the vote were properly relayed to the community, as well as preparing for next steps as a result of either a successful or failed referendum.

4.3 MATERIALS/TOOLS

A. Referendum Webpage

- Working with the CVRD Corporate Services department, a referendum-specific webpage was created that highlighted the 'nuts and bolts' of the vote, including eligibility, ID requirements, text of questions, voting locations etc.
- Project webpages were updated to provide easy reference information and the mostup-to-date details re: funding, costs, schedules and more.

B. Information Materials

- Specific materials to cover the most common questions posed by residents were created, specifically a cost handout and a general project overview/summary.
- These were included with the library of materials on project webpages, shared at infosessions and mailed to homes.

C. Infosessions

- Three infosessions were held in the weeks leading up to the referendum: one at the Union Bay Community Hall, one at the Royston Community Hall, and the final at the project office.
- Roughly 120 people attended the sessions which were intended as a drop-in style, with the project staff on hand to answer any final questions from the community.
- The project office was also advertised as open to the community during all work hours in the lead up to the vote date and a new sign was created for the office with voting information.

D. Newsletter

- Two newsletters were issued in this time period the first announcing details of the vote and upcoming infosessions, the second focusing on most common questions heard by the project team.
- Two follow up newsletters were sent following the referendum. These included details about voting dates/times and were mailed to 800+ homes in the voting area.

E. "Did You Know" Ad campaign

- A series of four paid advertisements were published in local newspapers in the month leading up to the referendum highlighting some of the key points of consideration by the project team.
- Focus included: funding availability, P3 opportunities and the need for improved environmental stewardship in the area.

F. Home-to-Home Outreach

- The project team undertook a door-knocking effort to reach homes eligible for voting and encourage turnout on the vote day.
- Team members ensured residents/homeowners knew about the voting logistics details as well as answered any outstanding questions the community members had.
- In total, an estimated 930 homes were visited, with approximately 120-140 residents/homeowners spoken to directly.

4.4 SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK/RESULTS

As residents and homeowners moved toward casting a ballot, comments and questions became more and more specific and less able to separate into general themes as previous phases. A few of the general categories for feedback were:

A. Cost for Residents:

While throughout the LWMP process there was general support for the project, the final costs presented to the community were generally considered high and raised significant concerns about the long-term affordability of the project. Information about reducing costs as additional development joined the service did not address these concerns.

B. Questions about public-private partnerships (P3):

While the CVRD did not hear significant concerns from the community about P3s, a local CUPE chapter initiated an opposition campaign based on the P3 component of the proposal. The counter campaign raised confusion about the opportunity presented by this funding.

4.5 POST REFERENDUM COMMUNICATIONS

As is now official record, the referendum was unsuccessful. Sharing the results and informing the community of next steps for wastewater planning in the area became the core focus for the remainder of 2016.

Key activities for post-referendum communications included:

- **A. Working with the CVRD's in-house communications team to release results news**: Along with results being posted on social media and websites the evening of the referendum, a news release was also distributed. The project team worked to support/promote this information on additional channels such as PlaceSpeak.
- **B.** Additional newsletters to explain next steps and emphasize respect for results: A newsletter was published shortly after the referendum was completed, advising the community of the results and of the immediate next steps around planning/funding etc. A subsequent newsletter in the fall of 2016 added more information about what the CVRD staff was currently investigating and advised the community that regular, quarterly newsletters would not continue until a clear path forward is identified.

C. Wrap-up of PlaceSpeak conversation:

At the end of September, 2016, the PlaceSpeak page was officially closed up, with advanced notice provided throughout the month via PlaceSpeak notices, newsletters and CVRD social media pages. The discussion page is still available for viewing online, and includes a message redirecting any interested readers to current contacts and information.

5.0 Conclusion

Between March 2013 and Fall 2016, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) worked through a planning and referendum process for the development of community wastewater services in the south region (Royston/Union Bay). Along with extensive planning, review and investigation, the project involved substantial communications primarily focused on ensuring that homeowners and residents in the proposed service area understood the project details.

The project was organized around three phases, each with its own specific communications goals and outcomes. A range of tools were used through the ongoing communications and engagement work, tailored to meet the specific needs of each stage of the multi-year, multi-partner project.

This summary report has aimed to provide an overview of the tools used during these stages along with insights on the degree of engagement and amount of outreach that occurred. It also provides a summary of key feedback themes that emerged from the community.

All feedback that was collected forms part of the consultation record for the project. Many of the communication tools that were used remain easily accessible online. The communications process that was followed became well-established in the community to such an extent that when the next phase of wastewater planning is decided on, the project team will have a foundation of informed residents, prepared for engagement, to build further outreach with.

6.0 Appendix

Please see separate appendix file for a library of materials.

Appendix

- **1. COMMUNICATIONS PLANS**
- 2. WORDMARKS/VISUAL IDENTITY
- 3. NEWSLETTERS
- 4. INFOBOARDS
- 5. INFOSHEETS
- 6. NEWS RELEASES
- 7. ADVERTISING
- 8. SOCIAL MEDIA & PLACESPEAK
- 9. MEDIA CLIPS
- **10. COMMUNICATION LOG**

1.0 Communications Plans

- 1.1 SSP COMMUNICATIONS PLAN (MARCH 2015)
- 1.2 SSP COMMUNICATIONS PLAN (UPDATE APRIL 2015)
- 1.3 SSP & LWMP COMMUNICATIONS PLAN (UPDATE MAY 2015)
- 1.4 SOUTH REGION LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN
- 1.5 SSP REFERENDUM COMMUNICATIONS PLAN



Subject: South sewer project

File: 1470-06

Purpose

To outline methods of communication around the plans for the south sewer project.

Target audience(s):

- Residents and property owners of Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation
- General public of the Comox Valley
- Union Bay Improvement District (UBID)
- CVRD board of directors
- Members of Comox Valley local governments
- Media

Project background:

- Royston and Union Bay need to replace failing septic systems to prevent the continued contamination of receiving waters in Baynes Sound, the most prolific cultured shellfish growing area in BC
- The Village of Cumberland's existing wastewater treatment facility, consisting of lagoonbased primary and secondary treatment, is not able to meet many of its permitted operating requirements and is in need of replacement
- The K'ómoks First Nation (KFN) has extensive aquaculture interests in Baynes Sound and is a land owner in the proposed south sewer service area. The KFN has formed a key partnership with the CVRD in the application for federal funding, with the aims of solving the negative environmental impacts in Baynes Sound and helping enable KFN's long-term land use planning and economic development goals
- In combination with the sewer master plan, the CVRD utilized an engineering process, which included a triple bottom line analysis and risk assessment, to help derive the most cost- effective solution to the wastewater quality issues
- The result of that process is that funding is being sought for a new, sustainable, state of the art wastewater treatment plant and collection system to treat, reclaim and reuse wastewater from Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and KFN development lands
- The south sewer project is fully supported by these broad strategies: sewer master plan, regional growth strategy, regional sustainability strategy, and regional water supply
- Total cost of the first stage of the project is estimated at \$42 million.
- The federal Gas Tax grant, awarded in March 2013, covers \$15 million. The remainder of the \$42 million for stage one of the project will come from a \$2 million federal grant through the Community Works Fund and borrowing through the Municipal Finance Authority.
- The money borrowed through the Municipal Finance Authority will need to be repaid. An information meeting will be held with the residents who would be part of the service, to propose the costs required to pay for the sewer service through taxation to repay that money.

Key speaking points:

- Failing septic systems in Royston and Union Bay, combined with the wastewater from Cumberland are having a lasting negative effect on the receiving waters of Baynes Sound
- A new south sewer treatment plant and collection system is required to rectify this problem and eliminate the contamination of Baynes Sound
- The south sewer project will utilize innovative policy and technology to ensure water reuse, energy recovery, nutrient recovery, and to create a sustainable and efficient sewer collection and treatment solution
- The project will employ the highest level of intergovernmental cooperation and collaboration between the CVRD, Cumberland, KFN, and private development, working towards the common goal of providing safe, reliable, sustainable and cost effective wastewater treatment for years to come
- The \$17 million federal grant funding will have an effect on the level of funding required from the property owners in the areas to be serviced
- An information meeting will be held with affected property owners to propose the amount they are required to pay for the sewer service

Guiding principles:

- Communications included in all project advisory group meetings and in key project-related discussions
- Project to have budget sufficient to cover communications strategies
- CVRD board and committee meetings to be used to provide updates on project status to elected officials
- Partnership, transparency and positive interaction of those working together on a community benefit

Situation analysis:

Strengths:

- Affected communities aware of issues relating to septic fields, Baynes Sound water, etc.
- Good relationship with local media
- Support from Kensington Island Properties development in the area
- Partnership and collaboration with K'ómoks First Nation, and Village of Cumberland
- \$17 million federal grant contribution

Weaknesses:

- Subject matter complexity number of players/partners; roles of each
- Governance issues to be determined
- Unknown potential cost to property owners

Opportunities:

• Regular committee and board meetings able to provide forum for updates on project status to elected officials

<u>Threats:</u>

• Criticism from special interest groups (eg. CUPE, other organized labour) – *minimized if no P3 involved*

Communications strategy/tactics:

Define the project for	• Identify spokesperson(s)
the public	• Develop key messages for use with media, and for
	public/resident/stakeholder meetings
	• Develop 'frequently asked questions' document on the
	project (content provided/approved by project
	lead/designated project team member)
	• Develop special web page(s) for the project. The web
	KIP letter of support, grant application executive
	summary, applications themselves (?), FAQs, and other
	relevant material/information
	• Consider technical briefings for media, as appropriate
	• Use CVRD social media sites for current information and
	'traffic directing' to material on website
	• Media release(s) developed and issued as project "news"
	comes forward
V	• Respond to media enquiries in timely, consistent manner
informed about the	• Provide key messaging, speaking points, etc., as needed
project, key issues and	Develop issue (response document (content
opportunities	 Develop issue/response document (content provided/approved by project lead/designated project
	team member) to ensure issues are addressed quickly and
	accurately
Grant award event	• Sign created to federal specs; erected day of
March 13, 2013 (Done)	announcement (Mar 13/13) (Done)
	• News release/quote from CVRD chair – to UBCM to
	coordinate provincial/tederal quotes; issue release to CV
	 Develop invitation list for CV area participants: issue
	invitation March 7 (Done)
	Prepare media kits/backgrounder
	• Media advisory – March 11 (Done)
	• Speaking notes for CVRD chair (Done)
	• Arrange photographer (Done)
	• Update website, social media (Done)
	• Photos, media summary to UBCM post-event (Done)
	• Signage report to feds post-event (Done)
Lead-in to referendum	 Public meetings – facilitated by project manager
	• Material developed for public meetings, advertising,
	website, social media

Approval History

Created by: L. Carter, PAIS	July 11, 2012
Amended	September 25, 2012
	January 24, 2013
	February 1, 2013
	March 11, 2013



South Sewer Project - Communications Plan Update (to original plan, File: 1470-06)Date:April 13, 2015Status:Discussion Draft

Purpose:

To outline planned communications for the next phase of the south sewer project, now that the preferred scenario (treatment facility in south region with discharge to Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo via shared CVWPCC outfall) has been selected for further development of the south region liquid waste management plan.

Goals:

- Continue providing clear and timely information about the south sewer project to people in the proposed service area.
- Begin providing information to interested members of the Comox Valley public related to selected scenario and routing across the estuary.
- Anticipate and serve the informational needs of new audiences (such as construction route neighbours); be proactive in creating and offering project updates to these groups

Target audience(s):

- Residents and property owners of Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation
- Community groups and general public with particular interest in estuary
- Construction route neighbours
- CVRD board of directors
- Comox Valley local governments
- Media

Project background:

- Royston and Union Bay need to replace failing septic systems to prevent the continued contamination of receiving waters in Baynes Sound
- The Village of Cumberland's existing wastewater treatment facility, consisting of lagoonbased primary and secondary treatment, is not able to meet many of its permitted operating requirements and is in need of replacement
- The K'ómoks First Nation (KFN) has extensive aquaculture interests in Baynes Sound and is a land owner in the proposed south sewer service area. The KFN has formed a key partnership with the CVRD in the application for federal funding, with the aims of solving the negative environmental impacts in Baynes Sound and helping enable KFN's long-term land use planning and economic development goals
- In combination with the sewer master plan, the CVRD utilized an engineering process to identify the most cost-effective solution wastewater quality issues in the area. The result of that process is a proposed wastewater treatment and collection system to treat, reclaim and reuse wastewater from Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and KFN development lands.

This initiative has been termed the south sewer project.

- The Village of Cumberland has completed stage 2 of a liquid waste management plan for their community that identifies a shared collection and treatment system with the CVRDs south region as a preferred option.
- Following extensive technical analysis and public consultation, the CVRD is draftings a LWMP for the south region that identifies collection and treatment with discharge to the Strait of Georgia at Cape Lazo as the preferred solution moving forward
- South sewer project partners have supported this approach
- Total cost of the first phase of the project is estimated at \$56 million
- A federal Gas Tax grant, awarded in March 2013, covers \$15 million and needs to be used by September 2017. The remainder of the CVRD's share of the phase 1 project costs will be paid for by a \$2 million federal grant through the Community Works Fund and borrowing through the Municipal Finance Authority.
- The money borrowed through the Municipal Finance Authority will need to be repaid. Property owners within the CVRD phase one service area have been consulted on the cost, which is estimated at approximately \$25,000 per connection.

Guiding principles:

- Communications included in all key project-related discussions
- CVRD board and committee meetings to be used to provide updates on project status to elected officials
- Partnership, transparency and positive interaction of those working together on a community benefit

Situation analysis:

Strengths:

- Extensive 14-month public consultation process yielded selected discharge option of Strait of Georgia at Cape Lazo (connecting with existing CVWPCC outfall)
- Local media has been responsive to project updates and sharing news
- Final proposal was agreed to by all partners and advisory groups
- General support for goal of new community wastewater treatment service
- \$17 million federal grant contribution still in place

Weaknesses:

- Significant cost to residents at early estimates concern about options for financing and accuracy of estimates
- Complicated organizational structure with four partners and additional stakeholders.
- Construction neighbours were not part of consultation on proposed plan, which focused on residents in the plan's service area.

Opportunities:

- General support from the partner communities recognizing the need for community wastewater system
- Common interest in protection/improvement of water quality in Baynes Sound

Threats:

- Timeline for use of federal grant contribution is approaching
- Potential change to plans if project partners back out or select different options

Communications strategy/tactics:

Update public on the project: Create new communication materials to explain the selected scenario and next steps	 Develop key messages for use with media, and for public/resident/stakeholder meetings Develop 'frequently asked questions' document on the project (content provided/approved by project lead/designated project team member) Update project specific web pages, transitioning from LWMP-focus to construction planning. This can include some of the material developed to date as well as a project overview, map, schedule and other relevant material/information. Consider technical briefings for media, as appropriate Use CVRD social media sites for current information and 'traffic directing' to material on website Media release(s) developed and issued as project developments come forward Respond to media enquiries in timely, consistent manner Develop issue/response document (content provided/approved by project lead/designated project team member) to ensure issues are addressed quickly and accurately Ensure communications requirements for funding bodies are met
Proactively contact interest groups and stakeholders (including other local governments) to offer presentations about the project plan	 Develop contact list of relevant groups and issue invitations/offers of projects update Develop presentation providing update on project plan and work to come Create FAQs on any specific issues raised for sharing Provide key messaging, speaking points, etc., as needed for project lead (or project designate)
Host an infosession in the fall of 2015	 Advertise via traditional and social media Media advisory Follow-up Media Release, photos and event summary Use updated materials and prepared presentation *Note: This event could be combined with final open house session scheduled as a final step in public consultation for the LWMP. If that is selected, this would likely be held in late summer, 2015.



South Sewer Project - Communications Plan Update (to original plan, File: 1470-06)Date:May 13, 2015Status:Discussion Draft

Purpose:

To outline planned communications for the next phase of the south sewer project, now that the preferred scenario (treatment facility in south region with discharge to Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo via shared CVWPCC outfall) has been selected for further development of the south region liquid waste management plan.

Goals:

- Continue providing clear and timely information about the south sewer project to people in the proposed service area.
- Keep the community informed about the continued LWMP process following the selection of a preferred option.
- Begin providing information to interested members of the Comox Valley public related to selected scenario and routing across the estuary.
- Anticipate and serve the informational needs of new audiences (such as construction route neighbours); be proactive in creating and offering project updates to these groups

Target audience(s):

- Residents and property owners of Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation
- Community groups and general public with particular interest in estuary
- CVRD board of directors
- Comox Valley local governments and elected officials
- Media

Project background:

- Royston and Union Bay need to replace failing septic systems to prevent the continued contamination of receiving waters in Baynes Sound
- The Village of Cumberland's existing wastewater treatment facility, consisting of lagoonbased primary and secondary treatment, is not able to meet many of its permitted operating requirements and is in need of replacement
- The K'ómoks First Nation (KFN) has extensive aquaculture interests in Baynes Sound and is a land owner in the proposed south sewer service area. The KFN has formed a key partnership with the CVRD in the application for federal funding, with the aims of solving the negative environmental impacts in Baynes Sound and helping enable KFN's long-term land use planning and economic development goals
- In combination with the sewer master plan, the CVRD utilized an engineering process to identify the most cost-effective solution for wastewater quality issues in the area. The result of that process is a proposed wastewater treatment and collection system to treat, reclaim

and reuse wastewater from Royston, Union Bay, Cumberland and KFN development lands. This initiative has been termed the south sewer project

- The Village of Cumberland has completed stage 2 of a liquid waste management plan for their community that identifies a shared collection and treatment system with the CVRDs south region as a preferred option
- Following extensive technical analysis and public consultation, the CVRD is drafting a LWMP for the south region that identifies collection and treatment with discharge to the Strait of Georgia at Cape Lazo as the preferred solution moving forward
- KFN has supported the approach and the Village of Cumberland is reviewing the proposal
- Total cost of the first phase of the project is estimated at \$56 million
- A federal Gas Tax grant, awarded in March 2013, covers \$15 million and needs to be used by September 2017. The remainder of the CVRD's share of the phase 1 project costs will be paid for by a \$2 million federal grant through the Community Works Fund and borrowing through the Municipal Finance Authority
- The money borrowed through the Municipal Finance Authority will need to be repaid. Property owners within the CVRD phase one service area have been consulted on the cost, which is estimated at approximately \$25,000 per connection.

Guiding principles:

- Communications included in all key project-related discussions
- CVRD board and committee meetings to be used to provide updates on project status to elected officials
- Partnership, transparency and positive interaction of those working together on a community benefit

Situation analysis:

Strengths:

- Extensive 14-month public consultation process yielded selected discharge option of Strait of Georgia at Cape Lazo (connecting with existing CVWPCC outfall)
- Local media has been responsive to project updates and sharing news
- Final proposal was agreed to by all partners and advisory groups
- General support for goal of new community wastewater treatment service
- \$17 million federal grant contribution still in place

Weaknesses:

- Significant cost to residents at early estimates concern about options for financing and accuracy of estimates
- Complicated organizational structure with four partners and additional stakeholders.
- Construction neighbours were not part of consultation on proposed plan, which focused on residents in the plan's service area.

Opportunities:

• General support from the partner communities recognizing the need for community wastewater system

• Common interest in protection/improvement of water quality in Baynes Sound

Threats:

- Timeline for use of federal grant contribution is approaching
- Potential change to plans if project partners do not support the preferred option or select different options

Communications strategy/tactics:

Update public on the project: Create new communication materials to explain the selected scenario and next steps	 Develop key messages for use with media, and for public/resident/stakeholder meetings Develop 'frequently asked questions' document on the project (content provided/approved by project lead/designated project team member) Update project specific web pages, transitioning from LWMP consultation process to finalizing LWMP and moving the SSP forward. This can include some of the material developed to date as well as a project overview, map, schedule and other relevant material/information. Consider technical briefings for media, as appropriate Use CVRD social media sites for current information and 'traffic directing' to material on website Media release(s) developed and issued as project developments come forward Respond to media enquiries in timely, consistent manner Develop issue/response document (content provided/approved by project lead/designated project team member) to ensure issues are addressed quickly and accurately Ensure communications requirements for funding bodies are met
Proactively contact interest groups and stakeholders (including other local governments) to offer presentations about the project plan	 Develop contact list of relevant groups and issue invitations/offers of projects update Develop presentation providing update on project plan and work to come Create FAQs on any specific issues raised for sharing Provide key messaging, speaking points, etc., as needed for project lead (or project designate)
Host an infosession in the fall of 2015	 Advertise via traditional and social media Media advisory Follow-up Media Release, photos and event summary Use updated materials and prepared presentation *Note: This event could be combined with final open house session scheduled as a final step in public consultation for the LWMP. If that is selected, this would likely be held in late summer, 2015.

South Region LWMP

Public Consultation Plan

August 2014

3843 Livingstone Road Royston, BC VOR 2V0





South Region

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5	Background Consultation Area and Target Audience Local Interests Regional Interests Study Process	1 1 1 2
2.0	Public Consultation Framework	2
2.1 2.2 2.3	Principles Objectives Estimated Consultation Timeline	2 2 3
3.0	Consultation Methods and Tools	3
3.1 3.2	Project Website Social Media	3 4
3.3 3.4 3.5	Open Houses and Public Events Project Office Drop-In Hours	4 4 4
3.6 3.7	Comment Sheets/Phone Logs	4
3.8 3.9 3.10 3.11	Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Kitchen Table Talks	5 5 5 5
4.0	Outcomes and Products	5
4.1 4.2	Public Consultation Report PlaceSpeak Assessment	5 6
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1

1.0 Introduction

This document outlines the approach and tactics for public consultation during the development of a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for the Comox Valley Regional District's (CVRD) south region. The LWMP is an important step in the development of a wastewater management and water resource recovery service for the area.

1.1 BACKGROUND

In May 2014, the CVRD began the LWMP process for wastewater management and water resource recovery for the south region. The LWMP will assess multiple options for providing a wastewater service for the area and determine through analysis the best solution. There are significant public consultation requirements within the LWMP and final plans must be approved by the Minister of Environment before implementation.

1.2 CONSULTATION AREA AND TARGET AUDIENCE

The south region is defined as electoral area 'A' in the CVRD, excluding Denman and Hornby islands. The consultation area includes the entire south region with particular focus on Royston and Union Bay where concerns regarding existing septic systems are most significant and where a community wastewater system is being proposed.

Target audiences for LWMP public consultation activities include:

- Property and business owners in Royston and Union Bay
- Environmental stewardship organizations
- Industry associations

1.3 LOCAL INTERESTS

Residents in the south region have long heard about a proposed community wastewater collection and treatment system for the area. While opinions have varied over the years depending on the proposals put forward, there appears to be a general understanding that the service is needed. In a sewerage service referendum in 2006, the residents of Royston and Union Bay voted in favour of a new wastewater service for the area provided the regional district was able to secure two-thirds grant funding for the project.

1.4 REGIONAL INTERESTS

Baynes Sound holds significant community importance not only for its environmental value, but also as a key business driver for the area's shellfish industry. The K'ómoks First Nation is a property owner in the consultation area and has business interests in the Baynes Sound shellfish industry. The area is also key to the cultural heritage of the community. All of these interests identify the long-term protection of the sound as a key priority. Other parts of the region facing wastewater management decisions will also be watching this process closely to gain a better understanding of the available options.

1.5 STUDY PROCESS

The LWMP process is an approach utilized by many local governments in BC to develop a wastewater management strategy for their communities. Traditionally a three-stage process, the CVRD has chosen to combine stages one and two of the LWMP in order to make use of relevant prior investigations and advance the LWMP process efficiently.

While much work has already been completed, the LWMP involves key steps that create critical opportunity for public engagement. These include the creation of public and technical advisory committees, review of existing information, development of service options, identification of a preferred option, completion of an environmental impact study and assessment of financial and implementation plans.

2.0 Public Consultation Framework

With public consultation established as a critical component in the success of the LWMP, this framework has been developed to guide engagement throughout the process.

2.1 PRINCIPLES

The following principles will guide public consultation throughout the LWMP process:

- Follow Best Practices The acknowledged best practice "steps" of public consultation (informing, consulting, involving, and collaborating) will guide consultation.
- Meet the LWMP Requirements The specific requirements of the LWMP process that are designed to ensure meaningful input is sought from the public, will guide consultation.
- Support the Work of LMWP Consulting Engineers Associated Engineering is guiding the LWMP process. Public consultation will support and align with their efforts.
- Maintain Transparency Around Preferred Options The CVRD has made clear there is a funded and preferred wastewater treatment option. This view will be stated and shared objectively.
- Use Complementary Engagement Methods/Tools Multiple methods will be used to provide options for people and groups to share their views and achieve the best consultation results.

2.2 OBJECTIVES

- Outline goals, process, and tools of engagement.
- Clarify opportunities for public involvement.
- Indicate how input will be received, acknowledged, shared, analyzed, considered.
- Outline how those affected by or interested in the project were/are invited to share input.
- Include plans for communicating (at project end) the level of engagement throughout the process and how participant input affected final decisions.

2.3 ESTIMATED CONSULTATION TIMELINE

DATES	TASKS/EVENTS
FALL 2013	PREPARE – Create communications tools and methods to inform.
WINTER 2013 – SUMMER 2014	INFORM/EDUCATE/ANSWER – Outline need, issues, options for south region wastewater management and water resource recovery. Reintroduce topic, answer questions.
JUL. 2014	INFORM/INTRODUCE – Open house #1 to introduce the LWMP process and consultation options.
JUL. 2014 + ONGOING	CONSULT/INVOLVE – Introduce public advisory committee and launch online consultation platform.
NOV. 2014	CONSULT/INVOLVE – Open house #2 to present scenarios, environmental impact study (EIS) part 1findings.
NOV. – DEC. 2014	ANALYZE/INCORPORATE – Input from November open house, PAC/TAC, online input.
MAY 2015	CONSULT/INVOLVE – Open house #3 to present draft of stage 1 & 2 LWMP, EIS part 2.
MAY – JUN. 2015	ANALYZE /INCORPORATE – Input from May open house, PAC/TAC, online input.
AUG. 2015	PRESENT/REPORT –Submit LWMP stage 1 & 2 final report and EIS final report to MOE. Report back to participants on consultation value, results, effect.

3.0 Consultation Methods and Tools

Multiple complementary consultation approaches will be used to ensure the public has many opportunities to engage in a meaningful way and in a format that is convenient for them.

3.1 PROJECT WEBSITE

The project website will be the central location for project information and details of public consultation. It will be the continual hub for timely information about the process and will include:

- Accurate and current project information.
- Up-to-date event listings.
- Links to downloadable informational materials (e.g. Glossary, FAQs).

- Feedback forms.
- Access to resources (e.g. Staff reports, studies).

3.2 SOCIAL MEDIA

Using the CVRD's Facebook, Google+ and Twitter accounts, project staff can offer quick, convenient and shareable updates. These updates will be provided at minimum once per week and will provide new information wherever possible. These posts also create an easy opportunity for account followers to provide comment and pose questions.

3.3 OPEN HOUSES AND PUBLIC EVENTS

Three formal open houses will be held during the LWMP process. These will mark important milestones in the plan's development such as its launch (completed), the development of proposed options, and the presentation of a preferred solution. Events can also be held if complementary opportunities arise, such as the opening of the south sewer project office in Royston. These events are effective for sharing large amounts of information and are convenient for the public to find specific information. In organizing each event, the following priorities will be considered:

- Up-to-date and new information
- Presence of project experts
- Convenient hours and location
- Easy to understand informational material
- Availability of feedback opportunities

3.4 PROJECT OFFICE DROP-IN HOURS

Weekly drop-in hours will be available at the project office at 3843 Livingstone Road in Royston. This allows interested members of the public to review information in between milestone events and engage with project staff in smaller groups, often one-on-one.

3.5 INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

Easy to read materials will be provided both in hard copy and online to assist in explaining the background and ongoing work related to the LWMP. This information will be designed for ease of reading and written with the general public in mind as the target audience. Examples of this material include project boards, FAQs and a glossary.

3.6 COMMENT SHEETS/PHONE LOGS

A form that encourages feedback from the community will be available at all locations where information is being shared about the project, including the website, open houses and project office. Records of any comment sheets will be kept along with any phone calls or emails submitted with comments or questions.

3.7 NEWSLETTER

A quarterly newsletter will be produced to update residents in Royston and Union Bay (the planned service area) of any new information and the current status of the project. These newsletters will be distributed either through post or email and will also be made available

online to others outside of the direct consultation area. The newsletter will include project contact information should recipients have any additional questions.

3.8 TRADITIONAL MEDIA

Advertisements, press releases and direct media outreach will be used to keep the public informed of the project where appropriate. The primary focus will be to drive the public to opportunities where they can learn more about the LWMP process and provide comment.

3.9 PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

As part of the LWMP process, a PAC will be established that connects interested community stakeholders to the project. This group is made up of roughly 12 members of the general public and interested community, environmental and business organizations. They will be tasked with relaying public feedback on the planning process as well as reviewing information and providing comment to the project team.

3.10 KITCHEN TABLE TALKS

The project team will support members of the PAC and other interested community members in hosting 'kitchen table talks' where neighbours are invited together in a familiar, comfortable setting to informally discuss the LWMP and provide feedback. Comments will be recorded and shared for consideration during the plan's development. Discussion guide questions will be made available, as will staff when available and if requested to provide subject matter expertise.

3.11 ONLINE CONSULTATION/DISCUSSION FORUM: PLACESPEAK.COM

Online consultation services give the public the opportunity to engage when it is convenient for them, as well as allowing the project team the opportunity to highlight specific topics for discussion. The CVRD has launched a project page for the south region LWMP at <u>www.placespeak.com/southregionlwmp</u>. The page will be kept up-to-date and monitored regularly to ensure any questions are responded to and discussions are managed in a constructive and respectful tone.

To encourage the public to participate via PlaceSpeak, an engagement plan has been drafted that includes actions such as:

- Sending targeted invitations to interested constituents
- Drafting/sending a press release about the PlaceSpeak launch
- Targeted social media push to support launch of the discussion page

4.0 Outcomes and Products

4.1 PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT

The proceedings of consultation activities will be documented and available to regulators and the public at the conclusion of the LWMP process. It will include:

• Overview of consultation activities.
- Listing of informational materials created and provided to stakeholders.
- Reports of public events.
- Record of consultation reach and participation.
- Synopsis of trends and findings.
- Summary of incorporation of public feedback in final plan.

4.2 PLACESPEAK ASSESSMENT

A review of the PlaceSpeak tool will be undertaken to assess the site and effectiveness of engagement for future consideration by the CVRD.



Communications Plan: South Sewer Project Referendum

Date: March 16, 2016. Updated April 25, 2016.

Status: For Review and Consideration

Purpose:

To outline planned communications for a south sewer project referendum on borrowing and perproperty hook-up costs for south region residents. The referendum is expected to be held in June. This plan covers the March-June time period.

Goals:

- Provide clear and timely information about a referendum for the next phase of the south sewer project to people in the proposed service area, including time, question and background materials to support their consideration.
- Make clear to communities that "status quo" is not an option: action that will result in reducing the environmental impact of failing on site systems is required and that they all come with a price tag.
- Articulate the RD's position that based on research to date, this is the most cost effective option for moving forward with a community wastewater treatment solution.

Target audience(s):

Primary

- Residents and property owners in phase one of the proposed south sewer project
- Residents and property owners in the broader south region (Union Bay and Royston)
- CVRD board of directors and K'ómoks First Nation (partner)
- Local Media

Secondary

- Comox Valley local governments and elected officials
- PPP Canada officials and other funding organizations

Project background:

- Royston and Union Bay need to replace failing septic systems to prevent the continued contamination of receiving waters in Baynes Sound.
- Extensive assessment over many years has identified the south sewer project as the most cost-effective solution for addressing wastewater issues in the area. The SSP concept has evolved over time, particularly as a result of the liquid waste management plan (LWMP) process.
- Total cost of the first phase of the project is estimated at \$54.5 million. A federal Gas Tax grant, awarded in March 2013, will likely cover \$15 million (will be confirmed by a scope change process currently underway) and must be used by September 2018. An additional \$2 million was allocated to Electoral Area 'A' components of the project by the CVRD from its Community Works Fund grant. The KFN has allocated \$5.4-million and pending a decision

this summer, PPP Canada will hopefully contribute \$13.7 million as part of its support in developing the project as a public-private partnership.

- Property owners will be responsible for paying the costs remaining after all grant funding and other contributions have been applied.
- The amount remaining after all grant funding and other contributions have been applied will be financed by the P3 partner and property owners will be responsible for paying that debt off over the life of the P3 agreement.
- It is approval of these cost implications along with other key terms of the P3 agreement that will be the subject of the referendum.

Guiding communications principles:

- Communications to be included in all key project-related discussions
- Sharing clear, concise straight-forward details that speak to questions from the community is top priority
- CVRD board and committee meetings to be used to provide updates on project status to elected officials
- Messaging to reflect principles of partnership, transparency and community benefit

Situation analysis:

Strengths:

- Over two years of extensive consultation and public outreach on the need for a wastewater management service for the south region has highlighted the general community support for the project and established groundwork of communications and engagement
- Local media has been responsive to sharing project updates and news
- General acknowledgement that a community wastewater treatment service is needed
- On track to secure more than \$30M in grant funding close to being secured
- The "status quo' is not an option. If the referendum fails and the plan for community wastewater treatment and management can't be achieved, the region will work towards developing a bylaw to ensure onsite systems are compliant with provincial regulations. This gives some motivation to fund the proposed solution.
- Previous referendum on wastewater treatment passed in 2006 in this area; project did not move forward at that time because federal and provincial funding was not available

Weaknesses:

- Significant cost to residents at early estimates; concern about financing options, accuracy of estimates and potential additional costs
- While there is significant grant funding, the \$20,000/lot estimate is significant. Residents will be concerned about cost, particularly if their own septic systems are new or in good repair or if they're on fixed/limited incomes
- There are still unknowns in the plan: class C cost estimates, design of WWTP

Opportunities:

- General recognition of the need for community wastewater system
- Common interest in protection/improvement of water quality in Baynes Sound

Threats:

- \$28 M senior government grant funding is tied to moving forward at this time. There are other potential 'deal-breakers' the project could still face, including changes in the UBCM funding based on the revised project scope
- Residents and property owners are becoming fatigued with discussion about sewer service in the area after 'starts and stops' over the last decade
- External advocate against success of the referendum could influence outcome.

Communications Strategy/Tactics:

Create communication materials on referendum details – basics, background and need	 Create a referendum web page outlining the referendum question, and when, where and how voting will take place Develop 'frequently asked questions' document specifically on the referendum Develop cost-breakdown/home example to clarify anticipated price per hook-up Update project-specific web pages to include a referendum page that links to the legislative services page, and also contains the FAQs, background information, brief project overview, cost breakdown, map, etc. Develop clear key messages for use with media, and for public/resident/stakeholder meetings Offer media briefing/update about the issue and upcoming decision Develop media release; issue release following March board meeting (also as a follow-up to March 23 open house). Use CVRD social media sites for current information and 'traffic directing' to material on website Develop issue/response document to ensure issues are addressed quickly and accurately Plan series of four "info-sessions" for south region residents beginning in April; smaller and more intimate than an open house (<i>see below</i>) Create newsletter to be mailed out to existing newsletter contact list advocating for support on the vote.
Identify opportunities to share the CVRD's position of support for the project	 Develop speaking points/messages indicating the CVRD's recommendation and outlining the reasons for its support, using a reasoned approach that is sensitive to the cost for residents. Develop points/draft for a column by CVRD chair/Area A rep Bruce Jolliffe in local newspapers, including "Down by the Bay" newsletter Create an "Our Thoughts" document that acts as a central point where CVRD's perspective can be centralized Including short section in all material outlining the CVRD's position on the project

Plan info-sessions end of April- early June (depending on date of referendum): 3-4	 Email or mail drop invitations/session details to individual property owners Advertise via traditional and social media Media invitations Use updated materials and prepared presentation Develop survey to collect early opinions/questions for use in supportive future materials
	If successful: • Issue a news release announcing the outcome- along with
	relevant social media posts
	• Create/post backgrounder or Q&A with information about next steps
	• Prepare special edition of the newsletter explaining how the community will be moving forward
	• Amend website content to include results, streamlining background information to make clear no further action is needed.
	• Transition to and finalize the construction/procurement communications strategy currently in draft form. Begin implementation.
Announce results and	If unsuccessful
prepare for follow up	• Issue a news release announcing the outcome – along with relevant social media posts
	• Create/post backgrounder or Q&A with information about next steps for CVRD and residents
	• Prepare special edition of the newsletter explaining how the community will be moving forward
	• Amend website content to include results, streamlining background information to make clear no further action is needed.
	• Host an open office day that allows members of the public to stop in and ask questions about personal situations/scenarios. Potential to include PAC members as well.
	• Work with project team to prepare and plan for communication required as alternate steps are taken (ie: increased on-site system maintenance requirements.)

Spokespeople

Spokespeople during the referendum process will be:

- James Warren, Chief Electoral Officer: Election and voting details, dates and qualification
- Kris La Rose, Project Manager: Project details/updates, current opportunity and next steps
- Bruce Jolliffe, Electoral Area 'A' Director: Comment/opinion about project need and opportunity

Key Messaging

For the project team (in charge of this strategy), key messages will cover two stages: preparation for the vote and outcome of the vote. Below are some draft messages for consideration.

Preparation for the vote:

- The project team feels confident that after many years of planning work, an achievable path forward has been found that will provide this needed service in as cost-effective way as possible for the community.
- A community wastewater system is important for the area given the properties' poor suitability for on-site systems, and the measurable impact of failing systems on Baynes Sound.
- The status quo is not an option: if the referendum is not successful, the CVRD will investigate alternative options to improving conditions of wastewater treatment systems in the service area.
- Significant grant funding opportunities have been identified and secured, providing the \$54.5 million project roughly two-thirds funding an opportunity that is
- It is important that the community be informed about the opportunity that is now available, including the expertise and innovation potential through a public-private partnership model.
- The project team is committed to answering any questions the public has before voting day and encourages people to watch for upcoming newsletters and notices about informational sessions.

Successful referendum

- With this clear community mandate, the project team is encouraged to continue the forward progress on this important project.
- We're thankful for all who took to the time to vote in this referendum and share their thoughts so that the CVRD has the confirmation it needs to move forward with this exciting opportunity.
- We recognize there are some in the community who remain concerned about a range of aspects on this project, and we're committed to answering their questions and collecting their feedback as we move forward in the next planning stages.
- The community will continue to be informed and updated about the progress of this project, with the goal of shovels digging into ground in the summer of 2017.

Unsuccessful referendum

- The project team respects the decision by the community and will take a short time to assess the outcomes and the implications of the existing proposal.
- As was made clear in advance of the vote, the delay that this unsuccessful vote represents for the project puts at serious risk the existing funding structures and will likely mean the loss of significant dollars secured at this stage.
- Regardless of the outcome of this vote, the status quo is not an option. If a community wastewater system cannot be advanced in this area, the CVRD will be looking at other ways to ensure that onsite systems are working well and not harming the surrounding environment.
- Residents in the area will continue to be informed of updates as next steps are determined regarding wastewater management in the south region.

Summary

The CVRD is preparing for a potential referendum in June to allow for borrowing by the CVRD for the south sewer project in its most current iteration. This communications plan lays out steps to both inform the community about the project proposal and the logistics of a vote, as well as providing the reasons why the project team feels this is the most affordable option for a community wastewater system and why the status quo cannot be maintained. By building on the already well-established audience, and providing informational material alongside documents that clearly outline the opinion and rationale of the CVRD on this issue, the community will have the information it needs to make an informed choice.

- 2.1 SOUTH SEWER PROJECT LOGO
- 2.2 LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN WORDMARK

2.1 SOUTH SEWER PROJECT LOGO



2.2 LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN WORDMARK









3.0 Newsletters

- 3.1 ISSUE #1 AUTUMN 2013
- 3.2 ISSUE #2 WINTER 2014
- 3.3 ISSUE #3 SPRING 2014
- 3.4 ISSUE #4 SUMMER 2014
- 3.5 ISSUE #5 AUTUMN 2014
- 3.6 ISSUE #6 WINTER 2015
- 3.7 ISSUE #6A SPECIAL ISSUE
- 3.8 ISSUE #7 SPRING/SUMMER 2015
- 3.9 ISSUE #8 AUTUMN 2015
- 3.10 ISSUE #8A SPECIAL ISSUE
- 3.11 ISSUE #9 WINTER 2016
- 3.12 ISSUE #10 SPRING 2016
- 3.13 ISSUE #10A SPECIAL ISSUE
- 3.14 ISSUE #11 SUMMER 2016
- 3.15 ISSUE #12 SPECIAL ISSUE



SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on regional sewer initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Issue #1 - AUTUMN 2013



We're Moving Forward! Sewer Solutions for Royston and Union Bay

It's official! Funding has been granted and the wheels are turning: a regional solution to providing safe, reliable and costeffective sewer treatment in the Baynes Sound area is in process.

The south sewer project is a multistage project that will create a sewer collection and treatment solution to serve a large portion of the Baynes Sound area. The project region spans from the southern boundary of the City of Courtenay in the north, to Union Bay in the south, and from the Village of Cumberland in the west to the coast of Baynes Sound.



Moving Ahead Together

Background

In March of this year, a \$15 million grant was provided to the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) and the Village of Cumberland, in partnership with K'ómoks First Nation, to establish a wastewater collection system and sewage treatment facility to address failing septic systems in Union Bay and Royston along with addressing wastewater treatment issues in Cumberland.

The funds were awarded by the Union of BC Municipalities as part of the federal Gas Tax funding program, and allocated to the first stage of the project. The CVRD added an additional \$2 million from its Gas Tax allocation to bring total grant funding to \$17 million.

An operational project team has been established at the CVRD and the project is now moving forward. A project image has been created (at right) to identify all materials related to the project.



Stage One

A New Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection System

The first stage of this multi-stage project involves planning and building a state-ofthe-art wastewater treatment plant and collection system to collect, treat, reclaim and reuse wastewater from Cumberland and the high-density areas in the core of Royston and Union Bay.

The new plant, once built, will treat wastewater to reclaimed water standards. Heat will be recovered from treated effluent and used to heat facility buildings and process areas. Excess heat and reclaimed water can be made available to off-site users to provide energy benefits and offset the use of potable water in the greater community. An ocean outfall will be constructed for safely discharging treated water to Baynes Sound. The recovery and reuse of nutrients from biosolids will be possible by way of composting at the CVRD's existing composting facility, where the SkyRocket soil amendment is created.

Prior to the design and building stages the project team must first complete a liquid waste management plan and an environmental impact study for the project. Both are required in order to meet Ministry of Environment requirements. These two processes are scheduled to begin this fall and will involve community input and public consultation.

After stage one is complete, surrounding residential areas will be added to the system as part of future stages. The timing and funding for future stages have yet to be determined.

Aquaculture is an important part of this region: there are several active aquaculture companies in Baynes Sound, as well as a productive shellfish reserve that supports species such as manila and littleneck clams, cockles and oysters. The industry creates local jobs, enhances the local economy, and attracts visitors and residents to the region each year.

Partners WorkingTogether

The Comox Valley Regional District is the lead operational partner on the project and will own the sewer treatment plant once it is developed.

The CVRD is joined on this project by the K'ómoks First Nation (KFN), which has aquaculture interests in Baynes Sound and is a land owner in the area.

A third partner is the Village of Cumberland. The village has an existing wastewater treatment facility consisting of a lagoon-based system that discharges into Maple Lake Creek, the Trent River, and eventually Baynes Sound. This system needs replacing. Cumberland's participation in the south sewer project is pending final commitment from council.

By working together, the CVRD, KFN, and the Village of Cumberland can cooperatively address negative environmental impacts that current sewer arrangements are having on Baynes Sound.

This regional approach ensures a coordinated effort that will make it possible to combine funds, knowledge, resources and operational staff when it makes sense to do so. The partners first came together in 2011 to apply as a group for funding for the project.





Project Funding

Funding for the project has been granted by the federal government through the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM). Stage one of the project received federal funds of \$17 million made up of \$15M in Gas Tax funding from the UBCM application-based program for capital projects, and \$2M from the CVRD annual Gas Tax fund allocation.

This project is already making headlines in BC and beyond: the south sewer project received the largest ever financial grant provided by the Gas Tax fund.

What Comes Next

STAGE ONE: THE COMPLETION OF STAGE ONE IS A FIVE YEAR PROJECT						
Project Set Up	Planning & Environmental Assessment	Establish the Service Area	Secure Land & Right of Ways Complete Detailed Engineering	Construction	Stage One Complete	
2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	

The CVRD south sewer project team is committed to keeping residents informed over the life of this project. Curious about the history of this project or previous sewer initiatives for the region? Visit the project pages at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Project Area Map

We aim to keep residents and property owners in the area informed about the project.

Common questions will be "Am I affected? Will we get sewer connections in our area? When?" We will not be able to map the exact service area until 2015, however we know that the first stage will involve providing sewer service to high-density areas in the core of Royston and Union Bay, and potentially Cumberland.

The adjacent map highlights in green the general areas that may receive sewer service during the first stage. The areas shaded grey may be added as part of future stages, however, the timing of these stages has yet to be determined.

The area served by the project is home to 6,110 people (as of 2010). As more people choose this area as a place to live, it is increasingly important to create effective systems for wastewater that meet or exceed environmental standards.





What is Happening NOW

- A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS for consultants to guide the liquid waste management planning process will be issued this fall.
- LOCAL TECHNICAL EXPERTS and area residents will be recruited to take part in a liquid waste advisory committee. This group will be responsible for sharing information with the community and bringing community concerns to the project team during the planning phase.
- A PROJECT OFFICE is being established for the south sewer project team in Royston at the former Royston Improvement District office, now owned by the CVRD. The public will be welcome to visit, view project materials, and speak with staff once operating hours are established.
- **PROJECT PARTNERS** are determining important regulatory, operational and cost sharing arrangements working together at the political and staff level.

Opportunities for Input

The south sewer project team will be holding open houses and community information events to share more detailed project information. Watch for announcements of these events in local newspapers and on the CVRD website. When possible, we will announce these events via this newsletter which will be published and distributed each quarter. If you prefer to receive updates via e-mail, please let us know via: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or follow the CVRD on Twitter for general updates @comoxvalleyrd

SOUTH SEWER PROJECT

Learn More, Contact Us Directly

A project contact phone line and e-mail have been established for this project.

Project web page: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Project e-mail: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Project phone: **250-334-6056**



About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the south sewer project team of the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on the south sewer project—part of a regional initiative by the Comox Valley Regional District, the K'ómoks First Nation, and the Village of Cumberland—to provide advanced wastewater treatment to protect and improve the water quality of Baynes Sound.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6



SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on sewer initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.



Issue #2 - WINTER 2014

Good Questions! We've Got Answers

Thank you for your great response to the first issue of this update newsletter in the fall. We heard from many of you. Who do we mean by "you" in this case? We heard from a mix of...

- Residents living in the area-many of whom have been there for decades
- Adult sons and daughters, calling on behalf of aging parents who live in the area
- Some new folks who have recently moved to the area from other parts of the island
- Landowners with property in the proposed sewer service area but who live out of province
- Curious citizens of the Comox Valley who read this newsletter online

Many of you called or e-mailed with questions about the project. In this issue we'll do our best to answer your questions and provide an update on what's happening now with the south sewer project.



Moving Ahead Together



You Ask, We Answer

Why is the project needed?

Failing septic systems in Royston and Union Bay, combined with the impact of Cumberland's treated lagoon effluent, are having a lasting negative impact on the receiving waters of Baynes Sound. This area is a valuable region for aquaculture, a wonderful place to live, and a popular spot for visitors and tourists. The current health of Baynes Sound is at stake and a new solution to ensure its future health is required.

Why will the project take so long to complete?

The first stage of the project involves development of a liquid waste management plan and environmental impact study, which will take at least two years to complete. Following this, the detailed engineering design will need to be finalized before construction can begin. The federal Gas Tax funding grant received from the Union of BC Municipalities requires that the project be completed by September 2018, and the project team will be working hard to deliver the project on time.

What will be the cost to homeowners?

This is an important question but one that can't be answered at this time. Costs will depend on the selected solution, the total number of properties participating, and how costs will be shared amongst participants.

l prefer to receive this newsletter by e-mail, is that possible?

Yes! Send an e-mail request to the project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca and we will add you to the e-mail list and remove you from the mailing list.

How does the recent Courtenay annexation of land affect the south sewer project?

A number of properties in the north area of Royston were recently brought into the City of Courtenay. These properties will no longer participate in the south sewer project. If you think you may be in this area, contact the City of Courtenay for more information. These properties were originally planned to be part of a future stage of the south sewer project. This change does not impact the number of properties participating in stage one of the project but will impact the overall number of participants for the project.

Helping You "Visualize" This Project

The south sewer project is a long term project. For that reason we've created a visual graphic (or "infographic") to show the stages and phases of the project. View it online here: http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewerinfographic

The First Step: Liquid Waste Management Planning

Creating a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for Royston and Union Bay is the first step in moving towards the creation of a new wastewater collection and treatment system for this area. This plan, once complete, will guide how the project is implemented and how the system operates over time.

Why it's the first step

The LWMP planning process is a common tool that BC communities use to plan and design new liquid waste management systems. It allows communities to develop their own solutions for liquid waste while meeting provincial regulatory requirements. The plan must ensure that the management and disposal of liquid waste is protective of public health and the environment. Public consultation plays an important part. An approved LWMP authorizes a local government to proceed with measures identified in the plan. The CVRD board approved the development of a liquid waste management plan last fall.

Understanding the process

Development of a LWMP is a multi-year process. The end result or "deliverable" is a comprehensive plan that outlines how liquid waste will be managed. The plan will include site specific studies and a program for public and stakeholder review. The CVRD process will include an environmental impact study and make use of the valuable wastewater planning work, input and studies that have already been completed for Royston and Union Bay. There is some flexibility in the process: as things proceed, the scope of work can be adjusted based on the findings of completed studies or the public consultation process.

What this looks like:



Who is involved

The LWMP process will be guided by a steering committee and a separate or joint public/technical advisory committee. These groups are made up of representatives of different interest groups, geographic areas, stakeholders, and government agencies. The goal is to represent community and stakeholder interests as well as those agencies who can review the technical and regulatory aspects of the plan. Public consultation is in addition to committee level work and involves a wide array of constituents, property owners, special interest groups and First Nations that have an interest in the area.



What is Happening NOW

- WE ARE EVALUATING PROPOSALS: In December the CVRD issued a request for proposals for a consultant to guide the liquid waste management planning process. A number of proposals were submitted from qualified engineering firms. We are evaluating these proposals now and will announce the chosen team shortly.
- **REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE OPTIONS:** Elected representatives from each of the partner groups are considering how the sewer service will be governed. The goal is to decide on a model that makes sense for all.
- **OPPORTUNITIES FOR INPUT:** The south sewer project team will be holding open houses and community information events to share more detailed project information. Watch for announcements of these events in local newspapers and on the CVRD website.

Consider email

You can receive this update via email. It would help us save paper and postage, and help you get the news faster! (Especially if you're a property owner who lives out of town or out of province.) Please let us know if you'd prefer this option and we'll email you all subsequent issues. Send your request to:

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca



Learn More, Contact Us Directly

A project contact phone line and e-mail have been established for this project.

Project web page: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Project e-mail: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Project phone: **250-334-6056**

Follow the CVRD on Twitter for general updates @comoxvalleyrd



About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the south sewer project team of the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on the south sewer project—part of a collaborative initiative by the Comox Valley Regional District, the K'ómoks First Nation, and the Village of Cumberland—to provide advanced wastewater treatment to protect and improve the water quality of Baynes Sound.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6



An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Issue #3 - SPRING 2014



A Look Back For Context And... What Comes Next

Many of you who live or own property in Royston, Union Bay and Electoral Area 'A' know about the history of wastewater management planning and studies that have been done in the area. Some of you however, are new to the area and may be wanting a broader context about these issues.

We thought it would be helpful for both groups if we provided a look back at what has already happened and a look forward at what is happening next in terms of wastewater management planning for the area.

This issue aims to do just that.

Let us know if you find it helpful and please continue to be in touch with questions about the project.



Moving Ahead Together

You Ask, We Answer

We're planning to build a house. Is there anything we can do during construction that will save expenses later on? What can we do to make it easy to hook up later?

Unfortunately at this point we don't know what the system will look like or where the collection system will be routed. This information won't be determined until after the two-year wastewater management planning process is complete. This makes it difficult to provide any guidance now on installation of your on-site wastewater infrastructure. Not until the detailed design phase is underway will we be able to provide this level of detail to residents and builders in Royston and Union Bay.

Do landowners have the right to opt out of a new sewer service? If we have a perfectly good septic system can we just stick with it?

If the construction of a new wastewater collection, treatment, and resource recovery system in Royston and Union Bay is supported by the community through the wastewater management planning process—which begins this spring—all properties in the areas to be serviced would be required to connect. Be sure to attend or take part in upcoming public meetings and consultation about the project to learn more about how the planning process works and why this would be necessary.

Are there options for putting a sidewalk along the water side of the Island Highway as part of this project? Or installing washrooms and showers at the Royston Wrecks?

The current scope of the sewer project doesn't include a design plan or details about public amenities yet. Please bring these ideas to upcoming public information meetings. As well, the project team will be holding weekly open office hours at the newly-established project office in Royston (the former Royston Improvement District offices on Livingston Road). Office hours will be announced in May. We will have a suggestion/request board in place (along with comment sheets). This will be a great place to share suggestions and provide ideas around what you want to see as part of this project.











You're Invited Learn more about the proposed south sewer project and wastewater management planning process

Join the project team and consulting engineers at the opening of the new south sewer project office in Royston.

Thursday, May 15, 2014 | 12:00-2:00pm

3843 Livingston Rd., Royston Format will be drop-in, open-house style. Refreshments will be served.

Come by to learn more about this innovative wastewater management project for Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland. The latest information boards will be on display and project team members from the CVRD engineering team will be on hand to answer questions.

Note: If you're unable to attend please note we will establish office hours at this new office location starting in May and running for the duration of the project. Watch for exact hours and updates on the south sewer project pages: http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Contact: CVRD Engineering Services southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca | Tel: 250-334-6056



A Look at Wastewater Management Planning Progress in the Area

Wondering what's been done? Here's a visual timeline of the work to date:



Looking Ahead to the Next Step: Get Involved in Wastewater Management Planning

As the timeline above shows, the CVRD and other community groups have made progress on wastewater management planning for the area. The next step will involve building on past studies and planning work to complete a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for the area.

There are various tools and processes that can be used to authorize the development of a new wastewater management solution including registration under the *Municipal Wastewater Regulations* (MWR) or an approved LWMP.

One of the main reasons the LWMP process has been chosen over MWR registration is because of how it involves the community through a meaningful public and stakeholder review process. We know residents are very engaged in finding a wastewater solution and the LWMP process makes room for public involvement and discussion, delivering an end product—a long-range plan—that represents the views and wishes of the community.

The LWMP process will officially launch in May with the formation of wastewater advisory committees. Some initial tasks include the identification of wastewater treatment options to be considered, the commencement of an environmental impact study and the announcement of opportunities for public involvement. We'll provide updates on LWMP progress in future newsletters. For an overview of upcoming LWMP dates and events visit the LWMP page at: http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer



What is Happening NOW

- ROYSTON PROJECT OFFICE ESTABLISHED FOR THE SOUTH SEWER PROJECT TEAM: South sewer project team staff have established a project office at the previous offices of the Royston Improvement District at 3843 Livingston Road. This location will house project team members and act as a project "home base" for the duration of the south sewer project.
- ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING TO LEAD THE LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS: Associated Engineering Ltd. has been awarded the contract for engineering consulting services to complete a combined Stage 1 and 2 liquid waste management plan (LWMP) and an environmental impact study (EIS) for the project. The Associated Engineering team will guide the LWMP process over the next two years. Associated Engineering was part of the team of consulting engineers that completed the 2011 *South Region Sewage Collection, Treatment and Discharge Study* for this area for the CVRD.
- SOUTH SEWER PROJECT TEAM CONTINUES TO EXPLORE NEW FUNDING SOURCES: The south sewer select committee
 has been meeting each month and working to review and determine governance and financing options for the project. In
 March the committee carried a motion for staff to continue to explore and prepare for future federal and provincial funding
 opportunities for the south sewer project.

Consider email

You can receive this update via email. It would help save paper and postage and you get the news faster! (Especially if you're a property owner who lives out of town or province.) Please let us know if you'd prefer this option and we'll email you all subsequent issues. Send your request to: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca



Learn More, Contact Us Directly

A project contact phone line and e-mail have been established for this project.

Project web page: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Project e-mail: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Project phone: 250-334-6056

Follow the CVRD on Twitter for general updates @comoxvalleyrd



About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the south sewer project team of the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on the south sewer project part of a collaborative initiative by the Comox Valley Regional District, the K'ómoks First Nation, and the Village of Cumberland—to provide advanced wastewater treatment to protect and improve the water quality of Baynes Sound.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request.

Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

S Comox Valley SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Issue #4 - SUMMER 2014

Mark your calendars: Public Open House set for July 17



All invited to open house: Fallen Alders Hall, 5-8 pm

Momentum is growing for the Comox Valley Regional District's south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) and we want to keep you in the loop.

An open house has been scheduled for Thursday, July 17, to begin consultation with the public as part of the LWMP process.

The CVRD continues its work to find a solution for the south region, with a focus on protecting Baynes Sound and finding opportunities for water resource recovery through the process.

In May, the CVRD launched the LWMP an estimated two-year planning process which will assess options for wastewater management and water resource recovery, and seek the necessary approvals to proceed with the preferred solution. The July 17th open house will be the first public consultation event for this process.

The event will run from 5 to 8 pm at the Fallen Alders Hall at 3595 Royston Road.

Good information and helpful people and did we mention that refreshments will be served? Hope to see you there!



Moving Ahead Together



Some helpful terms to know...

Glossary

Water Resource Recovery:

Wastewater is really used water, which contains important and valuable resources such as the nutrients nitrogen and phosphorus; energy in thermal, chemical and kinetic forms; and water itself. Water resource **recovery** refers simply to the act of recapturing such commodities for beneficial purposes. In its most basic form it produces water (effluent) that can be reintegrated into a watershed and hydrologic cycle from which it came.

Thanks for coming to visit – Open House warms new office space

Over 70 people stopped in to welcome us to the Royston neighbourhood on May 15th when we hosted an open house at the new project offices at 3843 Livingstone Road. (former Royston Improvement District offices). It was a great turnout with people from across the region taking the opportunity to learn more about the ongoing review of wastewater management and water resource recovery opportunities for the area.

Project staff were on hand along with members of the south sewer select committee including chair Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A'), Chief Rob Everson of the K'ómoks First Nation and Cumberland Mayor Leslie Baird.

Attendees asked a wide range of questions about the timing of service areas to be included in the first phase of construction, to the expected costs for the completed project. These are all questions that will be addressed as part of the LWMP process.

The open house coincided with the launch of the liquid waste management plan (LWMP) process, which will establish the long-term planning framework for wastewater management and water resource recovery for the south region. This process will determine the best option for moving forward and seek the necessary regulatory approvals to proceed with the preferred solution.

The Royston offices will house project staff for the duration of the south sewer project. Up-to-date information will be available at the office and the public is invited to drop in between noon and 4 pm on Thursday afternoons to learn more.

You Ask, We Answer

What is the difference between the south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) and the south sewer project? Or are they the same thing?

The south region LWMP is the planning process the CVRD will follow. It involves engaging stakeholders, the public, and regulatory agencies to provide input as options are identified, screened and evaluated, in order to ultimately select a wastewater solution for the south region. One of the options that will be considered during the LWMP has been called the "south sewer project". The south sewer project is currently the preferred option of the CVRD, the K'ómoks First Nation and Village of Cumberland and is the only option to currently have secured funding attached to it. However, depending on the outcome of the LWMP process, it may or may not be the final selected option.

I need to replace my septic system/am selling my home – what are the timelines for the south sewer project to be completed?

This is an important question, but it cannot be answered at this time. The LWMP, which began in May 2014, is anticipated to be a two-year process. At the end of that process, once a wastewater management solution has been selected, procurement, detailed design and construction will begin. Previous work done to develop the south sewer project option estimated that the first phase of construction could be complete by 2018—however, through the LWMP process, that option will undergo review in comparison to other options, which may have alternative timelines attached.

What areas are covered by the first phase of the south sewer project and why were they chosen?

If, as a result of the LWMP, the south sewer project is selected as the best option, the core areas of Royston and Union Bay will be priorities for the first phase of construction. These areas were identified as most critical because failing septic systems combined with the naturally high water table and poor native soil conditions in these more densely-populated neighbourhoods are having an impact on the quality of life and environment. The Village of Cumberland could also be included in the first phase as a replacement to their lagoon-based sewer system which is currently in use but does not meet today's standards for treatment and discharge.

What's this all about?

For many years, the CVRD and residents of the Royston/ **Union Bay communities** have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of **Cumberland and the K'ómoks** First Nation and have focused on finding an effective solution that will create water resource recovery opportunities and reduce the impact that failing septic systems and **Cumberland's lagoon effluent** are currently having on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the three partners received a \$15-million federal gas tax grant and \$2-million from the Community Works Fund towards their proposed wastewater solution: the south sewer project. As we work together to implement a solution for the south region of the CVRD, the south sewer project is one option that will be considered as part of a formal process called a liquid waste management plan. That process is underway.

Public and Technical Advisors to be confirmed

An important part of the LWMP is setting up two advisory committees to assist in providing input and recommendations to the steering committee as they consider potential solutions for wastewater management in the south region.

The public advisory committee (PAC) and the technical advisory committee (TAC) are both being formed now with recruitment periods closed and the confirmation processes underway.

- TAC will consider technical information on behalf of the steering committee.
- PAC will be responsible for considering public opinion related to the LWMP and proposed options.

Key stakeholder groups were invited to propose members for the TAC and PAC and an open call was made for people interested in joining the PAC. The CVRD received good response from those who are keen to be a part of the process moving forward. The number of participants is still being determined. Members will be responsible for maintaining a broad understanding of the project and its implications for stakeholders, and will play a key liaison role with the organizations/communities they represent.

The first joint meeting for the PAC/TAC is scheduled for July 14th.

Keep an eye here and at comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer for the confirmed list of PAC and TAC members, to be released shortly.



What is Happening NOW

- **TAKING THE CONVERSATION ONLINE:** The project team is currently reviewing online public consultation tools that will offer even more opportunity for input from the community on the liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process. Details will be available at the July 17 public open house.
- NEW INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW ONLINE: Additional information sheets are now available on the south sewer project website for you to review at any time including easy infographics and timelines about the LWMP process and examples of water resource recovery. Find them here: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer
- **PROJECT OFFICE OPEN FOR WEEKLY PUBLIC DROP-IN VISITS:** The Royston project office (3843 Livingstone Road), in the former Royston Improvement District offices, is open to the public each Thursday from noon to 4 pm. Interested residents are invited to stop in to learn more about the ongoing work that is being done or to ask any questions they have about the LWMP and south sewer project.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater treatment solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save the paper, postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option too to stay on top of important news.





Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and e-mail have been established for this project: Project web page:

www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

250-871-6100 ext. 21

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd



SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Next steps for wastewater management plan underway



It's been a busy summer for the Comox Valley Regional District's (CVRD) south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) team, and it will be an even busier fall as they move forward with next steps for wastewater management in Royston/Union Bay.

The shortlist of options for wastewater management is expected to be presented to the public at the next open house, tentatively scheduled for January 2015. This event will present to residents the process and investigative work that has been undertaken to date and outline possible wastewater and water resource recovery plans under consideration. Watch for more information about this event in early January.

Feedback from the community during the option-review period will assist the project team in its next step: a triple bottom line (TBL) comparative evaluation. The

TBL framework will evaluate the social, environmental and financial attributes of each scenario. This evaluation will inform the selection of a preferred wastewater management solution. The preferred solution will be presented to the public at the third open house expected in spring of 2015.

"It'll be important to hear from the community about their opinions on options so that we can determine the best solution for moving forward," said Kris La Rose, CVRD's south sewer project manager. "We will keep people informed through these newsletters, email lists, social media and local newspapers."

In July, an open house was held to kick off the LWMP process, introducing residents to the process that will inform the selection of a preferred wastewater solution for the area. Project consultants Associated Engineering (AE) are guiding the LWMP process. A public advisory committee (PAC), technical advisory committee (TAC) and steering committee (SC) along with the CVRD will inform and develop the LWMP. AE has been reviewing research already completed and undertaking new research required to assess the current situation, the environment and the requirements for a new community wastewater system in Royston/Union Bay.



WHAT YOU'LL KNOW AND WHEN YOU'LL KNOW IT:

January 2015:

- Shortlist of wastewater management options
- Cost estimates for those options

Spring 2015:

 Preferred solution, with estimated cost and what areas will be serviced during the first phase of construction

Winter 2015/2016:

- Options for payment of hook-up fees for relevant properties
- Final Plan, including draft operational certificates
- Location of treatment facility
- Timelines for construction completion

LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN



GLOSSARY

Wastewater

"Used" water and the material that it carries. Basically, a term for what is flushed down the toilet or washed down the drain.

Reclaimed water

Reclaimed water is wastewater that is treated and reused for another purpose, such as irrigation or industrial usage. It must meet quality standards as set by the province's wastewater regulations.



You Ask, We Answer

Is it true that the construction of a sewer system will require all those in the service area to pay up front – and the cost could reach up to \$30,000?

Accurate cost estimates can't be provided until the options for wastewater management are selected and more detailed plans are drafted. While there may be some grant funding support available, depending on which final scenario is selected, property owners will need to pay to hook up to the sewer service. However, residents will not be required to pay the entire cost up front. Payment options will be available, either through financing options or deferral, to ensure that everyone can participate, regardless of their economic situation.

I thought a wastewater treatment plant would be built as part of the Kensington Island Properties (KIP) development – and that as residents, we've already agreed to hook up to it. Why is that no longer the plan?

The KIP project has not proceeded in the original timeline outlined. Recognizing the continued need for a wastewater solution in the south region, the CVRD is proceeding with planning a solution for the area in the absence of a KIP-initiated facility. Updates on this work are being shared with KIP representatives. Opportunities for partnerships with KIP and/or other developments within or adjacent to the south sewer service area will be assessed as they arise.

Where is the treatment facility going to be built? I'm worried about the impacts of smell and industrial activity on my quality of life if it is built near me.

The location of the treatment facility will be determined later in the planning process, but the surrounding neighbourhood will be an important consideration in deciding on the appropriate site. Regardless of the final location, treatment facilities have evolved into sophisticated buildings with small footprints and minimal discernable odour associated with the treatment process.

Talking with neighbours

As part of the public consultation process for the LWMP, community representatives have been selected to serve as part of the public advisory committee (PAC). Resident members of this group will assist in relaying the community's feedback to the project team - and they want to hear from you. To share your thoughts, comments or questions about the wastewater management planning in the south region, contact:

Royston area

Brigid Walters Phone: 250-338-9804 Email: b.k.walters@shaw.ca

Claudette Flawse Phone: 250-338-9162

Alun Jones Phone: 250-338-1655 Email: a33djj99@shaw.ca

Union Bay area

Anne Alcock Phone: 250-335-3340 Email: unionbay@shaw.ca

Alternate: Bruce Livesey Phone: 250-335-1876 Email: cattaridge@telus.net

Kilmarnock, Union Bay area

Susanna Kaljur Phone: 250-335-3154 Email: kaljursv@telus.net

Alternate: Rod Smith Phone: 778-427-9995 Email: jrsmith1@shaw.ca



Project manager Kris La Rose invites residents to provide feedback @ PlaceSpeak

Share your thoughts online with PlaceSpeak®

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) has launched a new online venue for collecting opinions and feedback from residents interested in the south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP).

An online consultation forum has been set up at PlaceSpeak – a location-based community consultation website. The service is unique because of its 'geoverification' feature which confirms the locations of participants so discussion is focused on those in the affected area.

"Public consultation is critical to the development of a successful liquid waste management plan and we want to be sure there are options for everyone in the area to provide their comments in a convenient way," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound – Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

To participate in the online discussion forum, area residents are invited to simply sign up for an account at www.placespeak.com, confirm their location by phone number or address and then visit www.placespeak.com/southregionlwmp to select the "Connect to this Topic" button and start contributing. Participants can comment on discussion boards, post new items and vote in polls.

Of course, the project team will continue to collect feedback from the community in many other ways, including open houses, office hours, email, phone, comment sheets and more.

WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT?

For many years, the CVRD and residents of the Royston/ Union Bay communities have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of Cumberland and the K'ómoks First Nation and have focused on finding an effective solution that will create resource recovery opportunities and reduce the impact that failing on-site sewerage systems and Cumberland's lagoon effluent are currently having on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the three partners received a \$15-million federal gas tax grant and \$2-million from the Community Works Fund towards their proposed wastewater solution: the south sewer project (SSP). As we work together to implement a solution for the south region of the CVRD, the SSP is one option that will be considered as part of a formal process called a liquid waste management plan. That process is underway.

QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT SEPTIC SYSTEMS

Onsite sewerage systems (septic systems) are regulated by the Ministry of Health and Island Health through the Sewerage System Regulation. The CVRD has a target date of implementing a new wastewater treatment solution for the south region by 2018. In the meantime, if you have questions about on-site sewerage system requirements and regulations, consult the Ministry of Health's webpage here: http://www.health.gov.bc.ca/protect/lup_onsite.html, or contact your local office at 250-331-8518.

We want to hear from you about wastewater management in the south region.

Please fill out this form and return it to us by email, mailing it to the CVRD head office address below, dropping it at the project office at 3843 Livingstone Rd. (Royston), or contacting a public advisory committee member.

What is the most important issue for you when it comes to wastewater management planning in the south region?

- a. Cost
- b. Which stage of construction you'd be in
- c. Timing for implementation
- d. Where the treatment plant will be
- e. Water quality in Baynes Sound
- f. Other:

What qualities would this project need to have to be considered a success?

- a. On time/on budget
- b. Adaptable for future growth
- c. Maximixing the number of connections in Area A
- d. Clean up Baynes Sound
- e. Reclaimed water usage
- f. Other:

Note: If you prefer to select more than one option above, please indicate ranking of importance with "1" being the most important.

Comments:

Name:

Address:

Contact:

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater treatment solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.

SOUTH SEWER PROJECT



Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and e-mail have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

250-871-6100 ext. 21

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca**

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd



SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Open house Jan. 21 to share scenario shortlist and estimate of costs

Residents of Royston and Union Bay, mark your calendars for an open house Jan. 21, where a shortlist of options for wastewater management – and their estimated costs – will be presented to the public.

After months of investigation, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is able to introduce the possible solutions now being considered for wastewater management in the south region. The event will be held *Wednesday, Jan. 21 at the Union Bay Community Hall from 4 to 7 pm*. Community members are encouraged to come out, ask questions and share their comments.

Four options for the return of treated effluent to the environment have been shortlisted from an initial long list of nine. The options were selected based on regulatory requirements and feedback from the public and technical advisory committees (PAC and TAC) and the steering committee collected this fall. To read more about the screening process and the four standing options, read *From nine options to four: How a long list becomes a shortlist* on page 2.

Project staff and consulting engineers have been working on further developing the four remaining options – including assessment of potential costs for the project. Costs to be



presented on Jan. 21 are preliminary, high-level estimates.

"This is an important time for the liquid waste management plan (LWMP), where the public can help provide input into which option is best from a social, environmental and cost-effectiveness perspective," said Kris La Rose, Project Manager. "This is a critical stage for public feedback."

The open house will be a drop-in format with informational panels, and experts on hand to answer questions. The project team will be collecting feedback from the community.

To learn more about the LWMP work to date, visit www.comoxvalleyrd. ca/southregionlwmp or share your comments at www.placespeak.com/ southregionlwmp. Contact information for the project team can be found on Page 4 of this newsletter.





South Region

We know your time is worth something - and we'd like to thank you for coming out to learn about the LWMP process and providing feedback. Fill out a comment form/survey at the event and your name will be entered into a draw for one of four 10 visit passes to CVRD recreation centres. You can also be entered by sending us an email with your comments, or stopping in at the open office hours Jan. 22 and 29 at the Royston project office (noon to 4 pm) to provide your comments. Stay tuned for details on other ways to participate.

PLACESPEAK

Prefer learning and commenting at home or on your own, rather than attending an open house? The CVRD has set up an online venue at PlaceSpeak for collecting opinions and feedback and providing information to residents interested in the south region LWMP. Visit www.placespeak. com/southregionlwmp to set up an account and verify your *location – then click the "Connect* to this Topic" button at the top right-hand corner of the page to share your comments. Contact the project team if you have any questions about how to connect by emailing southsewerproject@ comoxvalleyrd.ca.

WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT?

For many years, the CVRD and residents of the Royston/Union Bay communities have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of Cumberland and the K'ómoks First Nation and have focused on finding an effective solution that will create resource recovery opportunities and reduce the impact that failing on-site sewage systems and Cumberland's lagoon effluent are currently having on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the three partners received a \$15-million federal Gas Tax grant towards their proposed wastewater solution: the south sewer project (SSP). As we work together to implement a solution for the south region of the CVRD, the SSP is one option that will be considered as part of a formal process called a liquid waste management plan (LWMP). That process is underway.

From nine options to four: How a long list becomes a shortlist

Planning a wastewater management service is a long road – but the project team and its advisors covered a lot of ground this fall as they narrowed down a long list of options for discharging treated effluent to the environment, in which all options were considered, to a shortlist of four options to be advanced for further development and review.

In October, the public and technical advisory committees (PAC and TAC) reviewed a list of nine options and recommended the removal of four because 'show-stoppers' were identified – meaning there was a critical reason it could not proceed (such as a regulatory standard it would not be able to meet). The steering committee then removed an additional option following their discussions, leaving four on the shortlist.

The SHORTLIST OPTIONS are:

- Discharge to Baynes Sound
- Discharge to Georgia Strait beyond Sandy (Tree) Island
- Discharge to Georgia Strait off Cape Lazo
- Discharge to ground at depth

The options that were REMOVED from further consideration were:

- Discharge to the Trent River/Hart (Washer) Creek
- Discharge to ground at surface single location
- Discharge to ground at surface multiple locations
- Managing and improving existing onsite sewage systems
- Connecting to the existing Courtenay/Comox wastewater management system

The project team and consulting engineers have been working to further develop the shortlisted effluent discharge options, conducting additional investigations where required. The outcome of this work will then be presented to the TAC and PAC to inform the development of complete wastewater management scenarios. Once the public has had a chance to review these scenarios and provide feedback, they will then be further evaluated by the LWMP advisory committees (see next steps in *Shortlisted scenarios enter new stage* below). A preferred wastewater management scenario is expected to be selected in the spring this year.

Shortlisted scenarios enter new stage of review

With the development of shortlisted wastewater management scenarios, the LWMP process has reached a significant next step. Shortlisted scenarios will be evaluated through a triple bottom line (TBL) comparative evaluation framework which considers the environmental, social and economic attributes of each option. The community's feedback will help with this evaluation by informing the selection of evaluation criteria and weightings under each category. This comparative review process will help to inform the selection of a preferred wastewater management scenario, expected to be complete in the spring of 2015.

To see a graphic of the full LWMP process, visit www.bit.ly/lwmpprocess



You Ask, We Answer

I've heard Kensington Island Properties (KIP) has all the approvals it needs now and is moving forward – how will this affect sewer service plans in Union Bay and Royston?

Proponents of the KIP project continue to move forward on plans for development in Union Bay. While early proposals suggested KIP would build a wastewater treatment facility that could be expanded to service residents in the Union Bay and Royston, changes to the original timeline has led the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) to proceed with planning for wastewater management separate of KIP's construction. Planning for any south region wastewater management service will consider potential future growth in the area and KIP representatives are being informed of the progress of the LWMP work. Potential future partnerships will be assessed as they arise. Any development connecting to the system will make a financial contribution towards the service.

I remember a different plan from years ago that seemed like a good solution. Why are we trying to come up with something new?

A significant amount of time has passed since a proposed plan was last presented for wastewater service to the south region and in that time a number of things have changed, including development plans in the area, the cost of construction and the regulatory requirements. When \$15-million was secured by the CVRD and its south sewer project partners in 2013, a plan could officially begin to be developed. Today's reality in terms of standards and cost will mean that comparisons cannot be accurately made to previous proposals.

Will my house be a part of the initial construction? If not, how long before I can hook up to wastewater service?

The wastewater collection and treatment system will be a large project constructed in phases. The project team will be looking to maximize the number of connected homes while maintaining affordability in the construction process. They have received feedback from many community members who want to be included in the first phase of development and those comments are being considered. A proposed phase one service area will be presented at the open house on Jan. 21.

Cumberland and CVRD LWMP processes meet at next stage

As the CVRD works through the LWMP process for the south region, neighbours and south sewer project partners at the Village of Cumberland are also in the midst of wastewater management planning for their community.

Both local governments are evaluating wastewater management options for their communities using the three stage LWMP process for approval and authorization of a wastewater management solution. Cumberland has completed a draft stage 2 LWMP, which identifies connecting to a south region wastewater treatment facility as the preferred option.

With that preliminary selection in place, Cumberland is watching closely to see what the preferred option for the communities of Royston and Union Bay will be. The CVRD is currently completing stage 1 and 2 of the LWMP process, which will identify the preferred wastewater management solution for Area 'A'.

If the CVRD and Cumberland's preferred solutions align, the two communities will work together to complete the third and final stage of the LWMP process for both communities, which would see a wastewater treatment facility constructed to service Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland.

GLOSSARY

Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP)

A process for evaluating and selecting community-specific solutions for wastewater management that meet or exceed regulatory requirements. Public and stakeholder consultation is a key component of the LWMP process, used to consider a variety of interests and opinions and assess community support. A LWMP approved by the BC Ministry of Environment authorizes a local government, in accordance with operational certificates, to proceed with the measures identified in the plan.

Triple Bottom Line Analysis

A comparative evaluation framework that considers the environmental, social and economic attributes of a scenario. In the LWMP process, this will be used to evaluate the shortlisted scenarios, providing a comparison between each that will inform the selection of a preferred solution.



Talking with neighbours

As part of the public consultation process for the LWMP, community representatives have been selected to serve as part of the public advisory committee (PAC). Contact them to share you thoughts on wastewater management planning.

Royston area

Brigid Walters Phone: 250-338-9804 Email: b.k.walters@shaw.ca

Claudette Flawse Phone: 250-338-9162

Alun Jones Phone: 250-338-1655 Email: a33djj99@shaw.ca

Union Bay area

Anne Alcock Phone: 250-335-3340 Email: unionbay@shaw.ca

Alternate: Bruce Livesey Phone: 250-335-1876 Email: cattaridge@telus.net

Kilmarnock, Union Bay area

Susanna Kaljur Phone: 250-335-3154 Email: kaljursv@telus.net

Alternate: Rod Smith Phone: 778-427-9995 Email: jrsmith1@shaw.ca



About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.





Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and e-mail have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

250-871-6100 ext. 21

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca**

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd



SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Time to share your thoughts on four shortlisted scenarios

The Comox Valley Regional District's (CVRD) south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) has reached a critical stage and the project team is seeking your feedback on four shortlisted scenarios for a wastewater management service in Royston and Union Bay.

Below are details of the shortlisted scenarios that were introduced last month via newsletter and an open house. We hope you'll take this opportunity to review information in this newsletter and provide feedback before the end of February. More detailed information is also available online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp. A comment sheet is included – or contact us in any way listed on the back of the newsletter to share your questions or opinions.

SCENARIO A: Discharge to Baynes Sound

- Advanced secondary treatment at a facility in the south region producing a high quality effluent (exceeding regulatory requirements)
- Discharge into Baynes Sound

SCENARIO B: Discharge to Strait of Georgia beyond Sandy Island

- Secondary treatment (meeting regulatory requirements) at a facility in the south region
- Discharge into Strait of Georgia beyond Sandy (Tree) Island

SCENARIO C: Discharge to Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo

- Secondary treatment (meeting regulatory requirements) at a facility in the south region
- Connect to outfall at Comox Valley Water Pollution Control Centre (CVWPCC) currently planned to undergo an expansion/ replacement. Discharge into Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo

SCENARIO D: Discharge to ground at depth

- Advanced secondary treatment at a facility in the south region producing high quality effluent
- Discharge into a non-potable aquifer through up to six wells spaced 300-600m apart

NOTE: All four scenarios offer opportunities for kinetic energy recovery from wastewater flows, heat recovery and reuse, reuse of reclaimed water and beneficial use of biosolids through the SkyRocket facility. Treatment capacity for all four scenarios includes flows from the Village of Cumberland.

Comparison of Phase 1 Costs*

PROJECT COSTS	SCENARIO A	SCENARIO B	SCENARIO C	SCENARIO D
Total phase one project costs	\$49.5 M	\$58.5 M	\$56M	\$57.5 M
General strategic priorities fund (GSPF) grant (all partners)	\$15M	\$15M	\$15M	\$15M
Community works fund (CWF) grant (CVRD only)	\$2M	\$2M	\$2M	\$2M
Total Electoral Area 'A' project costs with grant	\$22M	\$25.5 M	\$24.5 M	\$25 M

Electoral Area 'A' Phase 1 Costs*

ELECTORAL 'A' RESIDENT COSTS – 951 PROPERTIES	SCENARIO A	SCENARIO B	SCENARIO C	SCENARIO D
Capital cost per property	\$22,900	\$26,900	\$25,800	\$26,400
Annual debt repayment amount per property**	\$1,980	\$2,330	\$2,240	\$2,290
Annual operating and maintenance costs per property	\$350	\$390	\$390	\$350

* At an accuracy of +/- 30 per cent for most capital components (certain components have been developed to a conceptual level of accuracy +/- 50 per cent) ** Assuming a five per cent interest rate and 20-year borrowing term

Note 1: scenarios B, C and D will need a scope change approved by the Union of BC Municipalities to confirm commitment of general strategic priorities fund (GSPF) funding towards these options





South Region Your time is valuable – and we'd like to thank you for taking time to learn about the LWMP process and providing your feedback. Fill out the comment form in this newsletter and your name will be entered into a draw for one of four 10-visit passes to CVRD recreation centres. You can also be entered by sending us an email with your comments, or stopping in at the open office hours at the Royston project office (noon to 4 pm) to provide your comments.

WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT?

For many years, the Comox **Valley Regional District and** residents of the Royston/ Union Bay communities have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation intended to find an effective solution for reducing the impacts of failing on-site sewage systems and Cumberland's lagoon effluent on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the partners received a \$15-million federal Gas Tax grant towards their proposed wastewater solution: the south sewer project (SSP). Now, the CVRD is undertaking a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) to determine what the best solution is for wastewater management in the south region. If the selected option meets the parameters of the SSP, the CVRD will work together with Cumberland to complete final planning stages which would lead to construction of a wastewater treatment facility constructed to service Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland.



You Ask, We Answer

Will there be financing options available for people to help offset the costs?

Residents will certainly be given the option to amortize their connection cost over a number of years. The CVRD is working with financial and local government experts to understand whether payment of a lump sum at the beginning will be an option, and whether deferral of the costs will be available for eligible landowners. In the meantime, the project team continues to seek other funding opportunities for the project to further reduce the cost for residents.

The public should have a say in this – will there be a referendum?

The LWMP process – which requires significant consultation, has the potential to be the authorizing mechanism rather than a referendum for this project. Because the public's feedback is critical to the development of the plan and ultimately the successful approvals of the work by the Ministry of Environment (MoE), it offers a comprehensive opportunity to engage the community. The MoE and/or CVRD board will consider whether a referendum is needed, based on feedback received and on the level of engagement with the community during the LWMP process.

Where will the collection pipes run when this system is constructed?

The detailed design of a collection system has not yet been completed. There is currently a conceptual design for a gravity collection system for the area, created in 2005 and updated in 2011, which forms the basis of the planning work completed to date. The detailed design for the collection system will be developed in late 2015 and early 2016. There will be opportunities for public feedback on this process.

What's Next:

Since the first LWMP open house was held launching the process in July 2014, the project team, consulting engineers, and public and technical advisory committee (PAC/TAC) members have been busy reviewing interests, ideas and values from stakeholders, identifying a long-list of discharge options, screening those options and producing a shortlist. That shortlist of scenarios was presented to the public in January 2015, and public consultation on those scenarios will run through the month of February.

In early March, the feedback collected from the public, along with additional investigation work undertaken by engineers and project staff will be used to develop parameters for a triple-bottom line (TBL) analysis which assesses options based on social, environmental and financial considerations.

That process will identify a preferred scenario which will then be considered by the PAC/TAC and the steering committee, which will make a recommendation to the CVRD board of directors. Once a preferred scenario is selected, final reports will be completed and planning will begin for construction. To qualify for the Gas Tax funding, construction of the system must be complete by September 30, 2018.
Comment Sheet



We appreciate you taking the time to learn more and share your comments. By submitting this comment sheet, you'll be entered to **WIN one of four 10-visit passes to CVRD recreation facilities.**

Na	ıme:
Ad	dress:
Ph	one: Email:
1.	What are your questions, comments and concerns regarding the IMPACTS TO YOUR COMMUNITY of any or all of the four shortlisted scenarios?
2.	What are your questions, comments and concerns regarding the COST IMPLICATIONS of any or all of the four shortlisted scenarios?
3.	What are your questions, comments and concerns regarding the ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS of any or all of the four shortlisted scenarios?

*Please flip page for more space to record comments

4. Do you have any additional questions, comments or concerns about the shortlisted scenarios and/or the LWMP process?

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMMENTS TO THE COMOX VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT. YOU CAN...

- 1. DROP it off at the project office during office hours: Thursday NOON 4PM, 3843 Livingston Road, Royston.
- 2. E-MAIL your comments to: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca
- 3. MAIL it to CVRD head office: 600 Comox Rd., Courtenay BC, V9N 3P6

Thank you for your feedback!

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.





Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and e-mail have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/ southregionlwmp

250-871-6100 ext. 21

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd



An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the Comox Valley Regional District.

Partners continue discussion on best option forward



It's been a busy first half of an important year for the south sewer project as the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) and partners continue to assess the best option for moving forward with a community wastewater system for Union Bay, Royston and Cumberland.

In January, an open house was held for residents in the Royston/Union Bay area that introduced four short-listed outfall location options - an important component of the south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP). Following the feedback provided to the project team and members of the public and technical advisory committee (PAC/ TAC), Scenario C (Cape Lazo) was selected as the preferred option for the system's outfall.

A summary of the four scenarios can be found here: http://bit.ly/lwmpscenarios

Scenario B (Strait of Georgia via Sandy Island) and Scenario D (discharge to ground) were eliminated from further consideration because of logistical and regulatory challenges that would create serious risk for the project. The selection of Cape Lazo (via the existing Comox Valley water pollution control centre outfall) over Scenario A (Baynes Sound) was made due to significant concerns raised by the K'ómoks First Nation (KFN), aquaculture businesses, and residents in the Baynes Sound area about potential environmental impacts of a new outfall in that area.

Following a recommendation from the PAC/TAC committee, the south sewer select committee forwarded Scenario C to the KFN for a month-long referral period. The KFN supported the scenario in principle and it was forwarded to the Village of Cumberland for review.

After hearing from their residents at the May 28 committee of the whole meeting, the Cumberland council decided not to support Scenario C as proposed because of the higher cost when compared to the Scenario A (Baynes Sound). They voted to go back to the south sewer select committee to propose amendments.

"We continue to work to move this project forward in a way that all partners and the community supports," Kris La Rose, Project Manager.

Meanwhile, the project partners have also agreed to a cost apportionment model for the project, outlining how capital and operating costs for shared infrastructure will be shared between project partners.

The select committee will be considering next steps at its meeting later in June. The CVRD's sewage commission will also consider options that may assist in moving the project forward.

The next public open house will likely be held in the fall and will include updates on the selection/planning process to date, engagement on where the treatment plant could go, updated cost estimates, and greater detail on how the costs of the project could be recovered from property owners in the Area A service area. A newsletter will be sent out to inform residents of the date, time and location of the next open house.

The online consultation forum at placespeak.com/southregionlwmp remains live and residents are welcome to contribute thoughts there, or to phone the project office at 250-871-6100, to email southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca, or stop in during open office hours each Thursday afternoon from noon to 4 pm.





South Region

PlaceSpeak

The CVRD's online

consultation tool is available at www.placespeak.com/ southregionlwmp – Residents of the LWMP area can sign up for an account and join the discussion to receive project updates, share comments or ask questions. Connect from wherever you are, whenever is convenient for you. Questions? Email southsewerproject@ comoxvalleyrd.ca



Finding the right spot for a treatment facility

Work is beginning on the preliminary assessments required to identify appropriate locations for the new treatment facility that will be built as part of the wastewater treatment system. This will be a critical component to the south sewer project, and one that many in the community have identified as being of interest.

- Selecting a treatment plant site will involve multiple steps, beginning with identifying important factors that will lead to the creation of criteria that can be used to evaluate site options. Public feedback will help inform the development of that criteria.
- Location, geography, availability, access, and community input will all be factors that are considered as potential locations are assessed.
- Short-listed options will be brought to the next public open house for feedback from residents and homeowners. The community will be consulted before acquisition of any land for this facility takes place.

Residents are encouraged to provide initial comments or concerns by email at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or by phoning 250-871-6100.

Open house draws big crowd and lots of comments

On Jan. 21, the project team held an open house in Union Bay to introduce the four shortlisted scenarios for wastewater management in the CVRD south region.

By the numbers:

160+ - People attended

58 - Number of comment forms returned at the open house and via the January newsletter

20% - Percent of comments/ questions related to financing and the cost of the project

15% - Percent of comments/ questions related to the protection of the environment or impacts on the environment.

Other comments received included opinions on individual scenarios, questions about operations of the proposed facility, about construction planning, and about residents' responsibilities once in place.



You Ask, We Answer

Is Cumberland still participating in the south sewer project?

At a committee of the whole meeting at the end of May, Cumberland council heard strongly from residents who felt that the south sewer project, as proposed by the CVRD's south region liquid waste management plan process, is too costly to participate in. However, the village's existing wastewater management system is not compliant with provincial regulations and the village will be required to move forward with a solution. Cumberland council's decision at the end of the meeting was to propose amendments to the current south sewer project's preferred scenario to reduce project costs.

Is this work related to the Croteau Beach (Comox No. 2) pump station work?

The CVRD is in the process of planning the Comox No. 2 pump station in the Croteau Beach area. This station will allow for the realignment of an existing wastewater collection pipe which currently runs along Willemar Bluffs. Pipes from the pump station will run to the Comox Valley water pollution control centre (CVWPCC), as is proposed for the collection system from the south region. While the pump station is not required to move treated effluent from the south region's proposed treatment centre to the CVWPCC outfall, construction timing of the two projects could coincide to allow for both pipes to be in the same trench, therefore reducing the impacts and costs of construction for both projects. The proposed pipe from the south region along this route would be carrying treated effluent only (clear and odourless).

My septic system is working fine and this is an expensive project – why do we need it at all?

Given the soil conditions in the area, the impact on Baynes Sound, and the increasingly high regulatory standards for onsite sewage systems, the status quo is not an option for the community. Because of small lot sizes, many existing properties will be unable to meet today's sewage system standards. Without a community wastewater system, increased standards such as mandatory inspections and increased reporting standards would need to be implemented to protect human health and the natural environment. While the proposed service requires significant investment, it is a long-term solution that will reduce long-term costs by eliminating ongoing maintenance and replacement costs of existing on-site systems.







WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT: PROJECT BACKGROUND

For many years, the Comox Valley Regional District and residents of the Royston/Union Bay communities have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation intended to find an effective solution for reducing the impacts of failing on-site sewage systems and Cumberland's lagoon effluent on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the partners received a \$15-million federal Gas Tax grant towards their proposed wastewater solution: the south sewer project (SSP). Now, the CVRD is undertaking a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) to determine the best solution for wastewater management in the south region. If the selected option meets the parameters of the SSP, the CVRD will work with Cumberland to complete final planning stages which would lead to construction of a wastewater treatment facility to service Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland.



What's Next

- An open house for the LWMP will be held in the fall to share information, answer questions and collect comments from the community about the selected scenario, potential locations for a treatment centre and next steps for the planning process. This will be an important opportunity for residents to ask more about the project and to share their thoughts.
- The project team continues to pursue options for reducing project costs, including funding by P3 Canada, the provincial government, and any other potential source of funding.
- Once a scenario is agreed to by project partners, the draft LWMP will be developed and submitted to the
 province for consideration. The province will then determine if it is approved and, if yes, the project team will
 move forward with project implementation.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District . Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.

SOUTH SEWER PROJECT



Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and email have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

250-871-6100 ext. 21

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd



An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.

Reducing Costs Key Focus for South Sewer Project Team



While many people spent the summer enjoying the beauty of Baynes Sound, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) project team spent the sunny days finding ways to protect it by moving the south sewer project (SSP) forward.

In March of this year the LWMP public and technical advisory committees (TAC and PAC) recommended a combined outfall off Cape Lazo as the preferred solution. This was subsequently supported by the LWMP steering committee and K'ómoks First Nation (KFN). While the SSP team had already been busy investigating ways to reduce project costs, these efforts became the primary focus in May when the Village of Cumberland voted not to support the LWMP preferred solution without amendments that would provide a reduction in costs to their property owners.

Options for reducing costs reviewed over the summer included possible new partnerships or service options with the Comox Valley sewage service as well as new and existing grant funding opportunities.

Like many other municipalities challenged with the costs of developing critical infrastructure projects, the SSP team also advanced its review of a public-private partnership (P3) as a means to deliver this new service in a cost-effective way. PPP Canada (a Crown corporation dedicated to promoting P3s) is considering screening the SSP into its next round of grant funding in late October 2015. If project partners are successful, PPP Canada funding could reduce the capital

project cost by 25 per cent (\$16.5 million) and significantly reduce the cost of hook-up to residents in the area.

An early analysis suggests the SSP could be a good fit for a P3 project. The CVRD and Village of Cumberland are considering now whether to continue pursuing this as an option. The public sector would retain ownership of the infrastructure.

The next open house will be held this winter. Watch for a new mail out and notices to let you know when and where that event will be held. We look forward to keeping you informed as new progress is made on this important community project!

PlaceSpeak[®]

You can share your thoughts on your own time with the CVRD's online consultation tool: www.placespeak.com/ southregionlwmp. Residents in the area can sign up and join discussions, post comments, vote in polls and read the latest updates. Questions? Email southsewerproject@ comoxvalleyrd.ca





South Region

VILLAGE RECEIVES FUNDS FOR PIPES

While the SSP involves sharing some wastewater infrastructure, each participant community also needs to work on its own collection systems. Earlier this summer, the Village of Cumberland received funding from the province that will help it tackle important collection system work needed in its community. It's great to see our partners at the village of Cumberland receive this important grant that could help them participate in the south sewer project. To read the news release from the village, visit: http://bit.ly/ cmbldfunds

P3 and What it Means

An early analysis completed by provincial Crown corporation Partnerships BC on behalf of the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) suggests the south sewer project (SSP) could be a good fit for a public-private partnership (P3). The analysis is at an early stage in the review process by PPP Canada, an organization that assists in coordinating P3 partnerships by providing expert support and offering grant funding.

What does this mean to residents in the area?

- Lower costs: If approved by local partners and successful in the PPP Canada process, 25 per cent of the capital costs could be paid for by PPP Canada. Early estimates show that could reduce the hook-up cost for Royston/Union Bay residents by approximately \$10,000 per connection.
- Reduced risk: Highly competitive design/construction operations process that transfers risks from local government to a private sector contractor and ensures stability of long term operations and maintenance costs.

The PPP Canada process is an extensive one and the CVRD is still at an information-gathering stage. While the preliminary analysis indicates a potential positive opportunity for this project, PPP Canada will have to review the content and other factors and determine whether to screen the CVRD's project into the next round of funding. That will be decided by the end of October.

There are often many questions from the public about P3s – to address those, the SSP team has produced a Q&A that is posted to the south region LWMP webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp - under "How to Keep Informed". Copies are also available at the project office, or by email.

Update on Siting Options for New Treatment Plant

The early stages of assessing potential locations for the new treatment plant and three pump stations required for the SSP is underway.

Determining the location for a treatment facility is a critical component of the planning process. Among the factors considered are technical considerations, location, geography, availability, access and community input. It's expected a shortlist will be brought to the community at the next open house event this winter.

While the treatment facility will be somewhere central, the pump



stations will be at low areas, just above the foreshore, likely on Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure right-of-ways. There will be three in total – one in each of the south region communities included as part of the first stages of construction: Union Bay, Kilmarnock and Royston.

Pump stations are small in footprint and have very limited above-ground infrastructure. A good example is one installed at Millard Drive (photo to right), which is similar in size to what will be needed for the south sewer project.

Residents are encouraged to share initial comments, questions or concerns by emailing southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca, by phoning 250-871-6100 or by dropping in during open office hours, each Thursday from 1 to 4 p.m.

You Ask, We Answer

Has the regional district looked at lower cost alternatives to a community sewer system?

While the investment for a community wastewater system is a big one, it was selected by the CVRD LWMP process as the most cost effective and environmentally responsible way to manage south region wastewater. New on-site wastewater treatment systems (septic systems) can be very costly, depending on the property and technology needs. For many in the area, increasingly stringent regulations mean that only highly expensive type 3 treatment systems can be accommodated on the property. Ongoing maintenance (to the standards that will be required without a community system) is also pricey. Recognizing the significant price-tag, the project team is continuing to look for grant and partnership opportunities that could reduce the cost overall.

Will the discussion regarding a Kensington Island Properties (KIP) and Union Bay Improvement District (UBID) water agreement impact the south sewer project (SSP)?

Community wastewater collection and treatment systems are distinct from drinking water infrastructure and service. While both the UBID and KIP are being kept informed of the progress on the south region LWMP and SSP, the current discussions regarding a water agreement between the two parties will not have an impact on the CVRD's project. The SSP will proceed regardless of whether the KIP development moves forward.

Will we get to vote on this proposal, and if so, when?

The LWMP process, which is currently underway for the Royston/Union Bay area, can serve as an authorizing mechanism for the south sewer project. This is why the public consultation process and your engagement through this planning stage is so important. If the province approves the LWMP, it can act in lieu of a referendum or vote and allow the CVRD to establish services and borrow funds. While the LWMP can act in lieu of a referendum, it also doesn't preclude a vote – and the Ministry of Environment and/or CVRD board will ultimately decide whether a referendum is needed based on feedback through engagement with the community.



WHAT'S THIS ALL ABOUT: PROJECT BACKGROUND

For many years, the CVRD and residents of the Royston/Union Bay communities have discussed the need for improved wastewater treatment. Those discussions have developed into a partnership with the Village of Cumberland and KFN intended to find an effective solution to reducing the impacts of failing on-site sewage systems and Cumberland's lagoon effluent on Baynes Sound and surrounding area.

In 2013, the partners received a \$15-million Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) strategic priorities fund grant towards their proposed wastewater solution: the SSP. Now, the CVRD is undertaking a LWMP to determine what the best solution is for wastewater management in the south region. If the selected option meets the parameters of the SSP, the CVRD will work together with Cumberland to complete final planning stages which would lead to construction of a wastewater treatment facility to service Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland.



What's Next

- The Village of Cumberland and the CVRD's south sewer select committee will review the Cape Lazo combined outfall and make a decision about pursuing the PPP Canada funding, determining how the project will move forward.
- A final open house will be held for the LWMP and siting considerations. The open house will be held this winter.
- Once a scenario and approach are agreed to by all partners, the final work on the LWMP will be completed and the combined stage one and two LWMP submitted to the province for review/consideration.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.

Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and email have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer 250-871-6100 ext. 21 southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 pm 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca**

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd







An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.

CVRD committed to moving sewer project forward



The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s south sewer project (SSP) team remains committed to moving forward with a community wastewater system for Royston/Union Bay residents, building on the work to date and continuing in partnership with the K'ómoks First Nation (KFN).

"This is an important project for the residents of Royston and Union Bay and our First Nations partners, and many are eager to see this progress continue productively," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound - Denman/Hornby Islands (Area 'A'). "We are confident that we can still deliver this service regardless of Cumberland's decision, and we look forward to doing our part to provide this important infrastructure and protect Baynes Sound."

In mid-November, Cumberland council decided to withdraw from the SSP partnership, which still includes the CVRD and KFN. They have decided to restart their own liquid waste management process, started in 1999 to identify a replacement for their aging lagoon based wastewater treatment system which is out of compliance with provincial regulations.

"We are confident that we can still deliver this service regardless of Cumberland's decision, and we look forward to doing our part to provide this important infrastructure and protect Baynes Sound." Bruce Jolliffe, Director for Area 'A'

The CVRD project team is now working with their technical experts to revise the scope

e

of the project to reflect the reduced treatment and outfall requirements. More details about these changes and possible cost implications will be shared with the community as they become available.

"We will continue to build on the extensive work and engagement already undertaken to move this project forward in a timely manner that can meet grant timelines," said Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning.

Residents in the community and specifically those in the proposed service areas can watch the project webpage (www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/ southregionlwmp) for updates in the coming weeks, including full details about an upcoming project open house to be held in early 2016.

Any questions can be directed to the SSP office by emailing southsewer@ comoxvalleyrd.ca, phoning 250-871-6100 or stopping in during open office hours at the Royston office (3843 Livingstone Rd.) on Thursdays from 12 to 4 p.m.





South Region

Potential plant, pump station locations being reviewed

As plans for the SSP continue to move forward, the project team is turning its sights to a critical next step: identifying locations for a new wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and three pump stations.

The CVRD is working with experts to identify possible locations for the WWTP. The first step will be to screen for viability criteria, such as lot size, useable area, contamination/archaeological concerns, etc. Secondly, the remaining properties will be reviewed for the following criteria:

- Technical suitability elevation, proximity to utilities, etc.
- Environment presence of species at risk, proximity to fish-bearing streams, etc.
- Financial cost, assessed value, etc.
- Social suitable zoning, truck traffic route, etc.
- Legal options around sale of land, etc.

From this assessment, a short list will be determined and presented to the community at the next public event. Given the feedback, a final selection will be made.

Locations for pump stations are more technically constrained but facilities at these sites are underground, small, and don't require regular maintenance/activity. There will be one unit in each of the Union Bay, Marine Drive and Kilmarnock areas. These units will be near the foreshore, and likely on BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure right-of-ways. Property owners near locations under consideration will be contacted directly with additional information in the coming months. Short-listed options will also be available at the next open house event.

You Ask, We Answer

How will Cumberland's decision affect the cost of this project for Royston/Union Bay residents?

At this time, the impact on cost resulting from Cumberland's withdrawal is not yet known. The project team is working with technical experts to revise the scope of the project and better understand possible cost implications. We understand that cost is a critical feature of this project for residents and we've heard from many that their support depends on keeping the project affordable. While the CVRD is working to retain the \$15-million Union of BC municipalities (UBCM) Strategic Priorities Fund grant given to the project, there are other grant applications in play that could also help reduce the cost. The CVRD is committed to sharing updates on this as they are confirmed.

This project is important to me – is there anything I can do to help move it forward?

The community's support is important to the continued success of this project. If you would like to assist, providing a letter confirming your support would be a great way of contributing. These are a valuable addition to portfolios used by the project team as they continue to work through grant applications and regulator-approval processes. Want to help? Whether you are a business owner or residential property owner, tell us why this project is important for you and why you want to see it move forward – and submit to us any of these ways:

- Drop off at the Royston project office during office hours: 3843 Livingstone Rd.
- Mail to the CVRD Offices: 600 Comox Rd. Courtenay BC V9N 3P6
- Email to southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Learn More

Webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer





Contact Us Phone: 250-871-6100 ext. 21 Email: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 p.m. 3843 Livingstone Road

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.

You're Invited! Next public open house set for March 23

With new reduced cost estimates, revised partnerships and proposed plans for a June referendum, the south sewer project (SSP) team has a lot to update the community on.

To cover all this and more, an open house has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 23 from 4:00–7:00 p.m. at the Union Bay Community Hall. The event will combine a presentation by Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) staff at 5:00 p.m. with a casual drop-in opportunity to help share the latest about the SSP and get your feedback on the preferred and shortlisted sites for the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP).

"We know the community is eager to hear about the progress of this important community infrastructure project," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman/Hornby Islands (Area 'A'). "There's been a lot of headway made – and there's good news for the community in terms of revised costs and opportunities for input."

Since November 2015, the SSP team has been working to revise the project plan to remove the Village of Cumberland from service plans, following a decision by their council to withdraw from the SSP and restart a new liquid waste management plan (LWMP). The result is a reduced project cost estimate which, paired with recent successful funding results, have reduced the cost-per-connection



The last community event held in January 2015 saw 160 people come out to learn more about the SSP.

estimate by approximately \$5,000 since the last open house was held in January 2015. This is based on the retention of the \$15-million Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Strategic Priorities Fund grant and achieving PPP Canada funding for 25 per cent of SSP capital costs to deliver the project as a public private partnership (P3).

With a clear opportunity now identified to move forward with the funding necessary to ensure affordability to Area 'A' participants, the CVRD is looking to initiate a referendum for residents – seeking final, clear direction about the community's support to move forward in a timely manner (see more on page 3).

The open house presentation, beginning at 5:00 p.m., is expected to last about 45 minutes. Residents are welcome to attend the open house anytime between 4:00–7:00 p.m. to review informational panels, collect handouts, and speak with project staff and technical experts. The project team will be collecting feedback from the community.

To learn more about the SSP and the south region LWMP, visit <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/</u> <u>southregionlwmp</u> or share comments at <u>www.placespeak.com/southregionlwmp</u>. The project team is also available to help answer questions – contact information can be found on page 4 of this newsletter.

UPDATED COSTS				
Revised Cost of Scenario C – Cape Lazo	\$54.5 million			
K'ómoks First Nation Contribution	\$5-million			
UBCM Strategic Priorities Fund Grant	\$15-million			
PPP Canada Grant	\$13.7 million			
Community Works Funds	\$1.5 million			
Total Remaining Capital Cost for project area	\$19.3 million			
Estimated cost per connection (with grants)	\$20,257*			
*Payment/financing options – including deferral – will be available.				





South Region

Locations assessed for treatment plant and pump stations

Wastewater Treatment Plant

Shortlisted options for the location of a new WWTP and three pump stations are now available for community review, and the project team is seeking feedback on the potential locations.

Four sites have been identified as potential locations for the new WWTP. All four are on the west side of the Island Highway, between Royston and Union Bay. The map on this page shows the four that are under consideration.

In the spring 2015, the CVRD hired Heuristic Consulting Associates to identify and assess potential locations for the facility. Beginning with a search that included around 500 properties, a long-list of eight was identified based on considerations such as minimum lot size, cost, and technical requirements for the facility.

Further review of environmental factors, neighbourhood considerations, early community feedback and availability of the property has narrowed that list to the four identified on the map to the right.

The community is invited to comment on the shortlisted sites and this can be done by contacting the project team in various ways as listed on page 4, or sharing their feedback at the public open house on March 23.

Pump Stations

Information is also now available about the first and second-choice locations for the three pump stations that will be required for the system. The preferred sites for two of the pump stations fall within the road allowance of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI). Pump stations, which must be near the lowest geographic points of each serviced community, can be designed to have small footprints and limited above-ground infrastructure. There will be one in Royston, Kilmarnock, and Union Bay.

Feedback on these locations will be received until Friday, March 25, including at the public open house. Location decisions will be made in early April based on that feedback and further investigation into costs and construction needs. Maps and additional information are available online at <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/</u> <u>southregionlwmp</u> and at the project office.

Shortlisted sites for treatment plant



POSSIBLE PUMP STATION LOCATIONS

Royston:

a) At the boat launch on Marine Drive (would include a public restroom)*

b) Near the community mailboxes where Hayward Road meets Marine Drive.

Kilmarnock:

a) Next to Argyle Creek at the Sandborn beach access*

b) At the southwest corner of Montrose Drive and Kilmarnock Drive, next to Montrose Park.

Union Bay:

a) Next to the dock at the Union Bay boat launch*

b) At the foot of the breakwater, at the southern entrance to the Union Bay boat launch.

(Both options propose a public restroom, and the Union Bay Community Club, who operates the launch, have supported the proposal in principle.)

*Indicates preferred option

You Ask, We Answer

The deadline for the UBCM grant is drawing near – can this be completed in time?

Securing a funding agreement with PPP Canada requires that service establishment be complete by the end of June. The project team believes that goal can be met – but there are critical steps that have to happen in a timely manner for it to be achieved. This includes identifying a preferred treatment plant site by end of March 2016, finalizing a PPP Canada business case in early April 2016 and achieving a successful referendum in June 2016. Keeping the community engaged throughout the process will be critical moving forward.

Does a P3 mean we lose control of the project/infrastructure?

No. The CVRD will retain ownership of all new infrastructure and no existing jobs would be affected. The private partner would be responsible for hiring of personnel to operate the new facility. Control over the design and construction process is detailed through extensive contracts clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities for all parties. Financial payments will be tied to operational and environmental performance targets to ensure the contractor's compliance with all expectations and regulations. For more information see P3 and SSP Q&A sheet at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SSP_QA_P3.pdf

How can I get in touch to talk to someone directly about this?

The project team wants to hear from you too! Residents who want to share their thoughts or ask questions are invited to phone the project office (250-871-6100), email southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or stop in at the project office in Royston (3843 Livingstone Rd.). Open office hours are between noon and 4 p.m. on Thursdays. An online consultation forum is also available for interested residents at www.placespeak.com/southregionlwmp

The Referendum Option

It's been 10 years since the community was asked for a mandate to borrow funds for the SSP and – with a clear opportunity to move forward now laid out – the CVRD may seek to renew that mandate.

The LWMP has moved the planning process through some challenging steps, including identifying the preferred outfall location. While a completed and approved LWMP could allow for government borrowing, to meet schedule requirements – and respond to the community's interest – it's a time consuming process and would not allow the project to meet the deadlines for funding under PPP Canada. A referendum provides the most direct path forward. The SSP team is recommending a referendum be initiated this spring, with a target vote date in June 2016. Details are still being developed.

"We feel we now have the best opportunity in terms of financial contributions to move the SSP forward – but given our tightening timelines, a referendum is likely required to confirm community support to construct this critical infrastructure," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman/Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

More information about the specifics of the referendum question, voting dates, times and locations will be shared through newsletters, notices and advertisements in the weeks and months to come.

GLOSSARY

Public-Private Partnership ("P3"):

P3s are performance-based contracts for the delivery of major public infrastructure. Most often the public sector retains full ownership of the final facility, which the CVRD will in this case. In P3s, the private sector typically takes the lead in designing, building and sometimes operating the infrastructure, rather than the traditional model that sees the public sector tender and award each stage of design and construction and then operate the facility.

There are a range of models for P3 agreements that vary in the amount of private-sector involvement in both pre and post-construction phases – however a key characteristic of all agreements is the retention of public ownership and transfer of risk to the private sector partners over the construction period and in some cases a defined period of operations and maintenance of the infrastructure.

PPP Canada:

PPP Canada is a federal Crown corporation created in 2009 to encourage P3s as a way of delivering public infrastructure. To deliver more P3s, PPP Canada can leverage incentives such as grant funding, providing expertise and promoting best practices. The south sewer project has qualified for their program and, if approved by residents could receive nearly \$14-million in grants for participating.



What's Next

- A public open house will be held on Wednesday, March 23 at the Union Bay Community Hall from 4:00–7:00 p.m. It will feature information about the revised project scope and estimated costs per connection; PPP Canada funding; and shortlisted sites for the treatment plant and three pump stations.
- Feedback on proposed sites for the treatment plant and three pump stations is being collected. Sites will be selected at the end of March and a business case will be finalized in early April.
- At their March meeting, the CVRD board will consider initiating a referendum process, with a target vote date in June.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Save paper and postage and get the news faster – If you're able to and would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, just send us a note at **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** If you're a property owner who lives out of town or who has general delivery mail, this is a great option to stay on top of important news.

Learn More - Contact Us

A webpage, phone line and email have been established for this project: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer 250-871-6100 ext. 21 southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Thursdays: 12 to 4 p.m. 3843 Livingstone Road

If you would prefer to receive this newsletter by email, send your request to **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca**

Follow the CVRD on social media for ongoing updates about regional district activity:

@comoxvalleyrd







An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.



Referendum Voting Day: Saturday, June 18, 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

- Property owners and residents in Phase 1 of the SSP may be eligible to vote
- Union Bay Community Church hall and Royston Elementary school
- Advanced and mail-in voting opportunities available
- More voting info including the text of questions and details of voter eligibility – can be found at www. comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote



The last community event held in March 2016 saw 200 people come out to learn more about the SSP.

The South Sewer Project Referendum – June 18

In March 2016, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) board agreed to initiate a referendum process for the south sewer project (SSP). This will allow residents and property owners in Phase 1 to vote on whether they approve of the project moving ahead – specifically in relation to the estimated costs and key terms of a public-private partnership agreement.

Why a referendum? The planning process has progressed and significant grant funding is now potentially available to the project. However, grant deadlines mean there is a list of requirements that need to be completed soon. In order to confirm the community's commitment in a timely way, a referendum has been selected.

For more information about vote logistics such as times, locations and eligibility, visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

For more information about the project details, visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

SSP Questions? We want to answer them.

Have some questions about the SSP as you consider voting in the June 18 referendum? The CVRD's SSP team wants to help answer as many of those questions as possible – and will be hosting multiple opportunities in the coming weeks to make discussions easy and accessible:

South Sewer Project Infosessions:

- Project office drop-in hours: Monday to Friday until June 17, the project office at 3843 Livingstone (Royston) is open for drop-ins between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, May 25, Union Bay Community Hall (Bill Woods Room): 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, June 1, Royston Community Hall: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, June 15, Royston project office open house: 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Community hall sessions will include a short introduction and information stations to answer questions from residents. RSVPs are appreciated but not required: if you are planning to attend, please email southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or phone 250-871-6100.

Each of these offers the opportunity for small group or one-on-one discussions about the specific project area of interest to you.

We want everyone to have the opportunity to collect the information they need to make an informed decision about the SSP.

Have questions, but can't stop by? Phone 250-871-6100 or email southsewer@ comoxvalleyrd.ca







Updated costs and payment info for Phase 1 property owners

We know that the cost of this project – and specifically the cost for people who will be connecting in Phase 1 – is of critical importance to many.

Below is the most recent cost breakdown. At the March open house, a total parcel tax of \$1,938/year was presented to the public. The current estimated total parcel tax will be \$1,804/year, deferrable for eligible property owners. This latest cost estimate can change, but cannot exceed \$2,036, the maximum requisition being presented to referendum voters. The maximum requisition will allow room for unexpected cost increases that may come up during the procurement and construction period.

The capital costs will decrease as new participants are connected to the system.

Key additional updates:

- Collection of parcel tax will **begin in 2017** to help minimize annual cost for the first 10 years of service when there are limited connections and slow anticipated growth.
- An upfront, lump sum payment called a 'commutation' will be available to residents who would like to access this
 option. As cost estimates have been confirmed, the anticipated commutation cost is estimated to be \$22,500, with
 a \$25,000 maximum, to cover the capital portion of the project.
- Annual costs to initial users will decrease if and when other jurisdictions or major developments join the system. Operations and maintenance costs will reduce as more properties join the service, regardless of the method chosen to repay capital. Additional development will be of greatest benefit to those who amortize the capital costs as new arrivals will help share the annual debt repayment costs. The CVRD is examining possible options for rebates for those who chose the lump sum commutation payment.

COST BREAKDOWN

PROJECT COSTS					
Estimated Total Capital Cost (in 2019 dollars)		\$56.2 million			
Total Grant Funding to be Secured		\$3	\$30 million		
K'ómoks First Nation contribution		\$5	\$5.4 million		
Remaining to be borrowed on behalf of property owners (in 2019 dollars)	\$2	\$20.8 million		
COSTS FOR RESIDENTS					
Capital Repayment Options	One-time lum (commutati	p sum on)	Annual Parcel Tax*		
Estimated Capital Costs (based on accuracy of +/-15%)	\$22,500		\$1,245/year		
Maximum Allowable Requisition for Capital costs**	\$25,000		\$1,400/year		
Estimated Operation and Maintenance (O&M)*		\$559/Yea	r Parcel Tax		
Maximum allowable for O&M*	\$636/Year Parcel Tax				
OTHER ONE-TIME COSTS (estimates vary home-to-home)			Estimated Cost Range		
Connecting to Sewer System (home to property line)	\$1,000 to \$4,000				
Septic System Decommissioning	\$600 to \$1,000				

* Deferrable for eligible property owners. For more information on this, go to www.gov.bc.ca/propertytaxdeferment

** A 'Maximum Allowable Requisition Cost' is the highest amount that could be collected from homeowners by the CVRD. While estimated costs are currently lower, the CVRD will not be allowed to collect any more than this amount.

Key updates on project progress shared

It was a great turnout for an important public open house at the Union Bay Community Hall on March 23.

Since that day, planning work has progressed and the project team has continued to develop the best plan for moving this community wastewater system forward. Here are some of the key updates for residents in the area:

Wastewater Treatment Plant Siting:

- After considering the public's feedback, additional technical factors such as property access and supplementary costs, the project team is recommending that the CVRD board move forward with the Option D K'ómoks First Nation property. This is the southernmost property. Maps can be found at the SSP webpage.
- It is agreed that this property offers the lowest potential impact on any area residents, includes easy access and suitable geography and can be secured within the budget identified as part of the project plan.
- The CVRD board will consider this recommendation at their board meeting at the end of May.

Pump Station Siting:

- The project team received great feedback from communities about the siting locations. This feedback along with additional technical review has led staff to recommend pursuing:
 - 1. Royston: Option 1b has been recommended, proposing siting near the boat launch, but at a location at the south end of the park area, next to the small parking area.
 - 2. Kilmarnock: Option 2 Montrose Park (with more research required about where on the park property the facility can be located).
 - 3. Union Bay: A new Option 1a has been identified at the north end of the boat launch parking lot.
- The CVRD board will also consider this recommendation at their board meeting in May.

Public-Private Partnerships:

• The business case has been submitted to PPP Canada for consideration and it's expected a decision will be made at the end of this summer about whether this project will be accepted into the program.

YOU ASK, WE ANSWER

Why is a Public-Private Partnership (P3) being proposed for this project?

After extensive review and assessment, the P3 has been proposed because it offers the more cost effective option for property owners in the proposed service area. This cost effectiveness is based on a few contributing factors:

- 1. A project delivered via the PPP Canada funding program comes with a 25 per cent grant for capital costs of the infrastructure. For the SSP, this means roughly \$13.4 million.
- 2. The transfer of risk (ie: unexpected construction costs or schedule delays) from the public to private sector will reduce the cost of the project.
- 3. P3s like the model proposed for the SSP have been shown to result in lower overall capital costs.

We expect residents/home owners will hear from parties opposed to P3 projects in the coming weeks. It's important to remember that there will be no loss to public sector jobs, all infrastructure will be owned by the CVRD, environmental/operational standards will be secured via a project agreement, and it is the most affordable option for residents.

What if the referendum is unsuccessful?

If one or the other of the referendum questions fails, the project will be significantly delayed, likely resulting in the loss of grant funding. The next step could be to implement a bylaw that will require property owners to replace their outdated and defective systems which no longer meet current operating standards. Regular inspection and maintenance would be enforced.

If the regional district is not successful in implementing a community sewer system, the cost to replace failing systems will not be deferrable. This can significantly magnify financial hardship on property owners who are on fixed income.

The Comox Valley Regional District is conducting a referendum on Saturday, June 18, 2016 for voters included in Phase 1 of the south sewer project. Qualified voters are being asked to vote to determine support for the next steps of a community wastewater treatment system for parts of Royston and Union Bay including Kilmarnock.

Are you eligible to vote?

Eligible voters must meet all of the following requirements:

- You must be 18 years of age or older on voting day (June 18, 2016)
- You must be a Canadian citizen
- You must have been a resident of BC for at least 6 months immediately before you register to vote
- You must be a:
 - Resident elector been a resident of the proposed service area for at least 30 days immediately before the vote; Or
 - Non-resident elector you live elsewhere in BC but have owned a property in the proposed service area for at least 30 days prior to the vote.
- You must not have been disqualified by law from voting.

For information on non-resident property electors visit our website below.

How can I vote?

There are three main ways to vote for the proposed south sewer referendum.

- 1. In person on referendum day: Saturday, June 18, 2016 from 8 am 8 pm at:
 - Royston Elementary School 3830 Warren Avenue, Royston BC; Or
 - Union Bay Community Church Hall 5533 Island Highway, Union Bay, BC.
- 2. In person at advanced voting: Wednesday, June 8, 2016 from 8 am 8 pm at the CVRD board room located at 550 Comox Road, Courtenay, BC.
- 3. By mail: The CVRD will conduct mail ballot voting to qualified electors that register early. Please review requirements and registration details on our website detailed below.

This voting day make sure your voice is heard. The south sewer project effects your community and neighborhood. Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote for more information on the referendum or to register for mail ballot voting.

We look forward to seeing you out there voting.

James Warren, Chief Election Officer

Comox Valley Regional District



Learn More

Webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer



@comoxvalleyrd

Contact Us Phone: 250-871-6100 Email: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public: Mon-Fri, 8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. until June 17, 2016. 3843 Livingstone Road.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.

Mark your calendars: Referendum Voting Day, Sat. June 18

Residents and homeowners in the core residential areas of Royston, Union Bay and Kilmarnock will soon have a chance to vote on a proposed plan for the Comox Valley Regional District's (CVRD) south sewer project (SSP), which, if approved, will bring a community wastewater system to the area.

What happens if one or both referendum questions fail?

In short, the failure of either or both referendum questions will mean significant delays in project progress, putting at risk the extensive grant funding that is on track to being secured.

Next steps for the CVRD should this occur are not confirmed, but could include restarting the liquid waste management planning process or putting the project on hold as further grant opportunities are sought. It would mean the definite loss of the \$13.3 million grant from PPP Canada, and the probable loss of the \$15 million Union of BC Municipalities Strategic Priorities Fund grant.

The CVRD is considering an alternative means to correct the issue of failing on-site systems regionally, including increased regulations re: existing on-site systems to include regular inspection and mandatory replacement of failing systems. In the absence of a plan for a community wastewater system in the area, these regulations would apply in the south region.

Voting day is Saturday, June 18 from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. at Royston Elementary School and the Union Bay Community Church.

This is a critical point of the project and the outcome of this referendum will determine whether a community wastewater service can proceed. After many years of investigation, the project team is on track to secure \$30-million in grant funding and a \$5.4 million contribution from partner K'ómoks First Nation. Together this covers 63 per cent of the project's overall capital cost, a level of funding that is not common for construction of infrastructure in today's environment. Given this level of funding, increasing regulations and ever escalating infrastructure costs, it will very likely never be cheaper to build a community wastewater management system in Royston and Union Bay.

The referendum will ask two questions covering roughly:

- Whether residents support the establishment of regional district services

 (3) with coinciding maximum requisition amounts totalling \$2,036/year.
 This sets the ceiling on what the CVRD can collect from parcel taxes if approved.
- 2. Whether they support the CVRD entering into a partnership agreement with a private partner for the design, construction, financing, operations and maintenance of the facility, based on a maximum agreement term of 30 years.

To read the questions in full, visit <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote</u> or visit the project office at 3843 Livingstone Road (Royston) between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (or until 7 p.m. on June 15).







Frequently Asked Questions

Why aren't neighbourhoods like Gartley and Briardale included?

The Gartley and Briardale Road areas are included in Phase 2 of the SSP – which could be included, at the earliest, in 2025. Residents in that area will have a referendum to decide whether they would like to join.

The areas included in Phase 1 were selected based on need and cost. Gartley Point's lower density and Briardale's larger lots put them lower in need but higher in costs to install the required collection system and pump station. These costs would have raised the project cost for all those in Phase 1.

Why is a public-private partnership being considered?

After extensive review and assessment, a public-private partnership (P3) has been proposed because it offers the more cost effective option for property owners in the proposed service area. This cost effectiveness is based on a few contributing factors: a capital grant from PPP Canada equalling \$13.3 million, the transfer of risk (ie: unexpected construction costs or schedule delays) to private sector and the fact that P3s like the model proposed for the SSP have shown lower overall capital costs. P3s offer high transparency – setting out the cost throughout the entire life cycle of the project in the project agreement.

There will be no loss to public sector jobs, all infrastructure will be owned by the CVRD, environmental/operational standards will be secured via a project agreement, and it is the most affordable option for residents.

Aren't we just subsidizing developers without companies like Kensington Island Properties contributing as well?

New developments will have to pay as they connect – which will bring down the capital repayment and operations costs for the rest of the service area. Any new connections will have to pay development cost charges to contribute to the SSP service. This will ensure they are paying their share, and they will not benefit from grant funding secured to date.

What about any permits/approvals I'll need to connect my home to the system?

For many properties, this will not be an issue. Some homes near the ocean, riparian areas or archeologically-sensitive sites will require additional permits. Wherever possible, the CVRD will share the permits it receives with homeowners to remove duplication of efforts, and work to streamline any permit approvals required for the region.

More generally, the CVRD is committed to minimizing hurdles or administrative burdens as properties seek to connect to the system.

Isn't a new septic system cheaper?

Over an estimated life cycle of roughly 60 years, the SSP comes in at a lower cost than the average cost of a type-2 system. A mistake was found in an earlier version of this bar graph. However, the revised numbers still demonstrate that compared to the multidecade care and replacements of a type-2 system (most common in the proposed service area) the SSP is a lower annual cost.

Link to more on this topic here: http://bit.ly/ae_onsitereport



The CVRD is looking at ways to ease the impact on those who have recently installed new systems. Staff are recommending that a rebate be offered to homeowners with systems that will be 10 years or younger when a connection to the SSP becomes available. This will be considered by the regional directors at an upcoming meeting.

Contact Us

Phone: 250-871-6100

Email: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

The project office is open to the public Mon-Fri until June 17, 8:30 to 4:30 p.m., 3843 Livingstone Road

Learn More

Webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer Social Media:

@comoxvalleyrd



About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road, Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the south sewer project team.

Post-referendum: Next steps for the south sewer project



On June 18, residents and homeowners in Phase 1 of the south sewer project (SSP) voted against moving forward with the proposed community wastewater system as presented. On behalf of the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD), the project team wants to thank all of those people who took the time to be informed on the project and to vote on referendum day, or by mail-in or advance voting.

With the referendum completed, there are many questions about what will happen next. Not all of them can be answered at this time. However, there are some updates that can be shared:

- Considering next steps: The project will pause for a few months as the CVRD connects with project partners, funders, regulators and other parties. It is not yet known whether the existing grant funding and financial contribution – which covered over 60 per cent of the project's costs – will be retained, however, that will need to be confirmed before the next steps for the SSP can be determined.
- **Protect the environment:** The CVRD remains committed to resolving the environmental impacts due to malfunctioning on-site systems in the area. Regionally, review/research is underway on a program to ensure failing septic systems are identified and replaced.

Whichever way the CVRD moves forward with wastewater management in the area, consultation with the community will continue. While there will be little news in the coming few months, the project team will provide updates both via newsletters, local media and the website in the fall of 2016.

BY THE NUMBERS: REFERENDUM RESULTS

On June 18, roughly 960 people came out to vote: **43 per cent** of the estimated eligible voters for the area.

The results:

Question 1: South Sewer Service and Loan Authorization Bylaws		ylaws	Que s Partn	s tion 2: ership Agreem	ent		
YES	282 votes cast	29%		YES	238 votes cast	25%	
NO	681 votes cast		71%	NO	729 votes cast		75%





You Ask, We Answer

Will the project proceed if more grant funding can be found?

Over the past few years the CVRD has fully explored all possible grant funding opportunities to line up the estimated 62 per cent grant funding and financial contribution achieved for the proposal that went before the public on June 18. It is not yet known whether this funding will be available given the fact the associated deadlines are now unachievable. Moving forward the project team will likely have to start seeking new funding sources, possibly with a new project concept identified via a restarted liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process. The CVRD will be considering the implications of the referendum results in the coming weeks to determine possible next steps.

My septic system is failing – will inspections and replacement be required right away?

Separate from the SSP, the CVRD is looking at ways to reduce the environmental impact of failing on-site septic systems in all of its rural areas. Investigating programs to ensure that failing systems are identified and replaced is a priority for the regional district moving forward. There is still work to do to identify an appropriate path forward and the CVRD is committed to engaging with the community moving forward and highlighting education as a key component to any new initiative.

WHY A REFERENDUM?

- Tight deadlines for grants made it impossible for the LWMP – which requires multiple stages of review by senior levels of government – to be used as a way to approve borrowing for this large project.
- Ten years had passed since the previous, successful referendum and much had changed, a new referendum was the only way to provide authorization in the short time frame available.
- The need for improved wastewater treatment in the area is high. With a solid proposal in place, it was important that the CVRD gave the community an opportunity to consider this technically and practically sound sewer treatment proposal.



The SSP project team spoke to hundreds of residents in the months leading up to the June referendum.

.....

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published quarterly (or as updates arise) and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road, Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Contact Us

Phone: **250-871-6100** Email: **southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca** The project office is open to the public Thursdays, 12:00–4:00 p.m., 3843 Livingstone Road

Learn More

Webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer Social Media: @comoxvalleyrd

An update on wastewater management initiatives for Royston and Union Bay from the liquid waste planning project team.

Evaluating alternatives for wastewater management in south region

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is moving forward with next steps in identifying a solution for wastewater management in the Royston/Union Bay area.

Those steps include a significant review and evaluation of potential alternatives to the south sewer project before a proposed approach is brought forward for consideration to the CVRD board by late 2016/early 2017.

"We respect entirely the voice of the community that we heard through the referendum vote," states Ryan O'Grady, manager of liquid waste planning for the CVRD. "That's why we need to look at alternatives that will protect the natural environment in the area in a cost effective manner which the community supports."



- Alternatives could range from policy changes to amended infrastructure options or a combination of the two. A technical evaluation of possible paths forward is currently underway, along with discussions with stakeholders and partners.
- Key to this process is ongoing discussions with funding agencies who had committed contributions to the previously proposed project. The goal is to determine whether some of this money can be reallocated.
- The community will continue to be informed via these newsletters, website, and social media as updates are available. This may mean longer breaks between communications from the project team in the next six months as review work is underway.

Background information can still be found at <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/</u> <u>southsewer</u> or by contacting the project office (info on page 2).

You Ask, We Answer

Q: Now that the south sewer project is not moving forward as planned, what happens to all the work completed to date?

A: Regardless of how a wastewater solution is rolled out in the south region, the work done to date has provided both valuable foundational knowledge about the area as well as critical evaluation material that, depending on the selected alternative, could be directly relevant to future work. Feedback from residents over the process has also offered insights about potential approaches to be considered.

Most importantly, all of the work was necessary as part of the due diligence required to responsibly evaluate and assess the project as it was proposed.





Changes inside and out at project office

Residents in the Royston neighbourhood may have noticed some changes recently at the CVRD office on the corner of Royston and Livingstone roads. Some changes have been made both inside and outside of the office.

- Ryan O'Grady has started as the new manager of liquid waste planning. Ryan joins the CVRD with extensive experience in waste management working for government throughout western Canada. An engineer and agrologist (certified professional in areas including agriculture, environment and resource management), Ryan is excited to be part of the Comox Valley community.
- Kris La Rose has moved into a new position as senior manager of water and wastewater services. Ryan and Kris work in the engineering services branch of the CVRD, both reporting directly to Marc Rutten, general manager of engineering services.
- To reflect the many projects that the team on Livingstone Road are responsible for, the office has been renamed the liquid waste planning office. Signage changes are now complete on the outside of the building.

PlaceSpeak Completed

With nearly 100 participants and over 140 comments/ questions posted, the PlaceSpeak online discussion page is now wrapping up.

The online tool was rolled out as part of the consultation around the creation of the south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP). Feedback from many people, including those comments/questions shared on PlaceSpeak, helped with the creation of the first stage of the LWMP.

The discussion board was also a helpful tool during the referendum process, with many people asking questions about the project proposal in advance of making their voting decision.

While the review process continues, the project team wrapped up the PlaceSpeak forum as of September 30, 2016. Participants connected to the discussion topic were advised of the change at the beginning of September. All of the comments have been saved and will form part of the record for the south sewer project and south region LWMP.

Any questions or comments can still be shared with the project team via phone or email.



"I look forward to meeting members of the community in the coming months as we look at solutions for waste management both in Royston/ Union Bay and beyond."

- Ryan O'Grady, manager of liquid waste planning

REVISED OFFICE HOURS

For nearly two years the south sewer project office has had standing open office hours each week as part of the consultation and outreach for the LWMP. The project team continues to welcome questions or comments while the CVRD reviews and considers next steps for the area. In place of standing open office hours, residents are encouraged to contact the liquid waste planning office (contact info below) to set up a meeting with one of the team members to talk about a particular area of interest.

About this newsletter

This newsletter is issued by the Comox Valley Regional District. Its goal is to provide updates on wastewater management solutions in the south region.

This newsletter is published as updates arise and is distributed to property owners in the Baynes Sound area, posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and available via e-mail on request. Please send comments and questions to the south sewer project team at

southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or:

Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road, Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Contact Us

Phone: 250-871-6100 Email: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca

Learn More

Webpage: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer

Social Media: @comoxvalleyrd



PlaceSpeak.

4.0 Infoboards

- 4.1 WHY IS A SEWER SOLUTION NEEDED IN THE BAYNES SOUND AREA?
- 4.2 HISTORY OF SEWER PROGRESS IN ROYSTON/UNION BAY/BAYNES SOUND
- 4.3 SERVICE AREA MAP: STAGE ONE
- 4.4 INFOGRAPHIC: MOVING AHEAD TOGETHER
- 4.5 OPEN HOUSE QUESTIONNAIRE BOARD
- 4.6 UNDERSTANDING THE LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS
- 4.7 INTEGRATED RESOURCE RECOVERY FROM WASTEWATER
- 4.8 SSP STAGE 1 AND STAGE 2 LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING
- 4.9 SELECTING A PREFERRED WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SOLUTION
- 4.10 EFFLUENT DISCHARGE OPTIONS
- 4.11 NEXT STEPS: ANALYZING, EVALUATING AND COMPARING SCENARIOS
- 4.12 SHORTLISTED SCENARIO: A
- 4.13 SHORTLISTED SCENARIO: B
- 4.14 SHORTLISTED SCENARIO: C
- 4.15 SHORTLISTED SCENARIO: D
- 4.16 LWMP AREA MAP
- 4.17 WHY CHANGE IS NEEDED
- 4.18 COMPARISON OF COSTS
- 4.19 CVRD LWMP OVERALL PROCESS
- 4.20 SHORTLISTED SITES FOR TREATMENT PLANT
- 4.21 WWTP SITES: LONGLIST TO A SHORTLIST
- 4.22 PUMP STATION OPTIONS
- 4.23 LOOKING AT A PUMP STATION
- 4.24 PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANT SITE "A"
- 4.25 PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANT SITE "B"
- 4.26 PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANT SITE "C"
- 4.27 PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANT SITE "D"
- 4.28 TIMELINE
- 4.29 REVISED COSTS FOR RESIDENTS
- 4.30 WHY A REFERENDUM?
- 4.31 PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (P3)
- 4.32 LWMP AREA MAP



Why is a Sewer Solution Needed in the Baynes Sound Area?

Why Sewer? Why Now?

Funding has been granted and the wheels are turning: a regional solution to providing safe, reliable and cost-effective sewer treatment in the Baynes Sound area is in process. Here's why we need it.

ADDRESSING RISKS TO ENVIRONMENTAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH

All of the homes and businesses in Royston and Union Bay currently utilize on-site septic systems for wastewater treatment. This area exhibits poor native soil conditions and a high seasonal water table that are not conducive to the operation of on-site systems. These conditions are further impacted by extremely small lot sizes and high lot densities. Studies have shown that properties in these communities have been experiencing issues related to failing on-site septic systems for some time, thereby impacting water quality in the surrounding environment.



Understandably, many property owners in Royston and Union Bay who heard that a sewer service was on the horizon have not replaced aging systems, likely contributing to an increase in the number of failed on-site septic systems in these communities.

ENSURING SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

As more people choose this area as a place to live it's increasingly important to create effective systems for wastewater that meet or exceed environmental standards.

The population in the Comox Valley grew by 6.8% between 2006 and 2011, reaching a total of 63, 538 in 2011. The population forecast for 2030 is estimated to reach 84,500, with dwelling units increasing to 38,900, compared to 24,240 in 2006.

pulation forecasts are based on BC Stats' P.E.O.P.L.E methodology/model (Population Extrapolation for Organizational Planning with Less Error), using Statistics Canada census data up to 2006

CVRD POPULATION AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS



PROTECTING THE LOCAL ECONOMY

Aquaculture is an important part of the region. The many active aquaculture companies in Baynes Sound (plus a productive shellfish reserve) support species such as manila and littleneck clams, cockles and oysters. The industry creates local jobs, enhances the local economy, and attracts visitors and residents to the region. It exists in the region thanks to the productive waters of Baynes Sound. These need to be protected.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT HAS ARRIVED

The project passed a referendum in 2006 but it has taken years to find additional funding. In March 2013, the project received the largest (at the time of award) financial grant by the Union of BC Municipalities' Gas Tax Fund: \$15M. These dollars must be used by 2018. This funding and support from senior levels of government has been a long time coming and will reduce connection costs for residents. These dollars need to be used now, or owners will face a bigger bill in future.













Documenting steps leading to the award of the Gas Tax grant funding of \$15 million for the south sewer project...





1998

Special interest community group completes Union Bay LWMP Stage 1

1996

LWMP Stage 1 for Area 'A' completed, recommendations made for Stage 2

1979

Study completed to assess feasibility of sewage collection, treatment, and disposal system in Union Bay and Royston



Referendum for development of LWMP for Areas 'A', 'B', and 'C' is unsuccessful

••••











History of Sewer Progress in Royston / Union Bay / Baynes Sound



2002

Draft Royston LWMP Stage 1 report completed













2007-2013

Federal and provincial grant applications, resulting in successful funding announcement in March 2013

2011

Cumberland becomes co-applicant for Gas Tax Fund application











Service Area Map: Stage One



 $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$

will not be determined until 2015, however the first stage will involve providing sewer service to high-density areas in the core of Royston and Union Bay, and potentially Cumberland.

highlights in green the general areas that may receive sewer service during the first stage. The areas shaded grey may be added as part of future stages, however, the timing of these stages



Infographic: Moving Ahead Together

2013	CUMBERLAND	CVRD	KFN	
	Prepare to Take Part			
	Determine Costs	Determine Governance	Seek Additional Funding	
		PPP Canad	da Application	
	 Determine Council Interest Determine Community Interest 	 Establish Project Team Establish Project Office Set Up Project Advisory Group Set Up Select Committee 	 Treaty Negotiations 	
	Public Information (ongoing)			
	Project Updates Inform	nation Meetings • Newslette	ers • Online Information	
	Assess the Elements			
	 Cumberland LWMP Environmental Impact Study Public Consultation 	 CVRD LWMP Environmental Impact Study Public Consultation 	• Economic Development Plan	
	Negotiate Service Agreeme	nts		
	Draft Service Agreer	nents • Draft B	ylaws	
	Establish the Service			

















Baynes Sound is a great place to live and visit. What drew you here originally?

What elements, services or landmarks are important to you in the community now?













What questions do you have around bringing sewer service to Royston/Union Bay or Cumberland?













	Tallus abautyoursalf
ng In.	i en us about yourseij







Understanding the Liquid Waste Management Planning Process

The First Step: Liquid Waste Management Planning

Creating a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for Royston and Union Bay is the first step in moving towards the creation of a new wastewater collection and treatment system for this area. An approved LWMP authorizes a local government to proceed with measures identified in the plan.

TYPICAL THREE-STAGE PLANNING PROCESS

• Local government initiates plan voluntarily OR minister directs local government to prepare a plan

WHY IT'S THE FIRST STEP

- Local government passes a resolution
- Local government establishes advisory committees and informs the ministry and other agencies
- Determine scope of work for Stage 1 and initiate public consultation process

Stage 1 (Existing conditions, development projections, and list of options)

Draft Stage 1 report with input from advisory committees

Public review of draft report and the long list of options

Incorporate public feedback, evaluate and short list options, determine scope of work for Stage 2, revise draft Stage 1 report

Stage 2 (Detailed evaluation, selection of preferred option(s), and planning recommendations)

Draft Stage 2 report with input from advisory committees

Public review of draft report, short listed options, costs, and draft recommendations

Incorporate public feedback, evaluate options, determine scope of work for Stage 3, and revise draft Stage 2 report

Stage 3 (Plan summary with projected funding and implementation schedule)

Develop draft operational certificates, bylaws, and other Stage 3 plan components

Draft Stage 3 summary report with input from advisory committees

Continue public consultation and public review of draft Stage 3 summary report

Incorporate public

feedback and obtain

input and endorsement

The LWMP planning process is a common tool that BC communities use to plan and design new liquid waste management systems. It allows communities to develop their own solutions for liquid waste while meeting provincial regulatory requirements. The plan must ensure that the management and disposal of liquid waste is protective of public health and the environment. Public consultation plays an important part.

HOW WE'RE DOING THINGS DIFFERENTLY

The typical three-stage liquid waste management planning process involves starting at "square one" and moving through three stages. We are in the positive situation of having Stages 1 and 2 for the following communities:

Obtain input and endorsement from advisory committees, complete Stage 1 report

Submit Stage 1 report to ministry regional office for review

Obtain input and endorsement from advisory committees, complete Stage 2 report

Submit Stage 2 report to ministry regional office for review

from advisory committees to finalize Stage 3 summary report

> Submit Stage 3 report to ministry regional office for review

Resolution passed by local government to accept the final stage 3 summary report

Submit Stage 3 summary report to the minister for approval, with a copy to ministry regional office

When the minister issues a letter of approval, the Stage 3 report is approved as the LWMP. The minister may impose additional requirements as a condition of plan approval.

1996: Stage 1 Electoral Area 'A' LWMP 1998: Stage 1 **Union Bay LWMP 2001**: Draft Stage 2 **Union Bay LWMP 2002**: Stage 1 Royston LWMP

This means that certain elements of Stage 1 and Stage 2 for the LWMP planning process can be condensed. For example, some studies from past stages are still relevant and a lot of work has already been completed to determine potential treatment options. The result is that Stages 1 and 2 can be combined and completed in approximately 14 months, rather than two years.

















Integrated Resource Recovery From Wastewater

What Is Integrated Resource Recovery (IRR)?

Integrated Resource Recovery views waste as a possible resource rather than something to be disposed of. With an IRR approach, infrastructure plans are developed to maximize the value of waste resource streams.

This approach can provide local sources of energy, water and other resources, and reduces demand from external or new sources. Water, carbon, and nutrients are treated as renewable resources that can be recycled.

HOW A COMMUNITY CAN BENEFIT FROM IRR

- Reduced greenhouse gas emissions
- Reduced water consumption
- Reduced infrastructure requirements
- Reduced infrastructure costs

IRR: GREAT EXAMPLES LOCALLY, IN CRANBROOK, VICTORIA, AND VANCOUVER

Comox Valley Regional District: Creating marketable products from byproducts

SkyRocket is a soil amendment made of wood chips and biosolids—the solid waste particles remaining once wastewater has been treated. The CVRD reuses this wastewater byproduct in an innovative way to create nutrient-rich garden mulch that is marketed as "SkyRocket." This popular garden and lawn amendment earns rave reviews from gardeners, earns revenue for the regional district and diverts matter from the landfill.



City of Cranbrook: Using reclaimed water for crop irrigation

The City of Cranbrook operates a sustainable wastewater treatment system that uses reclaimed wastewater to irrigate feed crops and support a cattle industry. The treatment facility saves dollars for residents, costing approximately \$12 per capita to operate compared to \$100-\$300 for conventional systems. Greenhouse gases from the sewage treatment system have been reduced by 75% a year and annual energy savings of 600,000 to 700,000 kw hours have been realized.

Dockside Green: Treated wastewater is reused in households, landscaping

Dockside Green, a community development in Victoria treats 100% of its sewage on-site and uses treated water for flushing toilets, landscape irrigation and water features. Storm water is treated through a green roof system that flows water via connected naturalized creeks and waterways. These and other innovative tactics have made it possible for the development to reduce its total potable water consumption rate to 65% less than for traditional developments.

False Creek Community, Metro Vancouver: Heat recovered from sewer system is put to work

In Vancouver's False Creek, a Neighbourhood Energy Utility was built to recover heat directly from the municipal sewer system. It also utilizes heat from rooftop solar modules on three Olympic Village buildings. These innovative heat recovery systems provide space heating and hot water to 16,000 residents in the Olympic Village and surrounding area.



CONVENTIONAL WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT VS INTEGRATED RESOURCE RECOVERY

RESOURCE	WHEN IS IT WASTE?	CONVENTIONAL APPROACH	INTEGRATED RESOURCE RECOVERY APPROACH
WASTE WATER	When reaching collection systems	Collect, treat, and discharge to receiving environment	 Collect, treat, and reuse water for regulator-approved non-potable purposes Heat recovery
BIOSOLIDS	When produced by wastewater treatment plants	Collect and landfill, or apply to industrial landscaping	 Recover nutrients through regulator-approved use of residuals; and Collect and divert to composting or anaerobic digestion to produce biomethane



















Project Phase

Form Steering and Advisory Committees
Public Consultation Phase 1
Identify Scenarios
Environmental Impact Study (EIS) Part 1
Screen Scenarios
Public Consultation Phase 2
Develop Comparative Evaluation
Select Preferred Scenarios
Complete Draft Stage 1 & 2 LWMP
Complete Draft EIS Part 2
Public Consultation Phase 3
Finalize Stage 1 & 2 LWMP Report
Finalize EIS Report
Submit to Ministry of Environment









South Sewer Project – Stage 1 and Stage 2 Liquid Waste Management Planning



	2015					
C	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN
			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
•••••					••••••	
• • • • • • • • •		•••••				
•••••			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			••••••
		•••••			•••••	
•••••						
• • • • • • • • •						
•••••			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	
• • • • • • • • •						
• • • • • • • • • • •						









Screening and Evaluation of Wastewater Management Options

As the public advisory committee (PAC) and the technical advisory committee (TAC) identify potential options for wastewater management in the south region, there is a process of screening and evaluation that is required to determine which will be the best long-term solution for the area. This graphic shows that process.



























JANUARY 2015

January 21 **Public Event** PAC/TAC Meeting #5

Recommendation of a preferred wastewater management








From Nine Options to Four: How a long list became a short list.

Guided by the CVRD's consulting engineering team, Associated Engineering, the public and technical advisory committees met to engage in a screening exercise of effluent discharge options.

	Discharge Options	N
	OPTION 1 Discharge to Baynes Sound	
	OPTION 2 Discharge to Strait of Georgia, beyond Sandy Island	
	OPTION 3 Discharge to Strait of Georgia, off Cape Lazo*	
	OPTION 4 Connect to the existing Courtenay-Comox CVWPCC	
	OPTION 5 Discharge to the Trent River/ Washer (Hart) Creek	
	OPTION 6 Ground discharge to a single location	
	OPTION 7 Ground discharge to multiple locations	
	OPTION 8 Discharge to Ground at Depth	
	OPTION 9 Management and improvement of existing on-site systems	
LEGEND	Green: Sufficient information exists at this time to make a 'pass' judgment on this screening criteria, and a 'pass' has been assigned.	









The exercise allowed the committees to provide feedback on the attributes or "show stoppers" that would eliminate an option from further consideration. The outcome of this exercise

Of the nine discharge options identified, four was the development of a shortlist of discharge options to be advanced for further development. were advanced for further development by the The table below shows the judgment each option LWMP steering committee: Option 1, Option 2, received under a defined set of screening criteria. Option 3, and Option 8.

Screening Criteria **Nunicipal Wastewater** Permitting **Other Regulatory Regulations (MWR)** Implications and Approvals N/A N/A N/A N/A

*Original Option 3 was modified by the LWMP steering committee to include a combined rather than separate outfall with the CVWPCC off Cape Lazo.



Yellow: Insufficient information exists at this time to make either a 'pass' or a 'fail' judgment. Further investigation could move it to green or red.



Red: Sufficient information exists at this time to make a 'fail' judgment on this screening criteria and a 'fail' has been assigned.













Effluent Discharge Options





N/A: This screening category isn't applicable to the option.







Next Steps: Analyzing, Evaluating and Comparing Scenarios

There is still work to be done before a preferred scenario can be selected.

The scenarios will undergo a comparative evaluation, which includes a triple bottom-line analysis (TBL) and consideration of risk factors. This board outlines that process, highlighting how information contributes to different stages of this evaluation.



SCENARIOS UNDER DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

















Shortlisted Scenarios: SCENARIO A

SCENARIO A

Discharge to



Baynes Sound



WASTEWATER **COLLECTION AND** CONVEYANCE

- Wastewater collected by gravity and pumped to a new south region treatment facility.
- A total of 8 pump stations to be constructed in three phases.



- Advanced secondary treatment to produce high quality effluent and exceed regulatory requirements.
- Treatment facility to be sited in the south region, location to be determined winter 2015/2016.
- Treatment capacity includes flows from the Village of Cumberland with initial treatment capacity allowing for growth in both jurisdictions to 2035.



- Discharge of treated effluent into Baynes Sound.
- Will include an environmental impact study (EIS) following provincial guidelines to confirm that the discharge will not adversely affect human or ecological health.

COST ESTIMATE

Total Cost **\$49.5 M** Cost per lot, assuming 951 lots* **\$22,900** Annual operations and maintenance costs per lot \$350



Cost estimates are based on a preliminary design with an accuracy of +/- 30% for most capital components (some elements have been developed to a conceptual level with an accuracy of +/-50%).

* Assuming a five per cent interest rate and 20-year borrowing term.



- Energy recovery system at Royston pump station.
- Heat recovery from treated effluent and reuse at the treatment facility; exploration of off-site opportunities for the same. Assumption: cost associated with an off-site system to be covered by the end user.
- Reuse of reclaimed water. Assumption: cost associated with this system to be covered by the end user.
- Beneficial reuse of nutrients by incorporating biosolids into the existing SkyRocket facility.





















Shortlisted Scenarios: SCENARIO B

SCENARIO B

Discharge to Strait of Georgia



beyond Sandy Island



WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND CONVEYANCE

- Wastewater collected by gravity and pumped to a new south region treatment facility.
- A total of 8 pump stations to be constructed in three phases.



- Secondary treatment to meet the regulatory effluent requirements.
- Treatment facility to be sited in the south region, location to be determined winter 2015/2016.
- Treatment capacity includes flows from the Village of Cumberland with initial treatment capacity allowing for growth in both jurisdictions to 2035.



- Discharge into Strait of Georgia, beyond Sandy Island.
- Will include an environmental impact study (EIS) following provincial guidelines to confirm that the discharge will not adversely affect human or ecological health.

COST ESTIMATE

Total Cost\$58.5 MCost per lot, assuming 951 lots*\$26,900Annual operations and maintenance costs per lot\$390



Cost estimates are based on a preliminary design with an accuracy of +/-30% for most capital components (some elements have been developed to a conceptual level with an accuracy of +/-50%).

* Assuming a five per cent interest rate and 20-year borrowing term; Note: If selected, Scenarios B, C, and D would need a scope change request approved by the Union of BC Municipalities to confirm commitment of GSPF funding towards these options.



- Energy recovery system at Royston pump station.
- Heat recovery from treated effluent and reuse at the treatment facility; exploration of off-site opportunities for the same. Assumption: cost associated with an off-site system to be covered by the end user.
- Reuse of reclaimed water. Assumption: cost associated with this system to be covered by the end user.
- Beneficial reuse of nutrients by incorporating biosolids into the existing SkyRocket facility.



















Shortlisted Scenarios: SCENARIO C

SCENARIO C

Discharge to Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo





WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND CONVEYANCE

- Wastewater collected by gravity and pumped to a new south region treatment facility.
- A total of 8 pump stations to be constructed in three phases.



- Secondary treatment to meet the regulatory effluent requirements.
- Treatment facility to be sited in the south region, location to be determined winter 2015/2016.
- Treatment capacity includes flows from the Village of Cumberland with initial treatment capacity allowing for growth in both jurisdictions to 2035.



- Discharge into Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo.
- Connection to the upgraded outfall at the Comox Valley Water Pollution Control Centre (CVWPCC) with the SSP contributing capital costs proportional to relative flows.
- Will include an environmental impact study (EIS) following provincial guidelines to confirm that the discharge will not adversely affect human or ecological health.



COST ESTIMATE

Total Cost\$56 MCost per lot, assuming 951 lots*\$25,800Annual operations and maintenance costs per lot\$390



Cost estimates are based on a preliminary design with an accuracy of +/-30% for most capital components (some elements have been developed to a conceptual level with an accuracy of +/-50%).

* Assuming a five per cent interest rate and 20-year borrowing term; Note: If selected, Scenarios B, C, and D would need a scope change request approved by the Union of BC Municipalities to confirm commitment of GSPF funding towards these options.



- Energy recovery system at Royston pump station.
- Heat recovery from treated effluent and reuse at the treatment facility; exploration of off-site opportunities for the same. Assumption: cost associated with an off-site system to be covered by the end user.
- Reuse of reclaimed water. Assumption: cost associated with this system to be covered by the end user.
- Beneficial reuse of nutrients by incorporating biosolids into the existing SkyRocket facility.





















Shortlisted Scenarios: SCENARIO D

SCENARIO D

Discharge to Depth





WASTEWATER **COLLECTION AND** CONVEYANCE

- Wastewater collected by gravity and pumped to a new south region treatment facility.
- A total of 8 pump stations to be constructed in three phases.



- Advanced secondary treatment to produce high quality effluent .
- Treatment facility to be sited in the south region, location to be determined winter 2015/2016.
- Treatment capacity includes flows from the Village of Cumberland with initial treatment capacity allowing for growth in both jurisdictions to 2035.



- Approximately six discharge wells 300-600m apart.
- Will include an environmental impact study (EIS) following provincial guidelines to confirm that the discharge will not adversely affect human or ecological health.

COST ESTIMATE



Cost estimates are based on a preliminary design with an accuracy of +/- 30% for most capital components (some elements have been developed to a conceptual level with an accuracy of +/-50%).

Total Cost **\$57.5** M Cost per lot, assuming 951 lots* **\$26,400** Annual operations and maintenance costs per lot \$350

* Assuming a five per cent interest rate and 20-year borrowing term; Note: If selected, Scenarios B, C, and D would need a scope change request approved by the Union of BC Municipalities to confirm commitment of GSPF funding towards these options.



- Energy recovery system at Royston pump station.
- Heat recovery from treated effluent and reuse at the treatment facility; exploration of off-site opportunities for the same. Assumption: cost associated with an off-site system to be covered by the end user.
- Reuse of reclaimed water. Assumption: cost associated with this system to be covered by the end user.
- Beneficial reuse of nutrients by incorporating biosolids into the existing SkyRocket facility.





















The map below outlines the Comox Valley Regional District's south region liquid waste management plan area, the area with potential for future expansion of sewer service, and the phase one south sewer service area.



























DEVELOPMENT OF A SOUTH REGION LWMP ALLOWS THE COMMUNITIES of Royston and Union Bay to select and authorize a wastewater management solution for their area. It also facilitates future wastewater and rainwater management planning in the rural areas of the greater liquid waste management plan area.

LEGEND



Liquid Waste Management Plan Area

Potential Service Area

Phase One



Horn







Why Change is Needed

Why is change needed?

Evidence of failing on-site sewage systems in the Baynes Sound area makes it clear that change is required for wastewater management in Royston/ Union Bay. The high concentration of small lots in this area combined with poor soil conditions is increasing the risk of failing systems to human health and the environment.

Why can't we just better manage on-site systems?

Alternatives to a community wastewater system for the area were evaluated by the public and technical advisory committees (PAC and TAC), including better management of existing on-site sewage systems in the area. This option would include additional monitoring and maintenance requirements that would be enforced through new CVRD bylaws to augment the BC Sewerage System Regulations. Based on the issues outlined below and the challenges many in the community would face conforming to new standards, the PAC and TAC recommended that this option not be developed further. Listed below are some of the challenges with on-site wastewater treatment in the area.

Why is change Why not apply change

needed?

EVIDENCE OF ELEVATED COLIFORM COUNTS IN BAYNES SOUND

- Water Quality Monitoring has shown elevated fecal coliform counts in Baynes Sound near shoreline
- Public health risk
- Impact on shellfish harvesting

to existing systems?

"TIGHT" SOILS AND SHALLOW WATER TABLES

- Test pits and drilled wells show clay and silt layers near surface
- Much (80-90%) of the area underlain by shallow till, fine-grained marine sediments, or shallow bedrock (Payne Engineering Geology 2005)
- These soils lead to shallow, perched water table during wet season
- There are pockets of acceptable areas, but significant variability throughout the area

REGULATIONS ARE TIGHTENING

- Sewerage System Regulation (2010) and Standard Practice Manual (2014) recently updated
- Design and maintenance standards more restrictive than in past
- Stronger guidelines constrain smaller properties.
 Ex: >30 m from well (standard); >3 m from property line (guideline)
- Must have 1.5 m vertical separation from seasonal high water table
- New Water Sustainability Act will increase groundwater protection in BC
- These changes make it much less likely that a new type 1 system would be approved in the area

EVIDENCE THAT SYSTEMS ARE NOT FUNCTIONING CORRECTLY

- Payne Engineering Geology (2009) study found that 25% of areas tested
 - showed evidence of failing systems (i.e. down-gradient groundwater contamination)
- Sampled after a dry winter

 author predicted a higher
 failure rate in a typical winter
- By comparison, similar study at Cape Lazo found zero failures
- Island Health has expressed opinion that Royston and Union Bay should have a community sewer system



ON-SITE COSTS ARE SIGNIFICANT

• Maintaining and replacing on-site systems is costly. If the use of on-site sewage systems for wastewater management were to continue, additional maintenance and monitoring requirements could be enforced by the CVRD and poorly functioning systems would be required to be replaced.

REPLACEMENT COSTS	
New Type 1 system (standard tank & drain field)	\$10,200 - \$15,500
New Type 2 system (additional treatment)	\$18,700 - \$29,400
New Type 3 system (additional treatment sensitive area)	\$47,100 - \$60,000+
MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING COSTS	
Annual maintenance and monitoring	\$100/year (Type 1) up to \$800/year (Type 2/3)
Septic tank pumping	\$180 - \$600 as required (depends on tank size)
Private inspection	\$350 - \$600+ as required

Sources: Capital Regional District (2014), Robson (2010), and discussions with BC ROWPs.



















Comparison of Costs

These tables outline the estimated project costs and costs to residents for each scenario.

They are preliminary estimates developed to assist the public and the technical and public advisory committees (TAC and PAC) in comparing the shortlisted scenarios for wastewater management. The estimates are based on a preliminary design with an accuracy of +/- 30 per cent for most capital components (certain components have been developed to a conceptual level of accuracy at +/- 50%). Costs will change as the concepts are further developed.

Project Costs	SCENARIO A – Baynes Sound	SCENARIO B – beyond Sandy Island	SCENARIO C – off Cape Lazo	SCENARIO D – Ground
Total Phase One Project Costs	\$ 49.5 M	\$58.5 M	\$56 M	\$57.5 M

GSPF Gas Tax Grant (all project partners)	\$15M	\$15M	\$15M	\$15M
Community Works Fund Gas Tax Grant (CVRD only)	\$2M	\$2M	\$2M	\$2M
Total Electoral Area 'A' Project Cost with Grants	\$22 M	\$25.5 M	\$24.5 M	\$25 M
Collection Costs (with grant)	\$15.5 M	\$15.5 M	\$15.5 M	\$15.5 M
Treatment Costs (with grant)	\$6 M	\$5.5 M	\$5.5 M	\$7 M
Discharge Costs (with grant)	\$0.5 M	\$4.5 M	\$3.5 M	\$2.5 M
Total Electoral Area 'A' Capital Costs per Lot	\$22,900	\$26,900	\$25,800	\$26,400

CAPITAL COST ASSUMPTIONS

- The total phase one capital costs will be shared amongst project participants in the CVRD's Electoral Area 'A' and the Village of Cumberland based on an approved governance structure that would see each participating area pay only for those infrastructure components that directly benefit them.
- For estimation purposes, costs have been apportioned based on the number of properties in each participating area. The actual apportionment method has yet to be determined.
- The total property count for the phase one service area is estimated at 2,285 properties, this includes 951 properties in Electoral Area 'A' and 1,334 properties in Cumberland.
- If selected, Scenarios B, C, and D would need a scope change request approved by the Union of BC Municipalities to confirm commitment of GSPF funding towards these options.

Residents' Costs	SCENARIO A – Baynes Sound	SCENARIO B – beyond Sandy Island	SCENARIO C – off Cape Lazo	SCENARIO D – Ground
One time cost of connecting home to system at property line	\$1,000 - \$2,000	\$1,000 - \$2,000	\$1,000 - \$2,000	\$1,000 - \$2,000
Annual Debt Repayment (Capital)*	\$1,980	\$2,330	\$2,240	\$2,290
Estimated Annual Operations and Maintenance	\$350	<u>\$390</u>	<u>\$ 390</u>	\$350

*Other repayment options for the capital portion of project costs may be available such as lump sum payment. *Based on a five per cent interest rate and a 20-year borrowing term. Actual financing rate and term will be determined at the time of borrowing.

























CVRD LWMP Overall Process

Within the three stage LWMP process, stage 1 involves high-level investigations that examine the current wastewater management strategies. Stage 2 uses information developed during stage 1 in conjunction with supplemental studies to evaluate specific questions related to future wastewater management strategies. Given the extensive level of background work that has been completed to date, the CVRD has chosen to combine stages 1 and 2 of the LWMP.

The following provides the anticipated sequence of events and tasks that will be completed throughout the combined stages 1 and 2 of the LWMP process.

Establish public advisory committee (PAC), technical advisory committee (TAC), and steering committee (SC)

Establish combined stage 1 and 2 LWMP framework

Develop terms of reference

Prepare background information

Public consultation

for the LWMP and EIS part 1

for the LWMP process

Events: PAC/TAC meeting #1,

SC meeting #1

Event: Public open house #1

Develop and screen wastewater management options

Collects raw elements (interests, ideas, values)

Event: PAC/TAC meeting #2 Identify discharge options

Screen discharge options based on pass/fail criteria to develop shortlist

Public consultation

Events: PAC/TAC meeting #3, SC meeting #2 **Event:** Public open house #2

Conduct comparative analysis

Develop wastewater management scenarios based on discharge options

Events: PAC/TAC meeting #4

Complete triple bottom line (TBL) analysis of shortlisted scenarios. Identify preferred solution

Event: PAC/TAC meeting #5, SC meeting #3



Develop LWMP for preferred scenario





Shortlisted Sites for Treatment Plant

Finding the right site for the south sewer project's wastewater treatment plant

Location options for a new treatment plant have been narrowed down from 500 properties, to an 8-site long-list, to these four shortlisted options.

Project staff have filtered potential sites through a number of criteria including: lot size, price and availability, technical requirements, environmental factors and neighbourhood considerations. Thoughts? Please provide feedback. Comments will be considered along with further assessment of costs and technical feasibility. The preferred site will be selected at the end of March.

















WWTP Sites: Longlist to a Shortlist

From eight options to four – how a longlist became a shortlist

Using the most critical criteria (ie: lot size, usable area) was the first step to narrowing the list of potential sites for a treatment plant. Once a longlist of eight sites was identified, the properties were assessed considering additional factors such as construction viability and neighbourhood impacts. With those factors included, four lots have been shortlisted. They are the four that have at least two 'green' indicators and no 'red' ones.

Wastewater	Sci	reening Crite	eria	
Treatment Plant	Fnaineerina/	Neighbourhood/	Financial/	Notes
Site Options	Technical	Environmental	Legal	





Proximity to neighbours, availability flagged

Shortlisted as "Option D" Potential requirement for subdivision

LEGEND



Green: Sufficient information exists at this time to suggest this property meets the requirements of this category.

Yellow: While this property meets the technical requirements of this category, additional considerations must be made to consider moving forward.

Red: This property does not meet requirements in this category.





















Each community serviced by the south sewer project will require a pump station

Pump stations are relatively small pieces of infrastructure required to move collected wastewater to the treatment plant. They need to be located at the lowest elevations of each community. These may be Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) right-of-ways, park accesses or private parcels. For MOTI sites, applications are required that include detailed design. The selection process is underway, but two options for each community are shown below. Neighbours are being consulted directly about the proposed locations.











PREFERRED OPTION*

KILMARNOCK





PREFERRED OPTION

ROYSTON



PREFERRED OPTION*



OPTION 2

*Public washrooms proposed as part of this facility























Looking at a Pump Station

Depending on the community needs and the required infrastructure, the look of a pump station can vary

Pump stations come in many different shapes and sizes, but they do have some important qualities in common. The infrastructure for a pump station is largely underground – removing noise or odours as factors of concern.

The above ground facility can vary, depending on the demands on it: it could be simply buffered with landscaping, or a small hut could be constructed to protect the equipment.

While the technical parameters for the three pump stations are established, the final configuration and look of each pump station will be determined in part based on feedback from the public.

These images are shared to help demonstrate to the community the range of options available.

and the second s



SCHOONER COVE DRIVE, REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO



ANDOVER ROAD, REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO







MCDONALD ROAD, CAMPBELL RIVER



MILLARD ROAD, COURTENAY





















Proposed Treatment Plant Site "A"





Road Site

ABOUT THE PROPERTY

- Address: 4171 Briardale Rd.
- Total Size: 7.828 acres
- Usable Space: 3.25 acres
- Meets threshold criteria (size, usable area, freedom from contamination, cost, availability)

- As the northernmost property, the property offers potential construction cost savings due to the shorter length required on the forcemain.
- It is close to the Trent River and is bordered by a 2-acre park.
- Potentially affected by shoreline and agricultural protection areas.
- At a usable area of 3.25 acres, this property is at the lower end of viable property size for constructing the proposed wastewater treatment plant.





Proposed Treatment Plant Site "B"





Maur Corner (westside Hwy. 19A)

ABOUT THE PROPERTY

- Roll Number: 771-10837.000
- Total Size: 16.8 acres
- Usable Space: 12.8 acres
- Meets threshold criteria (size, usable area, freedom from contamination, cost, availability)

- Good buffering potential with limited community impact during construction.
- Three residential acreage parcels to the north.
- Hwy 19A frontage.
- Small riparian area along Beacon Creek in SW corner.





Proposed Treatment Plant Site "C"





Creek Property

ABOUT THE PROPERTY

- Roll Number: 771-10544.000
- Total Size: 20.3 acres
- Usable Space: 7.8 acres, 2.2 acres (either side of creek)
- Meets threshold criteria (size, usable area, freedom from contamination, cost, availability)

- Good buffering potential with limited community impact during construction.
- Hwy 19A frontage.
- Usable area located in southwest portion of property, requiring construction of access road and crossing of Beacon Creek. Potential impact on construction costs.
- Significant riparian area along Creek and notable amount of low, wet areas.





Proposed Treatment Plant Site "D"



SHORT LIST OPTION D

K'ómoks



First Nation Land

ABOUT THE PROPERTY

- Roll Number: 771-10544.025
- Total Size: 68.2 acres
- Usable area: Three areas are deemed usable: 9.2, 31.1, 8.7 acres
- Meets threshold criteria (size, usable area, freedom from contamination, cost, availability)

- Two usable areas have frontages on Hwy 19A, one would require road construction crossing Beacon Creek.
- Excellent buffering potential, no neighbourhood disruption during construction phase.
- Not able to subdivide under current zoning, though potential in the future.





What's been done and what's to come

In 2006, residents in Royston and Union Bay voted in favour of building a community wastewater system, based on 2/3funding. The project has come a long way since then – below is a brief overview of the steps taken since that referendum, and some stages that are still to come.

MARCH 2013

\$15M BOOST The CVRD, with partners K'ómoks First Nation and Cumberland, receive \$15M grant from the Union of BC Municipalities' Strategic Priorities Fund. An additional \$2M was allocated from the CVRD's gas tax allocation.

FEBRUARY 2015

CAPE LAZO CHOSEN An outfall that would connect with the existing Comox Valley wastewater system outfall at Cape Lazo was selected as the preferred option.

2007-2011

APPLICATIONS AND REVIEW

Multiple stages of federal and provincial grant applications result in creation of three-way partnership between CVRD, K'ómoks First Nation and Village of Cumberland and proposal of staged construction.







JULY 2014



SPRING 2018

MARCH 2016

OPEN HOUSE #3 The Public is updated about the project plans, reduced cost, P3 option and siting locations.

CONSTRUCTION BEGINS Construction of the treatment plant and collection system begins once the procurement process is complete and environmental approvals are obtained.

JUNE 2016

REFERENDUM If initiated, residents and owners will be asked to vote on cost implications from service establishment and long term P3 operating contract borrowing for the project's construction.

NOVEMBER 2015

PARTNERS CHANGE The CVRD and K'ómoks First Nation commit to continuing the south sewer project after Cumberland withdraws to restart their own LWMP.

PLAN LAUNCHED The CVRD launches the South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) – a comprehensive planning process focused on public consultation.













AUGUST 2016

P3 YES OR NO PPP Canada will decide by end of summer whether the project is a successful fit for their funding/support program.

Timeline



FALL 2016-2017

PROCUREMENT PROCESS IS UNDERTAKEN

Procurement process is undertaken to shortlist and then select the preferred project consortium (or bid team) to design, build, finance, operate and maintain the project over the 30 year operating agreement.











Revised costs and more grants have reduced the estimated connection cost per household

In January 2015, the south sewer project team introduced preliminary cost estimates for home owners to connect in the proposed services areas. Since then, the project has changed to remove Cumberland – reducing the capital cost and the number of connections. Also, additional funding has been identified. As a result, the estimated cost-per-connection for Area A residents has been reduced by over \$5,000.

S Project Costs*	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015)	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016)
Collection Costs	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 24,000,000
Treatment Costs	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000
Discharge Costs	\$ 11,000,000	\$10,500,000
Total Phase One Project Costs	\$ 56,000,000	\$ 54,500,000
*Costs are based on cost apportionment for the 951 properties in t	he phase one service area. Estimates are based on prelimi	nary design with an accuracy of +/- 30 per cent.
Project Grants	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015)	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016)
Project Grants GSPF Gas Tax Grant	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015) \$15,000,000	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016) \$ 15,000,000
Project GrantsGSPF Gas Tax GrantPublic Private Partnership (PPP) Canada (25%)	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015) \$15,000,000 N/A	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016) \$ 15,000,000 \$ 13,735,406
Project GrantsGSPF Gas Tax GrantPublic Private Partnership (PPP) Canada (25%)Cumberland Contribution	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015) \$15,000,000 N/A \$14,100,000	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016) \$ 15,000,000 \$ 13,735,406 \$ 0
Project GrantsGSPF Gas Tax GrantPublic Private Partnership (PPP) Canada (25%)Cumberland ContributionK'ómoks First Nation Contribution	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015) \$15,000,000 N/A \$14,100,000 \$0	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016) \$15,000,000 \$13,735,406 \$0 \$5,000,000
Project GrantsGSPF Gas Tax GrantPublic Private Partnership (PPP) Canada (25%)Cumberland ContributionK'ómoks First Nation ContributionCommunity Works Fund Gas Tax Grant (CVRD Only)	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015) \$15,000,000 N/A \$14,100,000 \$ 0 \$2,000,000	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016) \$ 15,000,000 \$ 13,735,406 \$ 0 \$ 5,000,000 \$ 1,500,000

Cost for Area A Residents	ORIGINAL SCENARIO C (2015)	TODAY'S ESTIMATES (2016)
Total Electoral Area 'A' Capital Costs per Lot with Grant	\$ 25,800	\$ 20,250
Annual Debt Repayment (Capital)*	\$ 2,240	\$1,320
Operations & Maintenance Cost per Connection	\$ 390	\$ 618
Monthly Costs to Area A Property Owners	\$ 220	\$ 160
One time costs for residents to connect home to property line**	\$1,000-\$4,000	\$1,000-\$4,000

* 2015 estimates based on a 20-year repayment period, where revised estimates for 2016 are based on 30-years. ** Cost of pipe installation on individual property and septic decommissioning will vary depending on location of pipe, landscaping and lot layout.

















Why a Referendum?

In March 2016, the CVRD Board will decide whether to initiate a referendum about the south sewer project

A referendum would allow residents and property owners to vote on whether they approve of the project moving ahead: specifically in relation to the total cost implications for Area A property owners and the key terms of the P3 agreement.

If the board agrees to a referendum, a formal legal process will begin, culminating in a vote in the middle of June.





Referendum?

THE PLANNING PROCESS HAS PROGRESSED

The planning process has progressed and significant grant funding is now potentially available to the project. However, grant funding deadlines mean that there are a list of requirements to be completed soon. In order to confirm the community's commitment in a timely way so that those commitments can be met, a referendum has been recommended.

What about the 2006 referendum?

IN 2006, THE COMMUNITY VOTED ON – AND PASSED – A REFERENDUM ON BORROWING TO PAY FOR THE VERSION OF THE SOUTH SEWER PROJECT

In 2006, the community voted on – and passed – a referendum on borrowing to pay for the version of the south sewer project under consideration at the time. The project did not go forward because there was not enough grant funding available. Although significant grant funding is now likely, since then, regulations have increased, construction prices have increased, and the need for an outfall has been added to the cost estimate. With 10 years gone by, the CVRD is looking to renew the mandate provided by the community last time.

What happens if the referendum passes?

THERE ARE STILL HURDLES THE CVRD TEAM WILL HAVE TO GET OVER

There are still hurdles the CVRD team will have to get over if the referendum passes – most critically, the confirmation of all the funding sources that the approved borrowing amount will be based on. If all of these are confirmed, the final design and procurement stages would begin, leading to the start of construction in spring 2018.

What happens if the referendum fails?

THE STATUS QUO IS NOT AN OPTION

The impact of failing septic systems in the south region cannot be ignored and the CVRD, partner K'ómoks First Nation, and public, environmental and industry stakeholders agree that the status quo is not an option. If this referendum fails, the CVRD may look to emulate what the Capital Regional District has done and implement a bylaw to require mandatory monitoring, reporting, and if required, replacement of existing systems.



















Public-Private Partnerships (P3)

Looking to P3 to reduce costs for residents

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is considering the potential of delivering the south sewer project as a public-private partnership under the guidance and financial support of PPP Canada.

It's an option being increasingly considered by local governments to provide complex infrastructure projects to residents in a more affordable way.

What is a P3?

What's in it for the private

THE PUBLIC SECTOR RETAINS FULL OWNERSHIP OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE

P3s are performance-based contracts for the delivery of major public infrastructure. Typically, the private sector takes the lead in designing, building and sometimes operating the infrastructure. There are a range of models for P3s that vary in the amount of private-sector involvement in both pre and post-construction phases – however a key characteristic of all agreements is the retention of public ownership and transfer of risk to the private sector partners over the construction period and in some cases a defined period of operations and maintenance of the infrastructure.

What is PPP Canada?

ENCOURAGING P3S WITH GRANTS AND SUPPORT

PPP Canada is a federal Crown corporation created in 2009 to encourage P3s as a way of delivering public infrastructure with better value, timeliness and accountability to taxpayers. PPP Canada accomplishes this by leveraging incentives such as grant funding, providing expertise and promoting best practices. For more information, visit www.p3canada.ca

sector?

APPEAL IN RETURN ON INVESTMENT AND SECURITY

Private partners in a P3 do make a profit but it doesn't necessarily mean an increase in cost for the public sector. Private companies are motivated to find innovative approaches and efficiencies so they can realize some profit, while still putting forward a competitive bid. This often results in lowering the cost of the project for the public sector as well. P3s are also appealing to the private sector because working with established partners like local governments offers stability and security.

Why is a P3 being considered for the south sewer project?

ALONG WITH TRANSFERRING RISKS OF CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION TO A PRIVATE CONTRACTOR, A P3 PROVIDES OTHER OPPORTUNITIES;

- The critical opportunity is the reduced capital costs through grant opportunities with PPP Canada. A 25 per cent grant towards the capital cost of the south sewer project equals nearly \$14-million in grants reducing hook-up costs significantly.
- P3s provide a much higher level of cost and schedule certainty so costs will be completely predictable to the public.
- P3s that include requirements for operations of the facility postconstruction will often lead to more innovative projects that create long-term efficiencies. They can also insulate the public sector from challenges often faced in the early operations of a new facility.
- Savings can be incurred by transferring most of the risks to the private sector, and efficiencies born as a result of the competitive procurement process. These savings can significantly reduce the capital costs of the project.











































LWMP Area Map

This map outlines the Comox Valley Regional District's phase one service area for the proposed south sewer project, potential future expansion areas, general treatment plant area and selected outfall.







5.0 Infosheets

- 5.1 GLOSSARY: SOUTH REGION LWMP
- 5.2 FAQ: SOUTH REGION LWMP & THE SOUTH SEWER PROJECT
- 5.3 Q & A: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND THE SOUTH SEWER PROJECT
- 5.4 Q & A: CONSIDERING A MARINE DISCHARGE
- 5.5 BACKGROUNDER: SOUTH SEWER PROJECT PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS
- 5.6 BACKGROUNDER: SOUTH SEWER PROJECT REFERENDUM
- 5.7 Q & A: SOUTH SEWER PROJECT REFERENDUM PROPOSAL NOT APPROVED

GLOSSARY South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan

Biosolids

Stabilized organic solids resulting from a municipal wastewater treatment process. After treatment and processing, biosolids that meet the requirements of the Organic Matter Recycling Regulation (OMRR) can be recycled and applied to land as a fertilizer to improve and maintain productive soils.

Development Cost Charges (DCCs)

Funds collected to offset a portion of servicing costs incurred as a direct result of new development. DCCs are applied as one-time charges and are usually collected from developers at the time of subdivision approval or at the time of issuing a building permit.

Effluent

Liquid resulting from the treatment of wastewater.

Environmental Impact Study (EIS)

A review of the potential effects of the treated effluent discharge on the receiving environment or human health. The study is used to refine the treatment and effluent dispersal systems, and to identify other mitigation measures to avoid or minimize effects. In addition to considering the discharge, the EIS addresses potential effects of the project "footprint" and develops the environmental monitoring program.

Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP)

A process for evaluating and selecting community specific solutions for wastewater management that meet or exceed existing regulations. Authorization to develop LWMPs is provided for under the *Environmental Management Act* (EMA). Final plans are approved by the Minister of Environment only after sufficient public and stakeholder consultation has taken place.

Municipal Wastewater Regulations (MWR)

Provides guidance on meeting the current standards and requirements for treatment, reuse and disposal of wastewater. It applies to all discharges of domestic effluent except those regulated under the *Public Health Act* Sewerage System Regulation and discharges from single or multi-family dwellings.

Public Advisory Committee (PAC)

The PAC is an advisory group who will consider public opinion related to the LWMP and EIS and provide feedback to the steering committee. The PAC is made up of roughly 12 people representing key public and community stakeholders with interests in the project area.

Reclaimed water

Reclaimed water is water that has received treatment to make it suitable for one of the applications identified in the MWR and is actually being used for that application.

Secondary treatment

Secondary treatment is a broad term referring to the many different processes that provide biological treatment of municipal wastewater through the reduction of organic material and suspended solids from the effluent.



South Region





GLOSSARY

South Region Liquid Waste Management Plan

Service Area

The specifically delineated area where a service will be provided. A service area may follow local government boundaries, or be entirely separate to reduce area size or include properties in multiple local government areas.

Sludge

The materials that settle in a primary settling tank (primary sludge) and secondary clarifier (secondary sludge). Sludge may be treated further to become biosolids.

South Region

A new term being used to describe the proposed LWMP plan area and encompasses Electoral Area 'A', excluding Denman and Hornby Islands. This includes the communities of Royston and Union Bay where a community wastewater system is being proposed.

South Sewer Project (SSP)

One of the solutions being evaluated during the LWMP process. The SSP is a multi-phase, multipartner project that would see construction of a new centralized wastewater collection system and water resource recovery facility in the south region of the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD).

Steering Committee

The existing CVRD electoral areas services committee will serve as the steering committee for the CVRD south region LWMP process. The steering committee will guide the LWMP process with input and recommendations from staff, consultants and the technical and public advisory committees; and make recommendations to the board of directors for consideration and approval.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The TAC is an advisory group who will consider technical information related to the LWMP and the EIS on behalf of the steering committee. The TAC is made up of roughly 12 people representing key government agencies with interest or jurisdiction in the project area.

Wastewater

"Used" water and the material that it carries. Basically, a term for what is flushed down the toilet or washed down the drain. Wastewater can also include rainwater, groundwater or snow melt that make their way into sanitary wastewater pipes.

Water Resource Recovery

Recovering water, energy and nutrients from wastewater. A current "best practice" design approach to wastewater management which has been selected to guide the LWMP process for the CVRD's south region.

Wastewater Systems Effluent Regulation

Regulations under the federal *Fisheries Act* designed to harmonize wastewater management in Canada. They include minimum effluent quality standards that can be achieved through secondary wastewater treatment.



South Region



Frequently Asked Questions

South region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) and the south sewer project (SSP)

What is a liquid waste management plan or LWMP?

The LWMP process is an approach for evaluating and selecting communityspecific solutions for wastewater management that meet or exceed regulatory requirements. Public and stakeholder consultation is a key component of the LWMP process, used to consider a variety of interests and opinions and assess community support. The south region LWMP has moved the planning process through some challenging steps, including identifying the preferred outfall location. To meet schedule requirements a referendum is proposed to act as the final community approval step for the proposed project.



What does the term "south region" refer to?

South region is a new term being used to describe the proposed LWMP plan area that encompasses the area south of the southern boundary of the City of Courtenay to the most southern boundary of the CVRD, excluding Denman and Hornby islands, including the communities of Royston and Union Bay.

Why is a wastewater solution necessary for the area?

All of the homes and businesses in Royston and Union Bay currently utilize on-site sewage systems for wastewater treatment. This area exhibits poor native soil conditions and a high seasonal water table that are not conducive to the operation of on-site systems. These conditions are further impacted by small lot sizes and high



lot densities. Studies have shown that properties in these communities have been experiencing issues related to failing on-site sewage systems for some time, thereby impacting the surrounding environment.

What is the south sewer project (SSP)?

The south sewer project is the name of the proposed wastewater management service involving a partnership between the CVRD and K'ómoks First Nation. It includes a centralized wastewater collection and treatment system. A significant grant application made for the SSP was approved in 2013. With that funding in place, the CVRD has moved forward with planning and seeking additional grant funding opportunities.

What will be the cost for property owners to take part in a community sewer system for Royston and Union Bay?

This is an important question that can't yet be answered fully. Estimates have been developed and are available on the CVRD website at <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp</u>. Estimates are currently around \$20,000 per hook-up. Final costs will depend on the solution that is selected, the total number of properties



Frequently Asked Questions

South region liquid waste management plan (LWMP) and the south sewer project (SSP)

participating, and how costs will be shared among participants. However, even with grant funding, property owners will be responsible for some cost of a new system. Payment options will be available, either through financing or deferral.

How much money did the CVRD receive as a grant for the SSP?

The CVRD and project partners received a \$15 million grant from the federal Gas Tax Fund in March 2013. This funding was received based on an application to construct a new centralized wastewater collection system and water resource recovery facility for the area. An additional \$2 million was allocated to Area 'A' components of the project by the CVRD from their Community Works Fund grants for a total of \$17 million. Additional funding opportunities identified since then have brought potential grant totals to more than \$35-million – nearly two-thirds of the \$54-million total.

Will there be a referendum?

Yes. The CVRD will be initiating a referendum process with the goal of a vote date in June, 2016. More information will be circulated in the coming months about the referendum question and voting details.

If chosen, when will the SSP be complete?

If funding sources are confirmed and an upcoming referendum is successful, construction on the centralized wastewater collection and treatment system would be anticipated to begin in summer 2018.

Where can I learn more about the south region LWMP and SSP? How can I provide input?

There are many ways to learn more and share your comments:

- Online project pages: Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp
- **Project newsletters:** Issued quarterly to property owners in Royston and Union Bay and others on request, and posted to the website.
- **Project office:** The project office at 3843 Livingstone Rd. (Royston) is open Thursdays 12-4 pm for visitors to ask questions or share thoughts with project staff.
- **Public advisory committee:** Set up to collect and consider public opinion. The PAC membership list with contact information is available on the 'Resources and Archives' project page online.
- **Open houses & public events:** Watch for details online or in quarterly newsletters and newspaper advertisements.
- Online public consultation tool: Visit <u>www.Placespeak.ca/southregionlwmp</u>
- Email, phone: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or (250) 871-6100 ext. 21





Questions and Answers

Public-Private Partnership and the South Sewer Project

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) and the K'ómoks First Nation (KFN), the south sewer project partners, continue to seek ways to reduce the cost of a community wastewater system for residents in the south region. Along with an increasing number of local governments across Canada, the



South Region

project partners are reviewing the potential to deliver the project through a public-private partnership (P3) with the guidance and possible financial support of PPP Canada.

This document aims to address some of the most common questions about P3s, and how this type of partnership could contribute to the completion of the south sewer project (SSP).

What is a "P3"?

The traditional project delivery method for an infrastructure project would have the public sector undertake a procurement process for detailed design of the infrastructure, followed by a tender process to select a general contractor to build the infrastructure. Milestone payments would be made throughout construction and, after a commissioning phase, the project would be operated and maintained by the public sector. In a P3, responsibility for two or more of the design, build, finance, operations and maintenance components are transferred to the private sector.

P3s are performance-based contracts for the delivery of major public infrastructure where **the public sector retains full ownership of the asset**. Typically, the private sector takes the lead in designing, building and sometimes operating the infrastructure. There are a range of models for P3 agreements that vary in the amount of private-sector involvement in both pre and post-construction phases – however a key characteristic of all agreements is the **retention of public ownership** and transfer of risk to the private sector partners over the construction period and in some cases a defined period of operations and maintenance of the infrastructure.

What is PPP Canada?

PPP Canada is a federal Crown corporation created in 2009 to encourage P3s as a way of delivering public infrastructure with better value, timeliness and accountability to taxpayers. To deliver more P3s, PPP Canada can leverage incentives such as grant funding, providing expertise and promoting best practices. They provide expertise and advice in assessing and executing P3 opportunities, as well as leveraging funds from the federal government. For more information, visit www.p3canada.ca

Why consider a P3?

A key benefit to a P3 is the transfer of risks in the project costs (such as cost overruns, schedule delays or unexpected maintenance) to the private sector. With the responsibility for maintaining schedule and budget on their shoulders, and influence of a highly competitive environment, private partners often find innovative and efficient solutions during design, construction and possibly operational stages.

Also key in developing a P3 project with the guidance of PPP Canada is the potential for a 25 per cent grant towards capital costs of the overall project. For the south sewer project (SSP), that could equal \$13.7 million if approved – more than doubling the grant funding the SSP has already established through the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Gas Tax fund.



Questions and Answers

Public-Private Partnership and the South Sewer Project

What are the potential benefits for the south sewer project partners if they proceed as a P3?

Along with transfer of risk, a P3 project could provide other opportunities to the south sewer project;

- P3s provide a much higher level of cost and schedule certainty so costs will be completely predictable to the public.
- P3s that include requirements for operations of the facility post-construction will often lead to more innovative projects that create long-term efficiencies. They can also insulate the public sector from challenges often faced in the early operations of a new facility.
- The critical opportunity is the reduced capital costs through grant opportunities with PPP Canada. A 25 per cent grant towards the capital cost of the south sewer project equals \$13.7 million, bringing the potential grant funds to nearly two-thirds of the project's total \$54 -million cost.
- Savings can be incurred by transferring most of the risks to the private sector, and efficiencies born as a result of the competitive procurement process. These savings can reduce the capital costs of the project by up to fifteen per cent.

What are the benefits to the private sector?

A 'traditional' procurement process would see different portions of a construction job parcelled apart and put forward for tender by the municipal government – slotting different companies into the range of roles required. A P3 project provides the private sector the opportunity for a larger role in all stages, encouraging them to deliver a broad range of services over a long-term concession period. Working with established partners like local governments offers stability and security for private companies.

Aren't P3 projects more expensive for taxpayers?

Because of the efficiencies that can be found when one company manages a broad range of services, P3 projects are usually less expensive over the project lifecycle, for the reasons mentioned above. Key to this is an extensive assessment up front that determines whether a project is well-suited to a P3 partnership: meaning there must be significant savings for the taxpayer. Not all projects are best delivered as a P3. Early assessment of the south sewer project suggests that it could be.

Is there a risk of losing ownership/jobs and control over things like environmental protection measures?

No. The SSP partners will firmly retain ownership of all new infrastructure and no existing jobs would be affected. The private partner would be responsible for hiring of personnel to operate the new facility. Control over the design and construction process is detailed through extensive contracts clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities for all parties. Financial payments will be tied to performance targets that will ensure compliance with all expectations and regulations.

What is the process for the south sewer project partners and PPP Canada if this is pursued?

If all south sewer partners and PPP Canada agree to begin the grant approval process, the partners will have to develop a full business case by April 2016. Information needed for the first phase of that case has already been collected as part of the preliminary assessment of this option. A decision regarding grant funding would be announced in August 2016. In order to meet the criteria to finalize a funding agreement, a referendum in June will have to be successful, a service establishment bylaw will have to be approved and the site for the wastewater treatment plan will need to be secured.



Questions and Answers: Considering a Marine Discharge



South Region

The Comox Valley Regional District is developing a liquid waste management plan (LWMP) for the south region

(Electoral Area 'A', excluding Denman and Hornby islands) that is evaluating wastewater management options for Royston and Union Bay, including the south sewer project – a centralized treatment facility that would serve Royston, Union Bay and Cumberland. The area is currently reliant on on-site systems for managing residential wastewater, but poor soil conditions and aging systems have highlighted the need for a central collection and treatment system for the area.

Has an ocean discharge been selected?

The planning process is focused on identifying a discharge location for treated effluent, including a rigorous screening process with the south region LWMP technical and public advisory committees (TAC and PAC). On March 5, 2015, after five meetings over seven months, the TAC and PAC recommended discharge to the Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo through a combined outfall with the existing Comox Valley Waste Pollution Control Centre (CVWPCC) as the preferred solution. Two other marine discharge locations – one in Baynes Sound and one in the Strait of Georgia off Sandy Island – were also considered, along with a fourth option for discharge to ground at depth.

Why a marine discharge?

Discharge locations for the area are limited because of soil conditions and low seasonal water levels in creeks and rivers that don't meet the province's required levels of dilution for discharge. For this reason a marine discharge has emerged as the most viable option for the project. Three separate marine discharge locations were short-listed by the PAC and TAC for further consideration. After completing a triple-bottom-line plus risk analysis, the Cape Lazo location emerged as the preferred solution by these committees. A discharge at any of these locations would have met or exceeded regulatory requirements with regards to effluent quality and dilution.

How will this affect the ocean?

Currently, failing on-site wastewater systems and inadequate ground conditions mean that poorly treated effluent is entering Baynes Sound. Cumberland's lagoon-based wastewater treatment system, which discharges to Maple Lake Creek, the Trent River and on to Baynes Sound, is currently not able to meet permitted nutrient and bacteriological effluent quality standards and is contributing to measurable impacts in the Sound. Any of the three proposed marine discharge locations would result in improved water quality in Baynes Sound. The quality of the effluent proposed for discharge off Cape Lazo will ensure protection of human health and the marine environment in that area. Wastewater from the project area will be treated to reclaimed water standards to allow for beneficial reuse for all proposed scenarios. Over the long term, the CVRD plans to minimize treated effluent flows to the marine environment by maximizing the reuse of reclaimed water.

How much treatment will the wastewater receive before being discharged to the ocean?

Provincial and federal wastewater regulations stipulate a minimum of secondary treatment for all municipal wastewater treatment systems. Secondary treatment includes reduction of organic material

and solids separation, often using a biological process with microorganisms. This form of treatment achieves an effluent quality for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and total suspended solids (TSS) of a maximum of 45 mg/L and a monthly average of 25 mg/L. By comparison, advanced treatment achieves a high effluent quality for BOD and TSS with a maximum of 10 mg/L.

Of the scenarios under consideration, Scenario A (discharge to Baynes Sound) and Scenario C (discharge to the Strait of Georgia off Cape Lazo) were developed having advanced treatment incorporated into the system. Scenario B (discharge to the Strait of Georgia off Sandy Island) was developed on the basis of secondary treatment.

How will this impact shellfish farming in Baynes Sound (if it is chosen as the outfall location?)

The BC Shellfish Growers Association, Underwater Harvesters Association and K'ómoks First Nation (who have extensive shellfish interests in the area) have been involved in the development of this LWMP from the beginning and have provided significant feedback about the potential effect that a marine discharge could have on the aquaculture sector. While water conditions are expected to improve, the project team continues to review regulations and import/export criteria to ensure that an outfall siting does not harm shellfish businesses in the area. Protecting this sector has been identified as a key priority.

Will this impact recreational use of the ocean in those areas – particularly Baynes Sound?

A treated effluent discharge in any marine location would not affect recreational use of the area. Treatment levels required by the province ensure that public health and the environment are protected. The treatment level chosen for discharge off Cape Lazo will exceed those required by the province.

How can we be sure that the CVRD will protect the marine environment if an ocean outfall is approved?

Provincial and federal regulatory requirements are set to protect public health and the environment. For example, more stringent setback distances and disinfection are required for discharge near shellfish bearing aquatic areas.

Further, in conjunction with the LWMP, the CVRD must conduct an environmental impact study (EIS) for the selected discharge location. The EIS will involve a preliminary assessment of project effects and a pre-discharge monitoring program that will inform site specific recommendations which the CVRD must follow to ensure the protection of human health and the receiving environment. Once the treatment facility is in operation, the CVRD will be required to conduct a regular discharge monitoring program to ensure that effluent quality is maintained.

What if something goes wrong at the treatment plant (ie – a power failure) – would raw waste be released to the ocean?

The provincial wastewater regulation stipulates numerous requirements to mitigate emergency situations. As set in the regulation, design of the treatment facility must include redundancy of major process units. This would allow for the use of one unit while the other is taken off-line. The regulation also requires the treatment facility to account for and include back-up power in the case of a power failure. Additional mitigation strategies (such as storage units) may be designed and included in the system.

South Sewer Project – Public-Private Partnerships May 2016

About the South Sewer Project



The long-awaited south sewer project (SSP) is a community wastewater (sewer) treatment system proposed for Royston and Union Bay which includes a gravity collection system and a new wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in the area. Collected wastewater would be treated at the WWTP and then piped to connect with the Comox Valley water pollution control centre's outfall at Cape Lazo.

The first phase of the project includes 930 homes – the core residential hubs of Royston and Union Bay, and the Kilmarnock neighbourhood. Currently, these neighbourhoods are served by on-site (septic) systems – however, due to the age of many systems and the unsuitability of the ground conditions, there is a measurable impact from these systems on the neighbouring Baynes Sound. Island Health supports the development of a community wastewater solution for the area in order to protect both human and environmental health.

The project is in partnership with the K'ómoks First Nation, who owns land in the area.

This project has been in discussion for many years – with a referendum even held and approved by the community in 2006. After significant research, analysis, and consultation, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) has identified an opportunity for moving this project forward and are holding a referendum to confirm community support on June 18, 2016.

About the P3 model proposed for the SSP

The CVRD is proposing to residents and homeowners in the area that the SSP proceed as a public-private partnership (P3), under a 'design, build, finance, operate, maintain' (DBFOM) structure. A DBFOM would create a performance-based contract that sets standards of construction, operations and environmental performance and will see the CVRD pay a private contractor approximately 2/3 of the construction costs when the system is finished, and the remainder spaced out over the 30 year agreement along with operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. If at any time the private contractor fails to comply with the terms of the agreement, repayment of capital costs and payment of O&M costs would be halted until compliance is demonstrated.

The CVRD has worked with PPP Canada – a Crown corporation created to encourage and support the delivery of infrastructure projects in Canada via P3 models – to apply for grant funding. These grants come with both support and expertise in the creation and delivery of P3 projects, but also with funds to cover 25 per cent of the capital costs for the project. In this case, that will equal roughly \$13.3 million. This funding is critical to the success of the project which is currently estimated to cost \$56.2 million.

Why a P3 for the SSP?

A key benefit to a P3 for the SSP is the transfer of project risks (such as cost overruns, schedule delays or unexpected maintenance) to the private sector. With the responsibility for maintaining schedule and budget on the shoulders of a private partner, this removes the potential for unexpected increases in costs to have to be shouldered by residents in the region – critical for this high-priced project.

Also key is the 25 per cent grant towards capital costs of the overall project. The additional \$13.3 M is crucial to making this project affordable for residents. Securing this funding and retaining the Union of BC Municipalities funding would bring the total grant funding to approximately \$31 M or 55 per cent of total project capital costs. Achieving this level of funding has taken years, and there are no viable alternative sources of federal or provincial grants.

Along with transfer of risk, a P3 project provides other opportunities to the south sewer project;

- The inclusion of facility operations post-construction can lead to more innovative projects that create long-term effciencies, thereby reducing costs to the residents.
- Efficiencies born as a result of the competitive procurement process can identify potential savings in cost. These savings can significantly reduce the capital costs of the project.

Will this affect jobs?

As this will be a new system, existing public sector jobs in the Comox Valley will not be effected. There will, of course, be employment opportunities in the construction and operations stages of the project's delivery. The labour model will be determined by the successful contractor – and union agreement models are not unusual in P3 projects.

Who will own the infrastructure and service?

The public will retain full ownership of all SSP infrastructure and services. No additional 'user fees' will be applied.

What environmental and operational standards will be set?

A private partner will be required to meet the same environmental and operational standards that the CVRD would be required to meet. Payments to them as part of the service agreement will depend on performance standards being met. Reporting requirements will ensure full transparency from the contractor. As a project providing service in and around Baynes Sound, this is a critical component.

Is there any liability for public sector?

A P3 structure will offer the SSP reduced liability by transferring many key risks to the private partner. Repayment of debt and operations and maintenance costs can be suspended if performance doesn't meet established standards. It also provides the SSP team with high cost certainty under the 'fixed price contract' - interest rates are fixed over life of contract, increases in operations and maintenance costs limited to inflation indexes.

What if a P3 model isn't approved?

The significant funding via PPP Canada makes this project attainable for the community; with no alternative source of funding currently available, the project would be delayed until an equivalent source of funding is achieved. It's taken the region many years to get to this point; costs are increasing over time, and competition for grant funding is getting stronger.

Is the community aware of this?

Residents and home owners in the south region have been provided regular and comprehensive updates on the project for over two years. They have been engaged regarding the potential for a P3 project delivery model from the beginning and have provided information about the values that are most important for them to see protected. The feedback to date is that there is a strong interest in seeing the project move forward. The public will get to make the ultimate decision via the referendum on June 18 2016, which includes a question specifically seeking approval for a 30-year service agreement with a private partner.

Questions/Comments? Contact the SSP Office:

Phone: 250-871-6100 Email: <u>southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca</u> Web: <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer</u>



May 2016 South Sewer Project - Referendum Backgrounder

Overview

The south sewer project is a community wastewater (sewer) treatment system proposed for Royston and Union Bay which includes a mainly gravity-fed collection system and a new wastewater treatment plant



(WWTP) in the area. Collected wastewater would be treated at the WWTP and then piped to connect with the Comox Valley water pollution control centre's outfall at Cape Lazo.

The first phase of the project includes 930 homes – the core residential hubs of Royston and Union Bay, and the Kilmarnock neighbourhood. The project is in partnership with the K'ómoks First Nation, who own land in the area. Please see the attached service area and neighbourhood maps.

The Need

Evidence of failing on-site sewage (septic) systems has been found in Baynes Sound – this, combined with the high concentration of small lots in areas with poor soil conditions, are creating risk to human health and the environment. Increasing regulations are making it harder and more expensive for homeowners to find acceptable solutions for new on-site systems. As a result, the Comox Valley Regional District board has identified a community wastewater system as a priority and this approach is supported by Island Health.

Funding and Costs

Phase 1 of the south sewer project is estimated to cost \$56.2 million in 2019 dollars. The project team is on track to secure roughly \$35 million in funding and contributions (breakdown provided below). The remaining costs will be financed, and amortized over 30 years beginning in 2017 by service participants. Both capital debt cost and operation & maintenance (O&M) cost will be recovered through parcel taxes. **The parcel tax for sewer will be deferrable for eligible property owners**.

A maximum requisition cost of \$2,036 per year is presented in the referendum question, based on an estimate of \$1,400/year for capital and \$636 in operations and maintenance. The actual estimated cost is approximately 10 per cent lower at \$1,804/year (\$1,245/year in capital debt repayment and \$559/year in O&M costs). The difference provides a buffer to protect against the possibility of minor cost increases due to uncertainties such as the actual interest rate or higher than anticipated construction costs. Maintenance costs will be subject to inflation, though the capital portion will not - the interest rate will be fixed over the 30 year project agreement.

Collection of parcel taxes for this project will start in 2017. This cost recovery strategy has been developed to minimize annual costs to initial users and increase costs over time in pace with anticipated development.

All property owners in the service area will pay the operations and maintenance costs annually. An option to pay a lump sum payment, referred to as 'commutation' of the capital repayment parcel tax will be available. A commutation is estimated to be \$22,500 with the maximum set at \$25,000. The O&M costs (for all) and capital repayment costs (for those that amortize the costs) are anticipated to decrease as new developments are added to the system.

COST BREAKDOWN	
Phase 1 Cost (in 2019 dollars)	\$56.2 million
Contributions:	
Union of BC Municipalities Strategic Priorities Fund grant	\$15 million
K'ómoks First Nation contribution	\$5.4 million
PPP Canada grant	\$13.3 million
CVRD Community Works Fund	\$1.5 million
Remaining costs for property owners	\$21 million
Total estimated annual costs for occupied parcels (capital + operations)	\$1,804
Maximum requisition from property owners per year (includes 10 per cent buffer per above)	\$2,036

Private Partnerships

In the interest of finding the most cost-effective option for the development of this infrastructure, the south sewer project team has identified a partnership with the private sector (public-private partnership) as a means of making this project affordable to property owners. PPP Canada – a Crown corporation – offers financial and administrative support that encourages the use of these partnerships.

Preliminary reviews suggest the south sewer project would be of interest to the private sector, and final consideration by PPP Canada for a \$13.3 M grant is underway. One question on the referendum ballot will ask about the community's support for such a partnership, based on a 30-year agreement where the CVRD retains all ownership of the assets.

Timing

If the referendum is successful and funding sources are secured, the procurement process would start in the fall of 2016, with construction expected to begin in fall of 2018 and expected to last 18 months. While property owners would then have two years to connect to the system, billing would start in 2017.

For More Information

For more information about voting specifics such as eligibility, mail-in ballots and voting locations, visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

To learn more about the project details, connect with us at:

- www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer
- www.placespeak.com/southsewerproject
- 250-871-6100
- southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca
- Royston project office drop-in hours: Mon-Friday until June 17, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., 3843 Livingstone Rd.
Service Area Map



Neighbourhood Maps

UNION BAY



KILMARNOCK



ROYSTON





Questions and Answers

South Sewer Project Referendum: Proposal not approved

On June 18, residents and homeowners in Phase 1 of the south sewer project were asked to vote on whether the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) should move forward with the initiative as proposed. The community voted 'no' to proceeding at this time. The CVRD will consider its next steps and in the meantime, will share available answers to the regularly asked questions here.



The referendum failed. What happens now?

As the voters didn't support the project via referendum, the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) board can't adopt the service establishment bylaw or enter into a long-term partnership agreement for the south sewer project.

Next steps will be determined in the coming weeks, but they could include restarting the liquid waste management planning process or putting the project on hold as further grant opportunities are sought.

The CVRD will work towards development of complementary regulations for inspection and maintenance of existing systems in rural areas across the region. If the CVRD is unable to implement a community wastewater management system in Royston/Union Bay these requirements would be applied to homes in the area as well.

Will the project proceed if more grant funding can be found?

Over the past few years the CVRD has fully explored all possible grant funding opportunities to line up the estimated 58% grant funding achieved for the proposal that went before the public on June 18. This grant funding will likely be lost because the associated deadlines are now unachievable. Moving forward the project team will likely have to start seeking new funding sources, possibly with a new project concept identified via a restarted LWMP process. The CVRD will be considering the implications of the referendum results in the coming weeks to determine possible next steps.

My septic system is failing - will inspections and replacement be required right away?

Separate from the south sewer project, the CVRD is working towards development of a bylaw to require regular inspection of on-site systems and mandatory replacement in case of failing systems. In the absence of a plan for a community wastewater system, these standards will apply to the south region. These regulations however are in early stages of development. There will be updates and public engagement as they progress.





- 6.1 JULY 2014 CVRD HOSTS OPEN HOUSE, LAUNCHES ONLINE CONSULTATION TOOL
- 6.2 AUGUST 2014 PARTNERS APPROVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE FOR PROPOSED SSP
- 6.3 SEPTEMBER 2014 CONSULTATION GOES ONLINE FOR SOUTH REGION LWMP
- 6.4 JANUARY 2015 OPEN HOUSE FOR RESIDENTS INTRODUCES COST OPTIONS/ESTIMATES
- 6.5 JANUARY 2015 SSP PARTNERS RELEASE ESTIMATED COSTS FOR WASTEWATER OPTIONS
- 6.6 NOVEMBER 2015 CVRD CONTINUES WITH SSP FOLLOWING CUMBERLAND DECISION
- 6.7 MARCH 2016 UPDATED SEWER PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES AVAILABLE AT OPEN HOUSE
- 6.8 MARCH 2016 SSP PARTNERS ANNOUNCE JUNE REFERENDUM, COMMUNITY UPDATES

News Release



For Immediate Release

July 18, 2014

CVRD Hosts Open House, Launches Online Consultation Tool to Share Information on Liquid Waste Management Planning in the South Region

The first open house for the liquid waste management plan (LWMP) process for the south region was held last night, with updates from the project's consulting engineers Associated Engineering provided to the public who came by to learn more.

Over 50 people attended the open house at Fallen Alders Hall in Royston to learn more about the LWMP—the process which the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is using to evaluate and select a wastewater solution for the area. It was the first formal public consultation event of the planning process.

"It's important that we keep residents and stakeholders informed throughout this complex planning process, and this open house was an important opportunity to do that," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A'). "We hope people continue to provide their comments and ask questions over the next few years so we can be sure we're identifying the best solution for wastewater management."

The LWMP is a two-year process that was launched in May to review options for wastewater management and water resource recovery for the south region of the CVRD, and to identify the best solution for providing effective sewer service to the Royston and Union Bay area. It includes an environmental impact study and multiple levels of public consultation. This open house was the first of three scheduled open houses to be held throughout the plan's development.

One of the solutions being considered by the LWMP is the south sewer project, a centralized wastewater collection and treatment system involving a partnership between the CVRD, K'ómoks First Nation and Village of Cumberland, which has received \$17-million in grants to date. The south sewer project has prioritized the core areas of Union Bay and Royston to reduce the impact of failing septic systems on Baynes Sound and its receiving waters. While a centralized wastewater management system has been identified through past study work as the preferred solution by the CVRD and project partners, it will only be selected if the LWMP process determines it is the best solution for the south region.

"Collecting public comment on the options under consideration will be an important part of the liquid waste management planning process," said Kris La Rose, CVRD's manager of liquid waste planning. "We want to give residents every opportunity to learn more about the process and to provide feedback on what they feel is the most appropriate solution to protect the local environment in the long-term."

To support and encourage public consultation during the LWMP process, the CVRD also launched PlaceSpeak at the open house. PlaceSpeak is a location-based community consultation platform. It makes possible online public discussion and information sharing by property owners in the proposed LWMP area. To take part, owners are encouraged to sign up online at: www.placespeak.com/southregionLWMP

The CVRD has also set up project information pages online and is publishing quarterly newsletters about the south sewer project. Those interested in receiving the newsletter can sign up by contacting the project team at 250-871-6100 or emailing <u>southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca</u>. For more information on the project, residents can visit: <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer</u>

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

- 30 -

Media contact: Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning Tel: 250-871-6100

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

- S Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca for frequently updated content
- find us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd
- B Follow us on Twitter at <u>www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>
- Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events
- 👛 Watch CVRD videos on YouTube

News Release



For Immediate Release

Aug. 26, 2014

Partners approve governance structure for proposed south sewer project in Comox Valley Regional District's south region

The south sewer project partners have reached an agreement on a governance structure for construction and operation of the wastewater management and water resource recovery system being planned for the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) south region.

A structure for the implementation of the south sewer project has been approved by the partners that will see the project managed through the creation of three services – one for electoral area conveyance and collection, one service for Cumberland conveyance, and one for all shared infrastructure. A commission made up of all three partners will be created to manage these services. This establishes how decisions will be made regarding the construction of the proposed project and ongoing operational management into the future. This governance structure will be implemented once the liquid waste management plan (LWMP) is complete.

The CVRD is currently working with consultant engineering firm Associated Engineering on a two-year LWMP process to assess options for wastewater management and water resource recovery for the south region and to determine the best option for moving forward. The LWMP process includes significant public consultation and is paired with an environmental impact study to ensure all environmental risks associated with the project are identified and mitigated.

In 2013, the partnership between the CVRD, Village of Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation received a federal Gas Tax Fund grant of \$17-million for the proposed south sewer project which aims to address the impact of failing wastewater management systems in Royston, Union Bay, and Cumberland on the receiving waters of Baynes Sound, and support economic development for the K'ómoks First Nation.

"This is an important step in finding a solution to the wastewater challenges we face in Royston and Union Bay. Jointly, the CVRD, the Village of Cumberland, and the K'ómoks First Nation have agreed to a governance model that will ensure each of our respective concerns are addressed as the south sewer project moves forward," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

"We are glad to be working together towards a solution that will provide an important service to the residents as well as protect the environment in the long term," said Cumberland Mayor Leslie Baird. "It shows the good working relationships that have developed between the project's partners and the work that is ongoing to ensure this significant project continues to move forward." With this important milestone achieved, project partners will continue to work towards an agreement on apportionment of project costs.

More information about the LWMP and south sewer project is available online at <u>www.comxovalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp</u> and at the project office at 3843 Livingstone Road, which is open to the public Thursday afternoons from noon to 4 pm.

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

- 30 -

Media contact: Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning Tel: 250-871-6100

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

S Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca for frequently updated content

Find us on Facebook at <u>www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

B Follow us on Twitter at <u>www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events

👛 Watch CVRD videos on YouTube

S Comox Valley

News Release

For Immediate Release

Sept. 11, 2014

Consultation goes online for south region liquid waste management plan

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) is adding a unique new tool to their consultation toolkit by launching a venue where opinions and feedback can be shared online by residents interested in the south region liquid waste management plan (LWMP).

An online consultation forum has been set up at PlaceSpeak – a location-based community consultation website. The service is unique because of its 'geoverification' feature which confirms the locations of participants so discussion is focused on those in the affected area.

"Public consultation is critical to the development of a successful liquid waste management plan and we want to be sure there are options for everyone in the area to provide their comments in a convenient way," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound – Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

The CVRD is currently working with consulting engineering firm Associated Engineering on a twoyear LWMP process to assess options for wastewater management and water resource recovery for the south region. This process will determine the best option for addressing the impact of failing onsite septic systems in Royston and Union Bay and includes extensive public consultation. One of the options being considered is the south sewer project, a partnership between the CVRD, Village of Cumberland and K'ómoks First Nation that received a federal Gas Tax Fund grant of \$15-million and \$2-million from the CVRD's Area 'A' and Area 'C' Community Works Fund in 2013.

To participate in the online discussion forum, area residents are invited to simply sign up for an account at <u>www.placespeak.com</u>, confirm their location by phone number or address and then visit <u>www.placespeak.com/southregionlwmp</u> to select the "Connect to this Topic" button and start contributing. Participants can comment on discussion boards, post new items and vote in polls.

Location information is collected for verification purposes only and is strictly protected. Only residents in the designated consultation area will be able to participate in the discussion. Those outside of the area can monitor the discussion and provide feedback directly to the project team.

The PlaceSpeak forum will supplement an already busy public consultation plan for the LWMP that includes weekly office hours open to the public, a series of open houses, social media outreach, information posted to the website <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp</u> and quarterly newsletters.

"The outcome of the LWMP will be very important for the residents of Royston, Union Bay and surrounding areas," said Kris La Rose, CVRD's manager of liquid waste planning and the south sewer project. "We want to be sure all of those interested have a chance to contribute their thoughts about what the best solution might be." The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

-30-

Media contact:

Kris La Rose Manager, south sewer project Tel: 250-871-6100

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

S Visit **www.comoxvalleyrd.ca** for frequently updated content

Find us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd

b Follow us on Twitter at **www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd**

Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events

Watch CVRD videos on YouTube

News Release



For immediate release

January 12, 2015

Open house for Royston/Union Bay residents introduces options/cost estimates for wastewater management service

A shortlist of wastewater management scenarios and the estimated costs for a wastewater management service in the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s south region will be introduced at an open house, scheduled for Wednesday, January 21, at the Union Bay community hall from 4 to 7 p.m.

The event will include informational boards, with project staff and engineering consultants available to update the community on the shortlisted scenarios.

"The community has been very interested in this project for a long time. This is a critical stage where important information is coming forward and we need to hear their feedback," said Bruce Jolliffe, chair of the CVRD's board of directors and director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A'). "Everyone in the community is encouraged to come and learn about the process and options and to share their thoughts."

The open house is the second in the south region liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process which was launched in May to review options for wastewater management and water resource recovery in the area, and to identify the best solution for providing effective sewer service for the Royston and Union Bay area.

"We want people to learn about the work we are doing and to ask questions so we can be sure the final decision is ultimately the best one," said Kris La Rose, CVRD's manager of liquid waste planning.

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

30 -

Media contact:

Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning Tel: 250-871-6100

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

S Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca for frequently updated content

- Find us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd
- Follow us on Twitter at <u>www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>
- Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events
- 👛 Watch CVRD videos on YouTube

For Immediate Release Jan. 22, 2015

South sewer project partners release estimated costs for wastewater management options in Royston/Union Bay and Cumberland.

With scenarios for wastewater management services and their estimated costs now available for public review and comment, the south sewer project partners have entered an important phase of planning that requires the community's feedback.

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD), K'ómoks First Nation and Village of Cumberland are seeking feedback on four options presented to the south region last night at an open house for the CVRD's liquid waste management plan (LWMP). Each option qualifies as the south sewer project, a three-way partnership that has secured \$15-million in funding for construction of a centralized wastewater treatment facility. The CVRD has also allocated an additional \$2-million in community works funds towards the electoral area 'A' portion of the project.

Preliminary costs of the four scenarios range from \$49.5 M to \$58.5 M for overall construction. Capital costs per connection are estimated at between \$22,900 and \$26,900 for electoral area 'A' residents included in the proposed phase 1 of construction and \$8,000 and \$12,000 for Cumberland residents (estimates for Cumberland currently include proportional amount of treatment facility and construction of a force main but not installation of collection pipes, which are already in place. Electoral Area 'A' estimates includes all portions).

"These costs will change as project planning progresses but should give the public a good sense of how costs may differ between the four scenarios being evaluated," said Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning.

"This is the time when people can really see what this project will mean to them and the south sewer project partners are eager to hear their comments," said Bruce Jolliffe, Chair of the CVRD's board of directors and director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

The open house last night was the second in the south region LWMP process for the CVRD's south region and saw 160 people attend. The Village of Cumberland has completed a draft stage 2 report as part of their own LWMP process, which to date has identified connection to a treatment facility in the south region as the preferred option. If the two LWMPs align, the communities will work together to complete the final stages of the planning and project delivery process. The CVRD plans to identify a preferred option by early March.

"It's nice to see the shortlisted options," said Cumberland Mayor, Leslie Baird. "We look forward to the CVRD finalizing their preferred option so that the Village can move forward on a decision in regards to participation."

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

Also attached "Backgrounder: South Region LWMP Scenarios"

Media contacts: Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning Comox Valley Regional District Tel: 250-871-6100 ext. 25

Sundance Topham, chief administrative officer Village of Cumberland Tel: 250 336-2291

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

S Visit **www.comoxvalleyrd.ca** or <u>www.cumberland.ca</u> to learn more.

Find us on Facebook at <u>www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

Follow us on Twitter at <u>www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events

Watch CVRD videos on YouTube



STATEMENT

For Immediate Release

Nov. 10, 2015

Comox Valley Regional District continues with south sewer project following decision by Cumberland to end participation.

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s south sewer project team remains committed to moving forward with a community wastewater system for Royston/Union Bay residents, building on the work to date and continuing in partnership with the K'ómoks First Nation.

"We remain committed to the south sewer project and moving forward with our First Nations partners to find a solution for the residents of electoral area 'A'," said Kris La Rose, Manager of Liquid Waste Planning. "We will continue to build on the extensive work and engagement already undertaken to move this project forward in a timely manner that can meet grant timelines."

While the CVRD is awaiting final notification of the decision by the Village, the CVRD respects Cumberland's choice to re-examine their Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP), and wishes them the best in finding a solution that is acceptable.

Residents in the community and specifically those in the proposed service areas can watch the project webpage (www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp) for updates in the coming weeks, including full details about an upcoming project open house to be held this winter.

Any questions can be directed to the south sewer project office by emailing <u>southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca</u>, phoning 250-871-6100 or stopping in during open office hours at the Royston office (3843 Livingstone Rd.) on Thursdays from 1 to 4 pm.

30 -

For Immediate Release March 8, 2016

Updated sewer plans and cost estimates available at Open House for Royston/Union Bay residents.

Revised plans, new reduced cost estimates and plans for a possible June referendum will all be on the agenda at the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s next south sewer project open house, scheduled for Wednesday, March 23.

The event will be held at the Union Bay Community Hall (5401 S. Island Hwy.) from 4 to 7 p.m and will include a presentation by the project team at 5 p.m. Residents are invited to drop in at any time to review informational boards, share feedback or ask questions of the project staff and engineering consultants who will be on hand.

"There's been a lot of progress on this important community infrastructure project and there's good news to share in terms of revised cost and opportunities for input," said Bruce Jolliffe, Chair of the CVRD's board of directors and director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A'). "We encourage everyone to come out to learn more, ask questions and share their comments."

The project team will be updating the community on the revised project scope, current cost estimates, and PPP Canada funding. They'll also be seeking input from the community about proposed locations for the wastewater treatment plant and pump stations and a possible referendum to allow the project to stay on the required timeline. A newsletter with more details is available at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp under the "How to Keep Informed" tab.

"Hearing from the community about the plan moving forward will be critical to this project's success," said Kris La Rose, CVRD's manager of liquid waste planning. "We have a great opportunity now with strong funding support, but it will mean having to move quickly to meet important deadlines."

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

30 -

Media contact:

Kris La Rose, P. Eng., Manager of liquid waste planning Tel: 250-871-6100

For Immediate Release

March 29, 2016

South sewer project partners announce June referendum, update community on lower costs, P3 potential, siting at open house

UNION BAY - Nearly 200 people turned out for an open house last week updating the community on the progress of the south sewer project and hear updates about reduced costs, potential public-private partnerships, treatment plant and pump station locations.

They also heard confirmation that the Comox Valley Regional District board has initiated a referendum for the project, to be held June 18, 2016. Residents can expect to see continued communication about details of this vote over the next few months.

"There were a lot of important updates for the community including the reduction in per-parcel cost by roughly \$5,000 since our last public event and the news that there will – given tight funding timelines and interest from the community – be a referendum to confirm the community's commitment to the project," said Bruce Jolliffe, CVRD's director for Baynes Sound-Denman Hornby Islands (Area 'A').

The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) and project partner the K'ómoks First Nation are working to move forward the \$54.5-million project that would provide community wastewater service to the core areas of Royston and Union Bay, and the Kilmarnock neighbourhood. They are on track to secure roughly \$35 million in grants, putting the current estimate of hook-up cost at \$20,250.

Feedback was also sought specifically about which of four shortlisted locations for a wastewater treatment plant is preferred, where pump stations may be located as well as comments about the revised cost and potential public-private partnership. Boards and info from the project can be found online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp

"There are some big steps that need to be completed for this to be successful, but we see a good opportunity forward and believe we've identified the best, most cost-effective solution for the community," said Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning

In the next few weeks, the project team will be making a recommendation about the wastewater treatment plant and pump station sites as well as completing a business case for PPP Canada -a Crown corporation that provide grants and support to encourage P3 infrastructure projects.

The Comox Valley Regional District is a federation of three electoral areas and three municipalities providing sustainable services for residents and visitors to the area. The members of the regional district work collaboratively on services for the benefit of the diverse urban and rural areas of the Comox Valley.

30 -

Also attached "Public Open House, March 23, 2016 - Summary"

Media contacts:

Kris La Rose, P. Eng., manager of liquid waste planning Comox Valley Regional District Tel: 250-871-6100 ext. 25

Choose your favourite way to stay up-to-date or to join in the conversation:

S Visit **www.comoxvalleyrd.ca** or <u>www.cumberland.ca</u> to learn more.

Find us on Facebook at <u>www.facebook.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

B Follow us on Twitter at <u>www.twitter.com/comoxvalleyrd</u>

Subscribe to our RSS feed for the latest news and events

Watch CVRD videos on YouTube

7.1 NEWSPAPER AD SAMPLES







Hillian said, while he

DID YOU KNOW?

Votina Dav is almost here

The referendum on the south sewer project is almost here. It will be held Saturday, June 18 from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. at the **Royston Elementary School and Union** Bay Community Church. Residents and property owners (who reside in BC) aged 18 and over will be able to vote on the two questions. Want more info about eligibility and requirements before voting day? Phone 250-334-6000 or visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

Questions about the project or voting details?

- Phone 250-871-6100
- Stop by the project office (3843 Livingstone Road) Mon-Fri, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
- Visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer or www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote



OPEN HOUSE South Sewer Project

Planning for a community wastewater system to service Union Bay and Royston has reached an important stage. The community is invited to learn more and share their comments about important project updates including:

- · An update on the amended project size and estimated cost with public private partnership (P3)
- An overview of estimated costs and reduced connection fee for residents
- Shortlist of sites for the wastewater treatment plant and community pump stations
- · Potential referendum vote

Wednesday, March 23, 2016 | 4 - 7 p.m. Union Bay Community Hall 5401 South Island Hwy., Union Bay Staff Presentation at 5 p.m. Drop-in Open House 4 - 7 p.m.

If you cannot attend, drop by the project office on Thursdays from noon to 4 p.m. (3843 Livingstone Rd.) with questions/feedback. Information will also be posted on the project's webpage.

Learn more at: www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp Contact: southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca | 250-871-6100

S Comox Valley





Referendum

VOTE: SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 8 AM TO 8 PM





- 8.1 SOCIAL MEDIA POST SAMPLES
- 8.2 PLACESPEAK DISCUSSION AND NOTICEBOARD

8.1 SOCIAL MEDIA POST SAMPLES

Comox Valley Regional District December 5, 2013 · 🚱

South Sewer Project: Moving Ahead

There are some innovative features planned for the proposed CVRD south sewer wastewater treatment plant. While construction of the plant won't begin until 2016, you can find information on the proposed plant features and more on the project website. Learn more: http://bit.ly/1bj0YNe #CVRDsouthsewer



Project Overview | Comox Valley Regional District You are here:Home » Departments » Sewer Services » Regional Sewer Initiatives » South Sewer Project » Project Overview

COMOXVALLEYRD.CA





Comox Valley Regional District

The south sewer project's online discussion page at @PlaceSpeak is still 'open for business'. It's a great way share comments or ask questions - the project team will always respond if you need info. Come by and say hello at www.placespeak.com/southsewerproject



PlaceSpeak - CVRD's South Sewer Project

Live or own property in the CVRD's south region? Connect to learn the latest about the south sewer project for Royston/Union Bay

PLACESPEAK.COM

1



Comox Valley RD @comoxvalleyrd · Feb 11 Lots of ways to stay informed about the south sewer project - @PlaceSpeak, website and social media. Details here: bit.ly/1ZPJ8xp

27 2 40 1 ***

Comox Valley RD @comoxvalleyrd · Jun 1 Stop by Royston Community Hall today 5-7pm for info about the south sewer project before June 18's referendum!



Comox Valley RD @comoxvalleyrd 8 Dec 2015 Royston/Union Bay: Latest south sewer project news in mailboxes this week: It's online: bit.ly/lwmpupdates Issue #8a - Special Iss

SOUTH SEWER PROJECT UPDATE

CVRD committed to moving sewer project forward

....



23.1

10

4

The Corrox Valley Regional District (CVR0)'s south sever project ISSP team remains committed to moving forward with a community waterwater system for Royston/Union Bay issidents, building on the work to data and continuing in particles with the K Winds First Mation (0XN). "This is an important project for the residents of Royston and Union Bay and our First Nations partners, and many are eagler to see this progress continue productively," and Ruce Jaliffer, CVRD's director for Baynes Sourd - Demand/Hornby Matdod (Area 'A). "We are condent that we can still deriver this service regardless of Cumberstard's desision, and we work forward to clong our part to provide the important inductive forward to doing our part to provide this important infrastructure and lect Baynes Sound."

mid-Ne ember. Cumberland council





Discussions and Noticeboard CVRD's South Sewer Project

Discussions

PlaceSpeak Wrap-up: Final Thoughts

As the CVRD assesses next steps for liquid waste management in the area over the coming months, we will be closing this engagement forum. Please share any final thoughts you would like to add here.

All comments/discussions already here are saved and will be retained as part of the record of the project moving forward.

Post-Referendum: Questions

On June 18, 2016, voters decided not to move forward with the SSP as proposed at this time. The CVRD is now considering next steps. Let us know here if you have any questions.

ARCHIVE: Questions

What questions do you have around bringing wastewater service to the south region?

Section 22 harmful to personal provacy

Uprated: 2 | Downrated: 0

I would really like to know how the payment for hook up structure will be rolled out, and if there will be rebates, or grace periods for homeowners like me. We moved into our home 5 years ago and had a brand new septic system installed, I'm sure we are not the only ones.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello - This is a very important question for many people. We expect more details - about what the cost will be, what payment options will be available and which areas will be included at what stage - will be available in 2015. Thanks for sharing your question. It helps us know how to best keep the community informed and engaged.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thanks for sharing your personal example. We understand everyone is in a different situation and this will impact each resident and homeowner differently – your feedback is helpful to us as we assess options moving forward. As for your questions about costs of infrastructure and possible rebates, the project team is looking at how other jurisdictions in BC have implemented similar systems, including how they have addressed this sensitive question of acknowledging and compensating landowners who have recently installed systems. The results of this review will be included in the next round of consultation this summer.

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 [Downrated: 0

Hight thanks for taking the time to post your questions and feedback on this site. The project team has been working very hard to secure as much senior government funding as possible to minimize the costs to the landowners. What costs remain will be spread evenly amongst all landowners in the service area. If we allowed landowners to opt out of the system, the remaining landowners costs would increase, more would opt out and before you know it - the project would no longer be viable. If this project is to proceed it needs to be shared amongst all property owners in the service area. The

debt repayment costs will likely be amortized over 20 years. The annual debt repayment portion of the system costs will be paid for the same period. Annual operations costs estimated at approximately \$350 (in \$2014) will be paid indefinitely. If you have any more questions about costs or any other aspect of the project you can reply to this thread or contact me (Kris La Rose) directly.

ion 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

For the record, I enjoy living oceanside and all that it has to offer. I hate the fact that a walk with my dog along the Old Island Highway in Union Bay in the summer allows for some pretty awful smells and agree there needs to be an upgrade of infastructure. I applaud the conversation and the initiative to have this completed by 2018 to take advantage of the grant. I'm not talking about opting out, let me clarify my question. What part of the infastructure would homeowners be on the hook for. Has there been, and could there possibly be any discussion on allowing a rebate for homeowners who have been responsible and who have spent the money on ensuring our properties are environmentally sound. We were told during the CRD Health Inpsection for our property purchase in Union Bay, that unless we installed a new septic system, our home would be deemed unliveable. That was in November 2009. We installed a \$21,000 system, there are 2 of us living in a 1 bathroom home. Perhaps some think it was overkill, we see it as being responsible for our waste, living in an oceaside community. Our septic system should last us at least another 20 to 25 years. I agree with an increase of taxes to allow for some portion of the public infastructure, this is part of being a community and having a government system in place, however think there should be a way to allow for some rebate, if not financially, then at least in a delay of hook up so that once the perfectly good septic systems needs replacing, or, if the home changes hands, the homeowner then pays for the hook up from home to the property line. Sure, the cost to the homeowner will likely be more expensive in say, 20 years, but I'd rather put my \$300+ annual maintenance fee in a savings account for that day, than spend it on something that replaces something that was working absolutely fine. Thanks for listening. Feedback is always appreciated.

on 22 harmful to personal - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

We really need this system - have needed it for many years, I am happy it is finally coming!!! Our seawater quality will improve. I feel for those people who have just had to install new septic systems but their systems will break down in 10 - 15 years and need another 20G to replace again and again - this system won't have this issue, it is evolvable as the needs for water treatment evolve.

^{22 harmful to p} - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

How much better can the sea-water get from what it is right now? If you look at the wildlife and fish out there it's bursting with life. And by the way, my brand new type 2 system did not cost more then 12,000 dollars and will last 20 to 25 years with little or no expense during the years to come. I can get 4 systems for the price the CRD will charge me over the next 20 years. Outrageous! because the provincial and local funding has dried up since the community voted on it 10 years ago. Well, my wallet will do that on this bureaucratic system very soon also.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello — Thanks for your comments. We wanted to provide some clarification on a few of your points. Firstly, Island Health has made it clear that Area A is in need of a community wastewater system in order to protect the public and environment's health. It's great that there continues to be wildlife in Baynes Sound, but testing in areas has shown concerning water quality levels that are critical to correct for the long-term environmental health of the area. Also – there is a significant funding opportunity right now which is one of the main reasons the CVRD is pursuing an LWMP for the area. The south sewer project has been granted \$17-million in funds, which will significantly offset the capital expense of this system.

^{22 harmful to personal privac} - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

It has been stated by the project team that a Type 2 system will cost approx. \$25,000 and last up to 60 years, replacement every 10-15 years is not an accurate statement. My husband and I sold our house last year on Laurel Drive, the septic system was installed in 1986 and is still operating today without the need for current replacement.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

In response to the Non Resident posting above (probably Mr La Rose). Current septic systems have a lifespan of at least 20-25 years. And that is based upon a family of 4 users, year-round. We are 2 seniors that are half the year not home, so it is safe to say that our new installed system in 2014 will last probably 40-50 years. And bytheway, our system only costed

12,000 and NOT 20G. As for the cleaner Baynes Sound, why dont the shellfish and other agua industries throw in a couple million \$\$ as they are the ones who profit from it and make killings on their exports.

Section 22 harmfu - Area C

Uprated: 2 | Downrated: 0

I agree with you re the improvement in the seawater. My concern however is that we will get the clean seawater and then the Regional District will approve more shellfish industrial growth and we will end up with more plastic crap and unsightly barges and even potential of greater environmental problems.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

. Apologies for any confusion. The cost comparison projects replacement of on-site systems every 30 years (not 10-15) as that is the average lifespan recommended for on-site systems, particularly in poor soil conditions like those found in many parts of Phase 1. For comparison purposes, the life cycle of a well maintained municipal collection system is at least 80 years. And for 'Anonymous' below: Thanks also for your comment. To be clear: all posts by the project team can be identified as 'discussion admin' or are marked by an 'administrator' note. The estimates for on-site systems came from local service providers. The majority of properties within phase one would require a type 2 or type 3 system due to poor soil conditions and high seasonal water table.

Section 22 harmful to per - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

If your new septic system only lasts 10-15 yrs, you got a bad deal. Septic systems normally will have a life of 25-35 yrs if properly maintained. And Barb, the majority of sewage polution in Baynes Sound is coming from Cumberland. They have been dumping their untreated refuse into the Trent River many, many years.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

One has 2 years to hook up once the infrastructure is in place around the spring of 2020. Who is paying for the final hook-up, going through my garden-driveway and up to the road which probably needs a pump and electric work. Then once that is done, who is paying for de-commisioning the used septic systems.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello - Yes, there will be two years to connect with the system once it is constructed. Parcel taxes for the system will begin to be collected next year (2017). Decommissioning, as well as the cost that you would pay to the connect your home to the system at the roadway is the responsibility of the homeowner. The south sewer project will be responsible for costs beyond the property line.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

One more question Mr. LaRose: The next answer of you a while back has not been answered or did I miss something on COMPENSATION. As for your questions about costs of infrastructure and possible rebates, the project team is looking at how other jurisdictions in BC have implemented similar systems, including how they have addressed this sensitive question of acknowledging and compensating landowners who have recently installed systems. The results of this review will be included in the next round of consultation this summer.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thank you Mr. LaRose. i am referring to an answer you gave to Mrs **Constitution** on February 26 2015 as to looking in to how other municipalities handle compensation the recently installed systems. I have never seen any conclusion on that, or am I missing something. As your answer stated, the results would have been in last summers round of consultation.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello – Apologies, but we're not clear on your question here. Are you asking about homeowners who have recently installed systems, and whether they will be required to connect to the system? Please let us know and hopefully we can provide the information that you need.

etion 22 harmful to persona - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

I was under the impression from the last public meeting in March that you stated to me that there would be another public

consultaion meeting before the referendum in June....When will this happen? I definitely want there to be a public "OPEN MIKE" style meeting, where a resident can ask a question(s) so that all residents can hear their neighbours concerns....some residents may not know what to ask, so when another resident asks a question, everyone in the room can hear your answer.....There can be a time limit for concerns & questions(2 min. say) so you can control the meeting... When you have had the "POSTER STYLE" meetings, especially at the one in March, there were around 200 residents there and around the "COST" Poster, there were 12 people WONDERING what the \$\$\$ numbers really meant, when I was there. There were not enough knowledgeable staff there to answer their concerns... Everyone was concerned and it was understaffed. The comment sheet was to be answered by phone or email...this is unacceptable...In the past, we have had the "Open Mike" meetings and they didn't take 3 hours to pose questions like the one in March did. In 2006 we always had the "open Mike" during that last application for the sewer plant. In regards to this website....only a very small percentage reads it, and the majority of UB And \Royston residents do not log on and therefore are "out of the loop"./

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello There will be a few opportunities for people to get the info they need before the referendum: - Open office hours until June 17: Stop in Mon-Fri, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm at the project office in Royston (3843 Livingstone Rd) And for those unable to visit during the work day: - Infosessions: May 25 (Wednesday) at the Union Bay Community Hall (Bill Woods Room) and June 1 (Wed.) at the Royston Community Hall. Both from 5 to 7 p.m. - Project Office Open House: June 15 (Wednesday) from 4 - 7 p.m. All of these are drop-in opportunities for people to talk with the project team. More information will be coming in the mail soon. We find that most residents and homeowners right now have very specific questions about the pieces of this project that are most important to them. Providing the opportunity for people to speak in small groups or one-on-one with the project experts is the best way for us to make sure everyone's questions are answered. Thanks for your feedback about how that process can be improved (ie – ensuring more staff are on hand). Finally, this online tool is just one way that the community can be informed of the process. For example, there is also the website and newsletters mailed to all homes which provide updates. People receive information in a wide variety of ways and we're providing options for information to be accessible to all.

ion 22 harmful to persona - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Thanks for your answer, however, you stated that most homeowners have very specific questions about the project and what is most important to them....If this is true, then it affects us all who are voting, and all us voters would want to hear the questions.....That is why an open mike is the answer. The CVRD should be more transparent....and answer publicly to a sit down, open mike audience on voters concerns. ...why would a voter have to RSVP to a Public Consultation Meeting for May 25/June 1/June 15 ...these dates and times amount to 7 hours of more consultation, when 1 meeting for 2-3 hours could have been implemented through a "open mike" public meeting,.

Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Did I read the latest newsletter correctly? Did it say that only Phase 1 areas will only be able to vote in June?

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I guess the administrator is not answering your question. But, Yes, that's what it say. It also says that they start adding the increased 'parcel taxes' already next year. How ridiculous is that? 559 or 636 dollars, which is part of that collection is for so called Operating and Maintenance cost. Ha, ha, for a system that is not going to be in place until sometime in 2020. What a ripoff!

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Apologies for the delayed replay - some notifications didn't come through in a timely way. Yes – Because the Phase 1 homeowners/residents are the only ones financially responsible for the project as it begins, it will be their decision whether it moves forward as presented. Let us know if you have any questions,

armful to personal - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

As a phase 1 landowner, if I also have another property in phase one that is undeveloped(ie: no house) would I then hook up only when there is a house constructed(thinking answer is yes.) Thanks

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello will begin the capital repayment in 2017, at the same time of other property owners. That means they can/will pay either the commutation (one-time lump sum) or amortized annual parcel tax. Vacant lots will not contribute to the operations and maintenance costs until those properties are hooked up to the system.

Section 22 harmful to personal pr Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

My Questions: 1)only the phase 1 properties will be voting on the entire SSP ...is this correct? 2) that the remaining residents of phase 2 (&3) will not be able to vote for this SSP at all...is this correct? 3) On May 12/2016 I was informed from the CVRD that phase 2 (&3) property owners, 10-15 years from now, will not be getting a referendum to vote as to whether they want to hook up to this new system....It will be Mandatory..is this correct? If so, shouldn't they have some kind of vote during this referendum on June 18/2016? 4)How are Phase 2 (&3) residents costs be calculated, especially when Phase 1 homeowners have been paying into the system for the first 10-15 years...seems like they(phase 1) would be paying the "bulk" of the watertreatment plant costs...please explain. 5) If deferring...on your parcel/property tax at 5%: Please explain how the balance of loan is paid: Scenario:....A homeowner sells their property and they have been paying yearly the SSP and deferring the yearly amount on their parcel tax. Then they sell their property... I presume they would have to pay their deferred SSP charges, so there is no lien on their property....Question: does the yearly SSP deferment amount resume and transferred to the new buyer and would there be transfer costs ?OR can the seller pay the balance owing outright(probably not) 6) If not deferring, but paying the yearly \$1804/\$2036...can the new buyer choose to defer?

Section 22 huminal to personn - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Thank you for your answer. So now I have received 2 different answers from the CVRD in regards to whether phase 2 & 3 landowners will get a referendum...No was the answer May 12, when I visited the SSP Royston office, and today it the answer is Yes there will be a referendum for each of the future stages....So is the correct answer Yes? Then, if phase 1 is voted to go through and the future phases vote No, then wouldn't the "Shared" Capital Cost, then be a Non-Shared Capital Cost and therefore the 930 Phase 1 homeowners will be paying for the entire project?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Hello Hello

- Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0 I presume that there will be only 1 vote per property.....Is this correct?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello - All property owners and residents (who meet criteria re: length of residence, age, citizenship, etc) will be able to vote. This will mean there is more than one eligible vote for most properties. For more information about voter eligibility,

visit www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

This doesn't seem fair. Each property pays the tax once. Each property should have a single vote. If there is a property with two owners and four tenants, that property gets six votes. On the other hand, a property with own owner (who is also living in the property) only gets one vote!

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello anonymous – Voter eligibility is set in the Local Government Act and is provincial legislation. It is beyond the CVRD's purview and applies to all referendums in British Columbia.

^{22 harmful to persona} - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

What year is construction to begin AND when is the estimated completion date.? Please answer ASAP. thank you

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Anonymous – This project is developing well and quickly – which means information is becoming more and more concrete with each day. As a result there have been updates to information –simply due to more details being confirmed and becoming available. We're happy to answer any questions you and others have with the best information we have – and have demonstrated our commitment to keeping that information up-to-date as we move forward.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I am not the 'administrator', but for a quick answer I can tell you that construction might start in the fall of 2018 with a completion plan sometime in 2020. And the beauty of it is that you have to pay for it starting already next year with your tax bill. And then you hope they won't run into 'middens' like they did with the pump-station on Millard Drive. If that happens, things come to a complete stop and can take ages to be resolved and expensive with hand-digging archeologists going over the site..

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Construction would begin in summer 2018 and be completed in 2019. You would have two years to connect. Regarding Anonymous' comments, all construction areas have been assessed for potential archeological risks. The majority of construction will be taking place outside mapped archaeological sites and the project team will be working closely with our project partner, the K'omoks First Nation, to address any issues that may arise.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

See what I mean when I say that the CVRD does not know what or how to plan this huge undertake. In a mailing (not even a month ago, April 27) they say on page 2 of 4, TIMING, that the project will start in the FALL of 2018 and will take 18 months. In my calculation that runs to the spring of 2020 if there are no delays. Just like with the mixed answers on referendum for later phases. They just answer you what you would like to hear so you would be pro. Don't trust the mixed answers. This is not a sound project. it rambles on all fronts and is too expensive for the average Area A resident.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Many properties along the shore of Baynes Sound are below the road behind them. If not using holding tanks and pumps for household sewage, what is proposed for reliable connection to the SSP? As is stated before, 'only a few properties will need holding tanks and pumps.' The number of homes in Union Bay, Kilmarnock and Spindrift that are below the road is certainly not 'a few'.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 1

The gravity lines specified to run along the foreshore will be buried in the ground running along the front of the waterfront properties. Let us know if you have any other questions.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 1

Hello - as a gravity-fed system, the proposed design would see the collection lines run at the down-slope side of properties

(for waterfront homes, that would often be along the foreshore).

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

This would be of course below the high-water line. My question is that in ground or exposed to the weather and waves, above ground?

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Can the project office please point to any references in any of the previous reports, open house materials, etc. that indicate that there is a plan to dig up the beach to install sewage collection pipes? That design decision would expand the scope of the project beyond the jurisdiction of the CVRD and it will trigger the need for a much larger scale of public consultation. It is important that this information was disclosed in the past. The idea that the CVRD will quickly get approval to install sewage infrastructure on the beach seems risky. If we approve the referendum, we are forced to start paying taxes but there could be many additional delays related to this element of the project. What if the permits are delayed by years or the costs skyrocket? Is there also a risk that the CVRD is saying that the collection lines will be installed in our yards between our houses and the ocean (not on the foreshore and not on the road?) Will the CVRD be implementing a right of way on our own property for this shared infrastructure (the collection lines, not the connection lines)? Will that limit our future ability to construct houses on our own property?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The project has always been explained as a gravity-fed system, which would mean down-slope from properties. As u pointed out, the current preliminary design calls for gravity collection pipes running through the eastern edges of the water front property lines- this would require statutory right of way and of course restoring the pre-construction state of the property. The final locations of collection pipes will be confirmed as detailed engineering designs are developed but the preliminary locations are available on maps at the project office.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Thank you for the answer (below) regarding the location of sewer pipes with waterfront homes. ...Hello - as a gravity-fed system, the proposed design would see the collection lines run at the down-slope side of properties (for waterfront homes, that would often be along the foreshore).. Does the CVRD have permits in place from Fisheries and Oceans to ruin the fore-shore? 2nd, As there is a law in place that forbids anyone to dig, construct, take away or cut anything within a 50' boundary above the high-water line, how does the CVRD expect the connections to be made with the main pipes running along the foreshore?.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 1

If the project is authorized by the public on June 18 we will move quickly to initiate the regulatory approvals required for the foreshore lines. The approvals obtained by and for the project will very likely cover the excavations required by the property owners to connect to the gravity collection system.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Saying that the approvals will "likely cover the excavations required by property owners" is not good enough. If the approvals do not cover those excevation projects, home owners could be on the cost for expensive permitting costs. In some cases, those costs alone might be more expensive than installing a new septic system. Can the project office share a map showing which properties will need to connect to pipes on the beach?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello anonymous – please feel free to stop by the project office between 8:30-4:30 to see the map of pipeline routing. There will be late office hours on Wednesday, June 15 as well or an open house at the Royston Community Hall on Wednesday, June 1. We cannot provide a guarantee that permitting will cover permitting costs because that may vary with individual properties and the requirements of each. Our intention is to share where possible.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

http://www.comoxvalleyecho.com/news/377585651.html "Grieve said although they are mandated to deliver services, during the referendum local governments and administration are not allowed to show bias." I am confused about this. Hasn't the administration shown a clear bias in promoting the yes vote on this project?

Anonymous - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0 When will the results of the referendum be released to the public?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Anonymous. The results are posted at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

harmful to person Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The vote is in, unofficially; Question 1: YES: 29% 282 Votes NO: 71% 681 Votes Question 2: YES: 25% 238 Votes NO: 75% 729 Votes

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/main/departments/legislative-services/south-sewer-service-referendum/results.html Common sense has prevailed!

ARCHIVE: Biggest Concerns

What is your biggest concern about a new wastewater management and water resource recovery plan?

etion 22 harmful to personal priv - Area H

Uprated: 2 | Downrated: 0

It is imperative to have a new poll of residents on this matter. The current project is far too different in scope from the previous proposal to apply the results from that one. E g the inclusion of Cumberland. Also the circumstances of many residents waste disposal options have changed in the years since the first referendum. Compared to the cost of the initiative, the cost of a referendum is minuscule. If you expect ratepayers to "get out and vote", you must give them options wherein their vote actually counts for or against SOMETHING!

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thank-you for sharing your thoughts . This is important feedback for the project team.

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The provincial liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process selected to authorize this project could be used to demonstrate electoral assent instead of another referendum, but the decision on whether to proceed without one will fall to the CVRD Electoral Areas Services Committee and ultimately the CVRD board. The crucial consideration in making that decision will be whether enough of the local landowners have been engaged in the consultation process, and whether this consultation indicated general support for the project. If either of these are uncertain, the EASC could decide that another referendum is appropriate. This PlaceSpeak forum is just one way that the public can have their say: the south sewer project team are available to answer questions in person every Thursday afternoon at the project office at Royston Road and Livingstone Road; there is a comment form available on the project website; you can reach me or other members of the project team via email or telephone anytime (see sidebar); we send out regular newsletters highlighting opportunities to provide feedback; and we are hosting public events similar to the one on January 21 at significant project milestones. We believe these public engagement mechanisms are appropriate at this stage but we are also open to suggestions. If you or anyone else can think of other ways that we can engage with the landowners within the service area to better understand their concerns, address questions, and gauge the level of support for the project please let us know! Thank you for providing this feedback. Kris

on 22 harmful to personal privacy Area H

Uprated: 2 | Downrated: 0

My greatest concern is operating cost. Firstly how much will it be and how will it be apportioned between Cumberland and other uses (who presumably will have greater pumping costs). Secondly and of perhaps even greater importance is: "Will it be deferable". Many ratepayers in this contemplated service area defer their taxe (much of which include operating costs for various services). The application of a sewer operating cost which is not deferable could have a huge impact on the immediate 'tax' burden of many residents that are on restricted incomes.

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The operations costs are summarized in the document 'Backgrounder: Scenarios and Costs' in the Resources page on this

site. Exactly how the capital AND operating costs will be apportioned between project partners is the objective of an analysis currently being undertaken. A decision on apportionment is expected in March or April. We are also working with a consultant to understand exactly how costs will be recovered from property owners within the service area. A key question to be answered is whether system debt repayment and/or annual operations costs are deferrable similar to how taxes are for those that are eligible. We'll have an answer to that question at the next public open house, sometime in late spring or early summer.

on 22 harmful to personal - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I am hoping that the water discharged is clean.

ction 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area F

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Am I correct believing: 1. There will NOT be a vote or a referendum on the sewer project. 2. Connection to the sewer project is mandatory. 3. The cost figures provided to the public are not based on any engineering plans. 4. The cost figures provided to the public are for service to the property line only. Questions: 1. What equipment, material, upgrades will there be required on the landowners property? 2. Will there still be tanks (as in present septic systems) and if so, what type of tank and what servicing will be required? more to come......

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thank you for taking the time to sign up to PlaceSpeak and for asking these questions. In answer to your questions: 1) The provincial liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process selected to authorize this project could be used to demonstrate electoral assent instead of another referendum, but the decision on whether to proceed without one will fall to the CVRD Electoral Areas Services Committee and ultimately the CVRD board. The crucial consideration in making that decision will be whether enough of the local landowners have been engaged in the consultation process, and whether this consultation indicated general support for the project. If either of these are uncertain, the EASC could decide that another referendum is appropriate. 2) Yes, connection to the system would be mandatory for property owners within the service area. No other jurisdiction that we are aware of has provided an opt out option, which would unfairly redistribute the costs to the other landowners as the project costs are shared equally between all landowners within the service area. And just as importantly, our studies to date indicate that on-site treatment is not a viable long term option in the core areas of Royston and Union Bay due to the density of lots and poor soil conditions. 3) The costs provided to the public at the January 21 public event for each of the four shortlisted wastewater management options were developed by Associated Engineering to a Class C level of accuracy (+/- 30%) which is appropriate for the preliminary design prepared by AE for each option. 4. In addition to the approximate annual costs for debt repayment and operations costs, a range of pricing for connection from house system to the property line and connection to the system was communicated. Because of the wide range of conditions at each property, size, slope, location of existing field etc., a wide range of pricing was provided: between \$1,000 to \$2,000. And your other questions: Other than the sanitary pipe connection between the landowners home and the street, most homes will not require additional equipment. In a very small number of situations it may be necessary for homes to include a pump to push their wastewater up hill to the closest point on the gravity collection system. If you have any further questions feel free to give me (Kris La Rose) a call, email or drop by the project office. Or continue to use this forum so other people can see the responses right away (rather than later in our FAQ).

tion 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

What about our existing septic system? Will we be required to decommission our existing septic systems and what is involved and what is the cost if any?

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

This is an important question, but one that can't be answered definitively yet. Most other jurisdictions that have implemented similar projects have allowed decommissioning of systems in place, i.e. pumping out and filling with sand. Our proposed approach will be communicated during the next round of consultation this summer.

^{22 harmful to per} - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

I am concerned that the information in the issue #9 is not enough. I do see that the cost for connection is in there but what about the yearly fees?

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

HI — thanks for your note. There are two portions of cost: capital and operations & maintenance. The cost in the newsletter is capital, and there will be options for payment, that includes a annual rate, which is still being calculated. Operations and maintenance is estimated to be about \$615/year for residents connected to the system. We will be providing a more comprehensive cost breakdown at the open house March 23. If you're unable to attend, all the info will be posted online at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp under the How to Keep Informed tab. Of course, we're happy to answer questions here, via email/phone/office drop in as well.

^{22 harmful to per} - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

ADMIN: Can you clarify your answer. Are you saying each residence will have an additional bill of \$615 each year to pay for operations and maintenance after connection. Is this amount going to be added to our property taxes or parcel tax or come in the form of a monthly bill.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello — Yes, O&M for the new system would equal \$618/year. The combined cost of both capital and operations and maintenance is estimated at \$1938/year – or \$160/month - for homeowners. This will be billed via parcel tax that would show up on your property taxes as a SSP line item.

ion 22 harmful to per - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Are you serious? \$615/yr. We have our septic tank cleaned and inspected every 3 years and the cost is just over \$300. How can people be expected to come on board this project when it is going to increase our living costs by 600% per year? As well as the capital cost outlays. Outrageous!

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

^{on 22 harmful to per} - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The cost to individual households. \$20,000 ++ installation is a lot of money for people on fixed income.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello ^{Section 22 harr} - Thank-you for your comment.

^{22 harmful to personal privacy} - Area F

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

My biggest concern about this website is the fact the administrator is the only one who can start a topic. I want to start a different topic from the ones listed. How about one that starts out with why we don't agree with what has been offered to us?

on 22 harmful to person - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I've already sent this comment to the South Sewer Project Team (via email), but thought it would be good to add it to this 'Biggest Concern' discussion. I have a significant concern about the way the annual capital cost (per household) is calculated. At the recent open house held in the Union Bay Hall, that cost was shown to be \$1320 per year (which comes from a 30 year amortization of a total 'per household' cost of \$20250). I understand that no allowance has been made (in the 'per household' total capital cost calculation) for population growth (ie increasing number of homes) in the area over the coming 30 years. My concern has to do with retroactive adjustments that (as I understand it) would NOT be made to those who choose to make an

upfront cash payment to cover the homeowner's portion of the capital cost of the project. In other words, when new homes are built after the sewer project is completed, that would mean the total capital cost of the project would be shared by a larger number of homes, and therefore, the total 'per household' cost should go down. That adjustment apparently will be made for those who want to pay the annual \$1320, but not to those who have paid their capital cost up front (\$20250). That would be a highly unfair way to treat those homeowners who choose to pay up front, thereby avoiding a huge increase in their property tax bill for the next 30 years. As I understand it, an adjustment would be made (to reflect an increased cost base over which to spread the capital cost of the project) to those who choose to amortize their portion of the capital cost - but that calculation would not be extended to those who make the upfront payment. What that would mean to me, is that someone who pays their \$20250 up front, would be paying someone else's share of the cost of the project – that someone else being the owner of a new home built sometime in the future after the septic project has been installed. That I CANNOT accept. I am sure that you (CVRD) must have the history available to you, showing the number of homes in the area over the past 10, 20 or more years. It should be fairly simple to do a high/mid/low forecast of 'home count' in the area for the next 30 years, and then use that forecast (I would suggest using the low estimate of new homes built) to calculate a revised capital cost (it would result in a lower capital cost for those of us who start with the sewer service on day 1). A periodic assessment (perhaps once every 5 years) could be made to determine the actual number of homes that have been built compared to what was forecast, and adjustments (that should NOT be a difficult calculation) would be made to BOTH groups - those that are paying by monthly payment AND to those who paid their capital cost up front. In that way, the capital cost would be borne equally and fairly by all whether paying cash or by monthly payment, or whether starting out with the new sewer service in year 1 or year 20. For me, this is a show-stopper. If this is not resolved fairly, then I would plan to vote no on the June referendum.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello — Thanks for your comment. You're correct that while annual payments can be adjusted as new connections come on, there wouldn't be the same ability for those who pay the lump sum – if that option is available, though details are still being finalized. If the option is provided, every property owner will have a choice. The communications material leading up to the referendum will be clear that there won't be rebates for those who choose the lump sum option - so they can make their individual decisions.

^{22 harmful to person} Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I see it was mentioned that if we do not agree to the SS project that we would all be subject to recurring septic inspections. I for one think that it would be a more cost effect route. Even if I have to replace my septic system, the going rate seems to be \$13000 - \$20,000 depending on size. That would be the final amount I would pay which is lower than the \$20,000 +/- 30% as well as the \$615 yearly user fee. I'm sure I can get a 2% 7 yr loan for \$20,000 at the moment which would cost \$1450 in interest with a total monthly payment of \$255 per month for 84 months. So in my eyes, it would be cheaper to pay a yearly inspection fee, as well as pumping out fee every 2-3 yrs rather than get hooked up to the SS project. Also, I'm sure there must be rules regarding inspections; systems under 10 yrs old should not require any inspections.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Frank-you for your comment. You are correct that the CVRD has made clear that the status quo cannot be maintained. If a community wastewater system is not established, steps will have to be taken to increase and enforce proper management of septic systems in order to protect environmental and public health, as has been done in other jurisdictions. This will be more onerous for some property owners than for others. When assessing the compared costs though, it's important to remember a few things; • This is long-term solution - and so property owners should consider beyond one septic system replacement. If those are Type 2 systems (there are very few properties within Phase 1 of the project that would qualify for Type 1 systems given today's standards), the project team feels this is the most cost effective solution for residents to date. • The cost (both capital and operations) to residents is expected to decrease as new developments occur in the area and if additional areas (ie – Cumberland or south Courtenay) join the service. Here's a link to an info sheet with a bar graph that speaks to a cost comparison over 60 years:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SSP_20160323_why_is_change_needed_updated_211.pdf As you pointed out, cost of installation can vary but the typical cost of Type 2 system is \$24,050 (in 2014 dollars). It is assumed that the system would require a replacement at least once within 60 years. On the other hand, the useful life time of the collection system for municipal systems is estimated to be 80 years on average.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello both. Thanks for your comments. We understand the need for this systems will vary depending on the age/condition of your existing system and the conditions on your existing property. The numbers are being shared simply so that voters

can make an informed decision in time for the June 18 referendum.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Of course Mr La Rose is quoting you and everyone else who would believe him that a Type 2 system cost 24,500. This is BS, because I just paid 14,000 for complete installation of a Type 2 EcoFlow system and works great. On top of that life expectancy, we are only 2 retirees living here 6 months a year, our system will last a life-time. There is no comparison with this bureaucratic SSP solution which is great for contractors, developers. And yes, we pay for initiating and developers just tie in and get smaller subdivided lots on the go.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hi with a go and only cost 14,000. CVRD is of course going to use 'scare tactics' with saying to do inspections and what not. They should have done that 10 years ago. Or the health department should have . It's their fault we are in this mess right now and they want you and me to pay for it. Ridiculous !!

n 22 harmful to personal privac - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

My biggest concern is the cost of the project to only a small number of property owners, it seems like a big price to pay when not all residents of the same community are paying for it. Plus payment is required before the project even begins. The information sheet regarding the vote date states some property owners may defer, that is simply piggy-backing on the provincial property tax deferment plan that support people 55 years and older that meet other criteria, plus would place a lien on your property. The value of parcel tax is significant, \$2036 over 30 years plus the cost to connect and decommission. Why is the value so high when a cost to connect within City of Courtenay boundary is approx \$30,000 and a user fee annually no higher than \$400? \$2036 over 30 years amounts to over \$60,000, add in connection fee and decommissioning of septic it is closer to \$65,000. Seems like a lot, I really doubt you would pay \$30,000+ every 15 years for a septic, your comments below indicate that a Type 2 system would cost approx \$25K and is expected to last 60 years...why would we then want to pay more than double that in half the time?? While I agree that property owners should think long term it would be rare for property owners to replace their systems 2 or 3 times within living in the same neighbourhood. if they are having their systems inspected and are up to par, the most cost effective route is to maintain their septic system. It also appears that the Phase 1 owners are paying for the initial bulk of the system and if Phase 2 owners came online it might reduce the annual costs, however, it seems a little unfair that we would basically subsidize the start-up costs for the Phase 2 areas. What if the other areas voted no to connect, then we still have areas within are communities not contributing to the costs and then some connected and others not... A lump sum payment value cannot be made available at this time but we know what the parcel tax would be??????

tion 22 harmful to per - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

on and the system requires more money to maintain. So what will the \$615. user fee be in 5 yrs as well as additional money added to the parcel taxes to keep the infrastructure running properly? With a new septic system, you know up front what your costs are going to be down the road other than the costs related to emptying and inspections which are small in comparison.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello **Sector 22 lamited to personal protect**, Apologies for not responding sooner - for some reason I didn't see your post. Thanks for sharing your comments - there are some questions within your note that we wanted to provide answers to: - While the capital cost to connect newly incorporated homes to the City of Courtenay sewer is more than that of the SSP, you are right that the operations and management costs are lower. This is due to the higher density of homes and the much higher number of homes connected to that system. - The annual parcel tax, and operations and maintenance costs, will decrease as more properties connect to the system. - Type 2 systems are more costly than \$25,000 and its estimated life is 25 to 30 years depending on level of maintenance. Assessments undertaken by our team show that a Type 2 system over a 60 year lifecycle is roughly \$2,300/year – and that would not get lower over time as the south sewer service would. - A lump sum payment (called a 'commutation') will be offered as an option. Similar to the parcel taxes, there will be an estimated value, and a maximum value. It is estimated at \$23,000, with a maximum of \$25,500. This is a detail only recently confirmed.

on 22 harmful to person - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Why is Stage One not connecting to homes located in Gartley Beach, the Briardale area, and the area between Kilmarnock

Drive and Union Bay? With the Stage One pipeline passing those areas, I would think that the overall cost per household could come down significantly if the total cost were spread out over a larger cost base. The total capital + annual operating costs will result in many homes in the Stage One area seeing a 100% increase in their annual property tax - and that is totally unacceptable. I think a regional wastewater management plan is good, but NOT when it comes with such an obscenely high price tag.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello . While you're correct that the force mains will go past these areas, these pipes will be pressurised large diameter pipes that convey sewage from pump stations to the treatment plant. Gravity pipes that collect waste from individual homes cannot be connected to these force mains and therefore places like Gartley Beach would require their own network of gravity collection pipes including a pump station. The small number of properties in the area combined with the high cost of the infrastructure to reach them would significantly increase costs for all participants in the initial phase of the south sewer project. We understand that this is a significant cost – however we believe this is the most cost effective option for a community wastewater service. With roughly 60 per cent of costs on track to be secured through grant funding it is not expected that this much funding could be found again or that construction costs will ever be lower.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hi - Yes, the high cost of the collection pipes and pump stations for those areas, combined with the low number of homes would significantly increase the capital cost of the project. We understand that everyone's degree of need will be different for a service like this. Thank-you for your comments.

etion 22 harmful to person - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

This is my reply to the Discussion Administrators response to my comment: What you're saying is that Stage One is paying for all the pressurized large diameter pipes (I read "expensive") plus the treatment plant --- and that by adding an incremental bit of collection system plus pumping stations for Gartley and Briardale (which each area needs anyway) - is going to increase the per capita cost??? I find that hard to believe. It doesn't matter to me that grant funding may not ever be found again to match what is in place now. It is still way too expensive compared to the cost of maintaining the system I now have (Type 3) - which will continue to serve me perfectly well for the next 30 plus years and more. I would much rather continue with what I have and pay the cost of maintaining that system than bear the annual burden of \$2000+ for the next 30 years.

^{iul to person} - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

One more comment regarding the annual cost calculation - which, at the recent open house held at the Union Bay hall was given as \$1320/year (\$20250 repaid over a 30 year period). I asked someone on the South Sewer project team what the interest rate was that was used to calculate the \$1320 (=\$110/month), and I was told it was 5%. I did my own mortgage calculation, and the actual payment is \$108.07/month, or \$1297/year - so I suspect the \$108 was rounded up to \$110 (which is totally ok). My concern has to do with the interest rate. Are we really going to be charged 5% - or was that just an estimate? Today, a prospective homeowner can get a 5 year fixed term interest rate of less than 3%. Using a 3% interest rate (instead of 5%) reduces the cost from \$108/month to \$85/month (\$1022/year). I am not a financing expert, but would guess that a project of this magnitude would attract some fairly good financing rates, at much lower rates than 5%. At 5%, the total cost to the homeowner over 30 years amounts to just under \$40000 (almost double the upfront \$20250). In today's environment, I'm sure that something can be done to bring that 5% annual rate down to something a lot lower. I would be concerned if that is not done - and presented to us before the June referendum.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thanks — the five per cent has been put forward as a conservative estimate since the financial team must consider a 30-year forecast. If there are reduced costs due to interest savings, those will be passed along to the residents, but we wanted to ensure everyone understands the potential cost even if interest rates are to increase from today's financial environment.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

will not be until the spring of 2020 and then you have to connect your home within 2 years. You could be paying 5 years for this in ADVANCE. I can not come up with any scheme like that other than an expensive life-insurgence policy, and just

hope that they are still in business when you die.

on 22 harmful to persona - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

There has not been any discussion between CVRD and the residents of Phase 1 as to where the water is coming from for the wastewater treatment plant. I would like to know : where it is coming from...is it Langley Lake, since the treatment plant looks like it is in Union Bay??And if so, why hasn't this been mentioned? How much water per day would be used? Please give a definite answer and please don't answer: "not much". Has the CVRD been in negotiations with the Union Bay Improvement District regarding the SSP water source? And if so the Union Bay residents have to be advised of this. Will you be reducing growth for Union Bay by using the water from Langley Lake? More development, more water usage, more water usage for SSP... This is not a huge lake. I don't want to be on water restrictions nor have a water shortage just to flush my toilet ., Please answer these questions before the vote, CVRD owes it to this community.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 1

Hello Hello

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

You never get the right answers as you can see today again. Simple question; how MUCH water is the plant going to use per day? Not talking about drinking water or industrial water. They just don't know again or don't want to tell you what you need to know before you make a decision on how to vote. Too many unknowns, too few to pay. Vote NO.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Anonymous - We are providing all the information that we have to the community. Apologies if we misunderstood the question but I believe the below explains the water usage. There's no water used in the treatment process. Any other industrial uses such as wash-downs will use the reclaimed water collected from the treatment process. The only water that would be drawn from a system is that used for workers - ie: staff kitchen tap. If you can provide further clarification about what water use you're alluding to, we can help provide more information.

Anonymous - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0 Cost, cost and cost.... Arne we subsidizing developers???

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 1 | Downrated: 0

Yes, and designers and office bureaucrats. Simply vote NO and save your money for better things. Those pen-pushers that work on the so called estimates don't know their job either as the forecasts of the cost and maintenance change all the time, and only go HIGHER.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Anonymous. Any new connections will have to pay into the south sewer project capital and operations and maintenance. That means that as new development comes on line, they will have to pay their share, which will bring down the costs for those connected.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

How is their "fair share" calculated for future development projects? On day one, the initial 950 homes start paying for the entire project - including excess capacity. If a developer wants to connect 10 years in, they should be asked to subsidize the initial 950 homes for the 10 years that they have been financing the initial construction of the excess capacity. When will we be told how this calculation is going to be performed?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

For new developments, Development Cost Charges (DCCs) are imposed to provide funds for existing service infrastructure
such as water and sewer. New developments will be charged DCC to pay into the south sewer infrastructure for the period of time before they were able to connect. The new developments will then help dilute the cost for all service participants as they start paying their annual share of the remaining debt repayment and maintenance costs.

Anonymous - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Regarding the answer about new developments paying Development Cost Charges (DCC's). At present in Union Bay the cost of charges paid to UBID is \$8900. per lot which Kensington Island Properties will pay once a new water agreement is negotiated. Could you explain how Kensington Island Properties will be paying into the South Sewer Project as UBID is responsible for water, firefighting and street lighting? UBID has nothing to do with sewer so how is Kensington Island Properties, who plans for 3500 new homes in the lifetime of the project going to reduce the cost for those 950 properties bearing the cost of this infrastructure?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello Anonymous – Re: your question about DCCs - Any new development in the area would be required to play DCCs to both the Union Bay Improvement District (for the services you outline below) and to the Comox Valley Regional District for the services it provides. If a community wastewater service is in place, it will include contributions to the sewer service.

Anonymous - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Cost for land owners, my septic system is maintained and pumped out ever two years, cost in the last two years. zero Now we are looking at approx. 21,000 then 600.+ dollars a year for usage. So

ection 22 harmful to person - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

At the SSP open house last night (May 25, Union Bay Community Hall), it became clear some home owners in the Stage One area may not get their house connected to the system until some time after the treatment plant has been commissioned in 2019 (up to two years after the commissioning), whether they want to get connected right away or not (there simply are not enough contractors in the Comox Valley to hook up everyone on day one). But... the 'sewer tax' will start being collected in 2017. That means that everyone will be paying the sewer tax in 2017, 2018 and 2019 without anything to show for it, and some even up to two years longer than that. That's anywhere from \$6000 to \$10000 per home owner. And, if that is not bad enough, what are home owners supposed to do if they are contemplating selling their old place now (with a potentially failed septic system) or building a new place now where they have to put in a new septic system if they want to live in their new house. What this advance sewer tax (at least from 2017 to 2019) means is that not only will the house seller or new home builder have to spend money for a new septic system if they want to sell or build - but on top of that, they will be paying a sewer tax for a minimum of three years and up to five years - for which they get nothing.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello E: You're correct that homeowners will not be able to connect to the system until construction on the system is completed. They will then have two years to connect – a buffer given to ease the transition for homeowners who need/want more time to source a contractor and complete the work. For people with existing failing systems, there are interim measures that can be put in place to hold over until the community wastewater system is constructed. Funds accumulated through collection of parcel taxes effective 2017 will be used to reduce annual parcel taxes in the first few years of operation to minimize the financial impact of the project on residents. People looking to build or repair/replace onsite systems in the next few years are advised to contact the project office to discuss further.

^{22 harmful to person} - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

At yesterday evening's (May 25) SSP town hall meeting in Union Bay, I asked a question about the maximum cost of the SSP, and got the following answer (and I think everyone needs to understand this): The 'maximum cost' is only the maximum amount of money that can be spent on the SSP under the terms of the current referendum vote. If costs escalate faster than expected, or if project obstacles are encountered which push the total cost higher than even the 12.5% contingency (which is not a very large contingency), then the project would stop after the maximum dollars have been spent - and the SSP project team would then have to seek approval from the electorate (that's you and me) to spend additional dollars. That means that the maximum annual sewer tax could actually be HIGHER than \$2036.

Anonymous - Area C

Yeah, all sort of sh... can hit you once you vote yes. 10 years ago they voted yes and the CVRD screwed it up. And now the cost is twice as much. Who's fault is that? Imagine that this time after you have been paying 2,000 a year for 3 or 5 years and the plans sinks. Your money is down the toilet also, as there is no service provided while you pay starting next year.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello and Anonymous: While you are correct that another referendum would be required if the annual parcel taxes escalate beyond \$2,036 per property, The risk of rejection and the inherent delays of another referendum could be catastrophic to the project and the project team and advisors have worked very hard to ensure that the maximum parcel tax is sized to minimize that risk. There are already significant contingencies built into the capital cost estimates, 15% design and 20% construction, and the P3 procurement will include an affordability cap (incorporating initial capital and lifecycle costs) which proponents cannot exceed. That cap will be set at the estimated costs (roughly 12.5% below the max) and once the project agreement is finalized there is no mechanism for the costs to be increased, that is what is meant by risk transfer to the private partner – no payments are made to the private partner until substantial completion, and fully 1/3 of capital costs are reserved and paid back over the life of the agreement as collateral for compliance with the project agreement. The buffer between the estimated costs and the maximum is there to absorb potential increases in interest rates between now and when the RFP is released, or other risks retained by the CVRD and not transferred to the private partner.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Please clarify:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SSP_Board_20160520_cost_table_handout_update.pdf This document states that the "Maximum allowable for O&M* \$636/Year Parcel Tax" Does that mean that if the residents approve this referendum that they will never be asked to pay more than \$636/year for operating costs during the next 30 years or is there a chance that O&M costs could increase above \$636/year at some point during the next 30 years (for example if labor costs increase over time,) which could push the total annual costs to each property owner above \$2000/year?

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

No you are wrong. the \$636.00 will go up with the rate of inflation. So by year 25 it can be closer to \$1,000.00 The plan is totally unfair to the individual homeowner. Once you vote yes, we will go broke as about \$2,000.00 will probably double your taxes next year and for many years to come. Also when you hook-up to the system (mandatory) you have to pay an additional \$1,500 to \$5,000.00 for the connection to the street from your house and decommissioning of your current septic. Just vote NO !

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello - Yes, O&M can increase with Inflation, tied to an index that would be specified in the project agreement. Commonly used is Consumer Price Index (CPI) or an aggregate of some more specific StatsCan indices such as labour, industrial equipment.. etc. The project would not able to arbitrarily increase payments. At the same time, operations and maintenance costs will go down if and when more users connect to the systems, spreading this cost out among additional households. Let us know if we can provide any additional clarification,

Section 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

One of my biggest concerns is that this is a private company running this project. We will have no transparency to what the profit to their company is. It does seem suspicious that they are leaving some areas out so that these lines will have to be run at least twice to service some of the areas. Kind of looks like to me that they are milking this out for the highest profitability.. Bottom line is why go into business if you are not going to make money, but I don't think that it's fair that they do it on the homeowners backs..

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello **There is no private company engaged in this project at this time.** The plans to date, including determination of phasing for specific service areas, have been determined by the Comox Valley Regional District. If the referendum passes, the project will proceed as a public-private partnership, which would see a private partner design, build, finance, operate and maintain the facility. That would be confirmed through an agreement which would clearly detail the terms and

standards - including the cost for the CVRD.

ection 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Just one other thing regarding the meeting at the Royston hall on June 1, shame on the CVRD for sending in there most inexperienced young people to deal with the homeowners These young people cannot answer the questions that the homeowners were asking and a really unfair situation to put their newest employees in.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello: There were staff from a range of seniority levels available at the event – all of them very capable of answering questions or helping to find the answers to questions posed. If you have any remaining questions, please feel free to email the project team at southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca or stop in at the project office.

^{n 22 harmful to person} - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Am I right in my understanding that a high pressure line will convey waste liquid from Royston to the treatment plant, and another separate high pressure line will transport waste from the Kilmarnock area to the treatment plant, and if Gartley Beach will be added in the future, it will need its own high pressure line?

Section 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

the costs to the home owner are too much. Find funding from other sources starting with all of the comox valley and the shellfish industry as they too are benefiting from this.

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Yes , the cost and for that matter the taxes and maintenance fees are WAY TOO HIGH. It is unfair to this small group of 900something homeowners. And the private investors laughing with a nice guaranteed return of 5% on their money.

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thank-you for your comment, let us know if you have any questions.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Please read these question and ask them to yourselves before deciding your vote on the Royston/Union Bay South Sewer Project 1. Why do we need two or more separate and complete systems in the Valley.? 2. We are 60 k people or perhaps 15 thousand sewer connections. Does this merit the extravagance of multi administrations, treatment plants and force mains. What rating scheme did the RD use to evaluate all options and result in the selection of this one? 3. Is the proposed plan the best option for the South Shore. It has huge gaps not included in Phase I, many arbitrary and inexplicable exclusions and forces many people to decommission modern fully functional systems. Incredible waste. To what degree does it solve the problem?. 4. What is the actual state of septic pollution in Baynes sound ? I have tried repeatedly tried to get info on incidences, severity and duration of known contaminations in Baynes Sound.? How many of these are due to known point sources that could be addressed through proper septic discharge enforcement?. How much contamination comes from the Trent River?. The R D has refused to give me any data. 5. What are the potential cost increases due to unforeseen complications in construction (middens for example)? These are not covered under this referendum (except for contingency of 12 %) and Phase 1 would have to pay more when if it were re-referendumed. But what choice would we have? You can't leave a half finished - non-operational system ! 6. What other cost increase will be due to "inflation" on operating and maintenance costs?. "Inflation" as it applies to increases in operating costs has not been defined. 7. Are you prepared to pay 3 -5 years "operating costs for a system which you will not be able to connect to for at least 3 and possible 5 years?. Is this even legal? (As a long time Project Manager, I have never encountered such a bizarre payment concept.) 8. Are you aware of and comfortable with the potential costs (wholly the user's responsibility) for connections (piping and pumping if necessary) and of decommissioning old systems?. No satisfactory cost estimates are forthcoming from the R D. 9. Are you satisfied that this proposal will result in an equitable and bearable tax levy for all affected residents of Area A, with only 950 Phase 1 properties paying for all of it for up to 30 years or until the RD sees fit to promote a Phase II and those affected approve that? 10. Are you satisfied that the RD has considered and presented options in a fair and unbiased manner (they are obligated to do so) ? 11. Are you comfortable with prospect of subsidizing Kensington (and probably other developers) to an unknown future degree? Please recall that Kensington in particular was expected to be an active participant and direct contributor to the 2006 plan. 12.

Are you comfortable with having this project directly influenced and ultimately operated by an as yet to be identified P3 (public private partnership). 13. Are you confident that the R D will obtain required Federal permissions to build/install collection lines below high water mark. If not, are you comfortable with the probable need to expropriate rights -of-way on some waterfront or semi-waterfront properties ? Please add your own particular concerns and then vote "yes" if you dare !!

Anonymous - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0 This was posted by Second 22 Member 1 in Area A Phase 1

Anonymous - Area C

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Very good points "!! I don't DARE to vote yes. I brought up the 3-5 years paying into the system before actually hook-up. They have no serious response to it. It is the most bizarre arrangement and you are right questioning the legality of it. If the project stalls for whatever reason in year 4, \$ 8,000.00 is down the sewer that never was. Simply VOTE NO !

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello – we've tried to answer your questions where posed, by number below: 1&2. The cost of upgrading existing systems in the Valley, and the required infrastructure to connect with them from the outlying areas, would be high. The proposed south sewer project would be available as a regional facility that could see additional communities/neighbourhoods connect in the future. Additionally, the wastewater treatment facility in Comox/Courtenay is nearing capacity. There are concerns that the existing site is not large enough to handle projected future flows from the existing sewerage service area AND the south region. 3. Many years of investigation and analysis has led to the south sewer project surfacing as the best option for the south region. With the high density of properties in core areas of Royston and Union Bay the need for a solution is highest there, and the costs of providing service are the lowest. The Phase 1 areas are the start of what is intended to be a project that will bring in the other areas in future years. 4. Information about the water conditions in Baynes Sound can be found here:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/2015_Feasibility_Study_continuing_to_use_private_septic_systems_a . Island Health has also supported the need for a community wastewater system in the interest of protecting public health. Also, a 2009 study regarding septic systems in Royston and Union Bay can be found here:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SS_2009_Royston_UnionBay_Sewage%20Study_Effects_of_Onsite_ 5. The cost estimate includes 20% design and construction contingency in addition to the 12% contingency for other unforeseen cost implications. The CVRD has undertaken Archaeological Overview Assessment of the construction zone and is aware of all the potentially sensitive areas and will continue working with regulators and the project partner, K'omoks First Nation, to address potential archaeological matters should they arise during the construction period. 6. Inflation on O&M payment is tied to an index that would be specified in the project agreement. Commonly used is Consumer Price Index (CPI) or an aggregate of some more specific StatsCan indices such as labour, industrial equipment.. etc. Project is not able to arbitrarily increase payments. 7. The collection of fees beginning in 2017 has been proposed to ease the initial high costs for ratepayers that would be required in the first years of construction/operation. Parcel taxes can be collected on a service once it's established. Whether the community supports the creation of this service is one of the referendum questions for people to consider. 8. The cost of connecting and decommissioning will range significantly from property-to-property, depending on location of plumbing and pipes, condition of the septic tank, landscaping/driveway condition etc. A broad estimate of \$1,000-\$4,000 has been provided by local contractors, but we recognize this will be different for each homeowner. 9. After many years of planning and applications for grant funding, we are finally able to secure or on track to secure over 60% of the total cost of the project through grant funds and contributions from project partners. Our analysis, supported by Associated Engineering, conclude that the costs of the SSP to residents is lower than those for a typical type 2 treatment plant over the lifetime of the facility. Follow this link to view the relevant report from AE http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/2015_Feasibility_Study_continuing_to_use_private_septic_systems_a 10. The CVRD has been engaged in planning on this project for over 10 years, actively developing a liquid waste management plan since May 2014. This has included extensive outreach and community engagement, culminating in a referendum - the ultimate means to gauge community support. 11. Homeowners are not subsidizing potential developments. Development cost charges will have to be paid by new development that cover their portion of the infrastructure costs. Any new connections will also help to spread the cost of the operations and maintenance, bringing down costs for all ratepayers. 12. The CVRD would retain full ownership of the facility, no public jobs will be lost, full accountability will be required via project agreement and the same environmental and operations standards of a public-operated facility will have to be met. In addition to that, a P3 reduces the risk of cost overages to the public, increases the potential for innovation, is estimated to reduce the capital cost by roughly 15 per cent and comes along with a grant worth \$13.3 million. 13. Expropriation is not an option for the CVRD. We feel confident the gravity system will achieve the approvals needed. If not, other routes on public right-of-ways would be proposed.

Administrator: regarding answer 11. Homeowners are not subsidizing potential developments. Development cost charges will have to be paid by new development that cover their portion of the infrastructure costs. Could you provide what the Development Cost Charges are at present and what formula will be used to determine what portion of those charges will be applied specifically to the South Sewer Project in order to bring down the costs to those in Phase I? Also, please explain how the costs will eventually go down for Phase I if the costs for the other phases are too expensive now?

Anonymous - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Administrator: regarding answer 11. Homeowners are not subsidizing potential developments. Development cost charges will have to be paid by new development that cover their portion of the infrastructure costs. Could you provide what the Development Cost Charges are at present and what formula will be used to determine what portion of those charges will be applied specifically to the South Sewer Project in order to bring down the costs to those in Phase I? Also, please explain how the costs will eventually go down for Phase I if the costs for the other phases are too expensive now?

Anonymous (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hello, the regional district does not have a bylaw currently in place regarding development cost charges (DCC) for the south sewer project as the sewer service is not established yet. If and when the service is established, a sewer DCC bylaw would be drafted and implemented. DCCs are monies collected from land developers to offset some of the infrastructure expenditures incurred to service the needs of new development. In other words as development happens within a service area it imposes a growth related capacity impact on the treatment plant. DCCs are collected and reserved so that when the cumulative effect of growth requires expansion of the treatment plant funds are available to expand the facility at no cost to existing users. The cost of initial construction can also sometimes be included in DCC calculations so that future uses help pay for initial project construction. Re: Phase II and III: When time comes for future phases to connect to the treatment plant, cost of collection system (gravity mains and pump stations) to service homes within these phases would be covered by the users in that area (likely with the help of grant funding as cost would be too high). However, properties in future phases will share the cost for the treatment plant and outfall (Shared Capital) with the initial users. Both capital and maintenance cost for the initial users of the system will decrease if and when later phases come in as more users share the cost.

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I am confused about two parts of the cost: 1) On the referendum page it lists the K'omoks First Nation Contribution as a grant. http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/main/departments/legislative-services/south-sewer-service-referendum/proposed-service.html Is the K'omoks First Nation actually going to give us this money as a grant or are they contracting with the CVRD for the ability to connect houses to the system in exchange for this cash payment? In that case, doesn't it mean that the system has to be larger to accommodate those additional connections - so the money coming in is cancelled out by the additional costs? Also, wouldn't it be more correct to classify that funding in the same way that our own cash contributions are being classified instead of calling it a grant? 2) The official referendum webpage states that "A maximum requisition cost of \$2,036 per year is presented in the referendum question" Many people are using that number to assume that the cost will be about \$60,000. However, doesn't the bylaw also allow the cost to increase each and every year based on a formula related to inflation that has not yet been determined? If inflation is 3%, could the cost near \$5000/year by the end of the project?

ARCHIVE: Locating a Wastewater Treatment Plant

Location, geography, availability, access and community comment will all be considered as assessments begin to identify an appropriate location for the new treatment facility. What are your priorities for the site selection process?

Anonymous - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Given that the project costs have only a 12.5% contingency, it sounds like a number of the key design decisions have been made. The selected site is extremely close a residential neighborhood. The design sketch shows an open vat of sewage. http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SSP_20160323_WWTP_AE_design_sketch.pdf It is also my understanding that there is nothing in the referendum that ties the CVRD to any specific design criteria or plant location and so we are basically writing a blank cheque but the actual plant design could be changed. As costs increase, corners can be cut in areas like odor control. The existing plant has become a horrendous nightmare for residents that are near it. http://www.comoxvalleyrecord.com/news/225829481.html Am I missing something or is this as bad as it smells?



This should be a huge concern for especially those who live in the Kilmarnock Area because we don't know for sure how big this treatment facility could become if in the future Cumberland, Courtenay Comox is added onto the SSP. Think 10 years from now that this could happen when all of these cities have to replace their systems plus phase 2 adding on. CVRD says no it won't happen, but I believe not, once the site is approved,The sewage treatment plant site is on a large piece of property, and it doesn't make sense for Comox, Courtenay & Cumberland to each have their own sewage treatment plant, which would be very costly. This is a very scary thought that all of the Comox Valley could run their sewage down here one day. I don't want to be out on my deck and potentially smell a treatment plant and that would lower my house value. This project is absurd!

ARCHIVE: Selected Scenario - Cape Lazo Outfall

The Cape Lazo option has been identified as the preferred outfall for the new community wastewater system proposed in Royston/Union Bay. Do you have any comments or questions?

Anonymous - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0 How often will we need to replace this outfall pipe? What will be the capacity of the pipe?

Noticeboard

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Reaching out to a public advisory committee resident representative is a great way to share your thoughts on the LWMP process. Find contact information here:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/assets/Department/Documents/SSP_TAC_PAC_representatives.pdf

ection 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

None of the options provided to Union Bay residents are acceptable. The costs are far too high and a +/- 30% is ridiculous. This is a repeat of what was pulled on UB landowners when former CAO Bob Long assured landowners Langley Lake would not even be considered as a water source for KIP. Look what happened.

Regarding costs. Why is this turning into a P3 project? Who is the Private in this and what are the costs going to be if a private company is involved?

The RD is manipulating the outcome of this project. All they have to say is the public supports it and we're done.

Start a petition - I'll sign it.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Records of all comments received from the community will be an important part of any LWMP submission so we appreciate you sharing your thoughts. Regarding your question on 'P3" projects, all potential sources of funding to reduce the costs to landowners are being explored, including funding from P3 Canada which would require the project be delivered by a P3 project delivery method, likely design-build-finance-operate-maintain, with ownership of the asset retained by the CVRD, but all other aspects provided under P3 contract by a private consortium. If the project team is successful in securing P3 Canada funding, they would fund 25% of the capital costs, significantly reducing costs to the landowners. It could also the opportunity of transferring risk to the private sector resulting in a higher level of confidence of future costs of the system. This has not been determined as the path forward but is being considered as an option.



Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

I fear this is another example of manipulation by the Regional District. There is nothing stating landowners will have a vote or referendum on this South Sewer Project. So no matter what the costs, we seem to be getting sewer.

What are their figures based on?

Is there anyone in authority going to answer questions posted here?

Is this website what the Regional District will hold up as the public having a say?

People need to start asking questions now and expect the truth.

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The point of the south sewer project is to resolve the long acknowledged health, environment and quality of life concerns resulting from failing septic systems in Royston and Union Bay, and replace the ageing and over capacity Cumberland treatment system, currently discharging into the Trent River. Aside from the 'on-the ground' impacts that residents regularly experience (especially in the summer and periods of heavy rainfall), the effluent from failed Area A system and Cumberland ends up in Bayne's Sound, impacting this important local eco-system and the shellfish industry. It's true that the provincial liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process selected to authorize this project could be used to demonstrate electoral assent instead of another referendum, but the decision on whether to proceed without one will fall to the CVRD Electoral Areas Services Committee and ultimately the CVRD board. The crucial consideration in making that decision will be whether enough of the local landowners have been engaged in the consultation process, and whether this consultation indicated general support for the project. If either of these are uncertain, the EASC could decide that another referendum is appropriate. The information provided at the January 21 public event at the Union Bay Hall is available on the project website at www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionLWMP - under 'how to keep informed'. The recently communicated cost information is based on a rigorous analysis by Associated Engineering over the past several months, building on the results of the 2011 South Region Sewage Collection, Treatment and Discharge Study, located in the 'studies, reports and minutes' section of the website. This PlaceSpeak forum is just one way that the public can have their say: the south sewer project team are available to answer questions in person every Thursday afternoon at the project office at Royston Road and Livingstone Road; there is a comment form available on the project website; you can reach me or other members of the project team via email or telephone anytime (see sidebar); we send out regular newsletters highlighting opportunities to provide feedback; and we are hosting public events similar to the one on January 21 at significant project milestones. Thank you for using this online tool and asking these important questions. If I've missed anything please follow up with me in this forum or directly by phone or email.

Section 22 harmful to personal privacy - Area F

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Thank you but I have read the material you are directing me to. Your comment: "It's true that the provincial liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process selected to authorize this project could be used to demonstrate electoral assent instead of another referendum, but the decision on whether to proceed without one will fall to the CVRD Electoral Areas Services Committee and ultimately the CVRD board. The crucial consideration in making that decision will be whether enough of the local landowners have been engaged in the consultation process, and whether this consultation indicated general support for the project." reveals what I suspected. The Regional District will claim the public was given the opportunity to speak to this matter due to a couple of open houses and this window dressing website. If you want to know what landowners think, why aren't all landowners provided with written information? I want hard facts not someone at an office verbally answering my questions.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Open office hours for the south sewer project and south region liquid waste management plan team are still held each Thursday from noon-4 pm (3843 Livingstone Rd., Royston). Work on the plan is continuing, and questions/comments are welcome!

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

An interesting piece of news for those following the south region LWMP process: http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/meta/whats-new/news-archives/2014-news/partners-approve-governance-structure-for-proposed-southers. Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The new issue of the LWMP newsletter is now available online! Visit the resources tab and click on "Newsletter - Fall 2014"in the Documents section. Great info available there! To see back issues of the newsletter, visit the CVRD's website here: http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/main/departments/sewer-services/regional-sewer-initiatives/royston-union-bay-cumberland/keeping-in

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

We have lots of new materials in the Resources section about the four shortlisted scenarios for wastewater management in the Royston/Union Bay area. Take a look and then head to the Discussion page to share your thoughts!

Topic Administrator - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Hi if you live in Royston or Union Bay you should have been receiving regular newsletters and other project related written information. If you aren't please let us know and we'll look into it. Check out our project website for all the hard facts that we have to date:

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/main/departments/sewer-services/regional-sewer-initiatives/royston-union-bay-cumberland/studies (you may have to copy that link into your browser), and/or drop by the project office on Thursday afternoons to talk in person. Regards, Kris

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

A new poll has been posted! What is most important to you when it comes to wastewater managerment planning in the south region? Cast your vote (at the right-hand side of your page) and help inform the LWMP.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

The Winter newsletter is now posted online at <u>www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/southregionlwmp</u> and on the resources page here at PlaceSpeak - check it out for details on the upcoming open house set for Jan. 21 (4-7 pm) at the Union Bay Community Hall!

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

If you submitted input on the south region LWMP over the last few months, you may have won one of four 10-visit recreation passes. Winners are being drawn from all who provided comments - and will hear from us by the end of the week. Thanks again to all!

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

It's a great time of year to cozy up with interesting reads! The fall newsletter featuring all the latest LWMP and south sewer project news is now available online. Check it out on the Resources Page of this topic. It'll be arriving in areas mailboxes as well soon.

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

Uprated: 0 | Downrated: 0

Two new Q&A's have been posted to the CVRD's South Region LWMP info page, providing more information about protecting the marine environment and the cost for residents. Follow the link below and look under "January 2015 Shortlisted Option" to learn more!

http://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/EN/main/departments/sewer-services/regional-sewer-initiatives/royston-union-bay-cumberland/how-to-key

Discussion Admin (Administrator) - Area H

'Hot' off the press: The summer issue of the south region LWMP newsletter is out! Royston/Union Bay - check your inboxes/mailboxes for the latest news, or read online on the Resources page here at PlaceSpeak!

9.0 Media Clips

- 9.1 2014 MEDIA CLIP SAMPLES
- 9.2 2015 MEDIA CLIP SAMPLES
- 9.3 2016 MEDIA CLIP SAMPLES

9.1 2014 MEDIA CLIP SAMPLES

10 www.comoxvalleyecho.com

Mayors look at what the year holds ahead for Valley Water, sewer big concerns

BY PAULIVES

The next is months will be easily to be the Town of Convario could be the town of Convario could be the town of Convarion of the town of t

Aurust

will be of particular interest a residence given recent boil concerns in the Crothe ann public engagisment customer oriented approach to deal the Lorne Hotel project ing with local nealbrack, investor, earing to be hold in Man, builder and developments, investor, staff report to be reviewed of a customer oriented approach to a set of the s

Top priorities are Maple Pool, holding line on taxes

ities are those usues d when I chose to run

an attempt to do what we can to can development cost charges, hold the line on taxes and make a comomically feasible to denmaintenance. It is imperative that we repaint the 5th Street bridge as well. The combined taxpayers of the Corner Valley and purchased dd like to work more with the members of the Highway. The City of Courter received a \$50,000 gra the Provin these fund

our comm and cost eff our taxpays sorb those

sponsibility. it is gratifying the City could play an import

all achi

News

We need to will deliver

Infrastructure a high priority

BY LESLIE BAIRD

All the

A4 Comox Valley Echo Tuesday, July 22, 2014

south of Courtenay.

consideration.

over time.

Bruce Jolliffe.

agement."

consultation.

We hope people continue to pro-

vide their comments and ask questions over the next few years so we

can be sure we're identifying the

best solution for wastewater man-

The two-year process was launched in May to review options

for wastewater management and

water resource recovery for the

south region of the regional district,

and to identify the best solution for

providing effective sewer service to

the Royston and Union Bay areas. It

includes an environmental impact study and multiple levels of public

One of the key solutions being

assessed is the south sewer project,

a centralized wastewater collection

and treatment system involving a

partnership between the CVRD, K'ómoks First Nation and Village of



Project Manager Kris LaRose answers questions from one of more than 50 residents who attended the Royston open house on the liquid waste management plan for the south region (Photo: CVRD).

Cumberland, which has been offered \$17-million in grants to date.

The sewer project has prioritized the core areas of Union Bay and Royston to reduce the impact of failing septic systems on Baynes Sound and its receiving waters, but over time could cover a wider area both along the coast and further inland.

While a centralized wastewater management system has been identified through past study work as the preferred solution by the CVRD and project partners, it will only go forward if it is found to be the best solution for the region.

"Collecting public comment on the options under consideration will be an important part of the liquid waste management planning process," said Kris La Rose, the regional district's manager of liquid waste planning. "We want to give residents every opportuni-

ty to learn more about the process and to

provide feedback on what they feel is the most appropriate solution to protect the local envi-

ronment in the long-term." To encourage public consultation during the process, the CVRD also launched 'PlaceSpeak' at the open house. PlaceSpeak makes possible online public discussion and information sharing by property owners in the proposed liquid waste management plan area. To take part, owners are encouraged to sign up online at: www.placespeak.com/southregionLWMP

The CVRD has also set up project informa-tion pages online and is publishing quarterly newsletters about the south sewer project. Those interested in receiving the newsletter can sign up by contacting the project team at 250-871-6100 or emailing southsewer@comoxvalleyrd.ca. For more information on the project, residents can visit: www.comoxvalleyrd. ca/southsewer

LETTERS



South Sewer open house well attended

Shortlist of options presented to Royston/Union Bay residents

Scott Stanfield

Record Staff

ww

AWL

HEH

WIT

About 160 people were presented with a shortlist of wastewater management options in the southern reaches of the Comox Valley at a second open house hosted by the regional district Wednesday at the Union Bay community hall. The CVRD launched a

liquid waste management planning (LWMP) process last May. Along with water resource recovery, the pro-cess will identify the best solution to provide effective

ART IN THE

and adde of the second second

W male i tener in W M why offic fill

rural areas, are serviced by onsite treatment, so they have septic tanks and septic fields," said Kris La Rose, manager of liquid waste planning. "The lots are very small, high-density, the soil conditions aren't very good and the systems are aging, and they're not very well regulated. As a result, we have a large number of failing systems causing potential impacts to human health and environment."

He notes the "long-standing problem" has generated numerous complaints from residents.

The CVRD, which is partnering with the K'ómoks First Nation and Village of Cumberland, is seeking public feedback on four options for discharging treated effluent: to Baynes Sound, to Georgia Strait beyond Tree

man they prove and for

South Sewer Project

Garmeniers Grunstin awaring loadback

surrequitto in the Soury Seven Project while would being Comber and nervege methods and disposed and completions

With possible francasi aspport hum 2410

Conside, performance entre project could mean a local server utility for instrument

at \$2525 per year for each residential and

Diver your feedback children of carriers with

Control Constant 20, 2015 and 100 of Constant 20, Control Constant 20, 2015 and 100 of Weight Field Training (or Marcelaw, Newtoniane 2, 2015) and 7 per Constantiany of Constant Charactery, 20175 Durssmaal: Avenue mend to the Provi Hall as Hirst Street.

Final call more struct the Tweld German Propert and complete the relative survey at exercised and at or in the Vilupe office or 2017 Discovers' Avenue.

Village of Comhesiand 0-136-7791 | contented

from moustaine and property meters

with transmery starstorts



PUBLIC N

THE VILLAG

CUMBERLAND 1

FLUSHING WATER

THIS MAY CAUSI DISCOLDURATION WATER. If the results present re-lap of your balled used will a chear

PLEASE CHECK YOR

REFORE DOWN LA

SCHOOL STORE AND T JAC

FROM OCT. 2

OCT. 30th, 2

SORRY, IT'S BELT-TIGHTENING TIMEL

THE SINGLE MOM ON WELFARE

GIMME THAT! YOU'RE

MAKING FAR TOO MUCH!

Budget pushes white picket fenc

BY DERMOD TRAVIS

COMOX VALLEY ECHO

An independently owned and operated usenaber published by Echo Publications

407-E Fifth Street, Courtenay, B.C. V9N 1J7

Phone 250-334-4722

Classifieds 250-334-4215

Circulation 250-334-4734

Fax 250-334-3172





100 14 10 240 - they

575



9.3 2016 MEDIA CLIP SAMPLES

CVRD staff working on how to keep sewer funding

Sewage commission directors wants a regional solution to reduce costs to residents

BY MICHAEL MINDAILS

With the South Sower Project fulling to garner flectural assent in the lane referendum Combos Valley Regional Didrict staff are working in sal-vage some of the functing in had secured for the proj-ert.

et. "They are in the process if connecting with all the inferent funding sources to determine the implica-tons of the failed enterem-The 199 Canada Innd The 199 Canada Innd Forward award that good forward award and have con-traction of the second second the second second second provide second second second provide second second second provide sector for 30 years with the second secon

these of the fulled informa-dum Around for use cert of the total cost of the estimated skola. million project was negotiated by start. Citizen the residenti-op-residing to the project and the timosilous. It is marge-tain whether the CVRD ran reliain some to all of the secured funding start for localing at all prosibile ruthons.

is looking at all possible options. Ryan O'Grady, Manager of Liquid Waste Planning, and they am to have a botter understanding in a douple of months and re-mert to the ametion crem.

One of the referring of the set o

<text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text>

The of the maps and the maps of the maps o for kids to benefit KidStart

Basi na year pain yoariddi Jahn Howard Sdatar and Mudhanis Criffe ai Yong Koba Mudhanis n Casa Pan Howard Sdatar Muthanis Mudhanis Criffe Pan Howard Sdatar Muthanis Muthanis Koba Mudhanis n Casa Pan Howard Sdatar Pan Howard Sdatar Pan Howard Sdatar Na Kata Pan Howard Mudhanis n Casa Pan Howard Sdatar Pan Howard Sdatar Na Kata Pan Howard Mudhanis n Casa Pan Howard Sdatar Na Kata Pan Howard Kata

250 135 7341 Correction

chrywess is used instruments and the control of the second to be larger and the second to be larger and the second to be and the second term of term of

Please constructively as we can to build those partner-wips and multilan lines partnerships. The scor-get? Griste said they can Griste said they can dot upple

Grieve solid they can score regord and perhapse resore regord and perhapse resolution that they remove upon the include others include. "We have to have at the and of the day a reason-able figure because no-bodys going to want to spinnel any momes that in reality, you're spend-ing that money for your ladd, You're spending that money for your going that

in reality, you're spending that ing that money for your luds. You're spending that money loe your gound luds? O'Crouly said hey will be kohling ar earnmanl-eating with all the value-boliters in the project peas nut present, as well, as delw into other funding apportunities.

Crematorium lease not a burning issue at council

term of five years, bring ing the lease explyr in Den 31, 3036. The dity, according its provine for according to provide for the lease. Thus has been confirmed as \$14,211 pr year. A few counsilers had meetions concerned

A few presentances non-questions connecting whether the city was tan-dar any colligation to put the issue out to tender of lawing to provide a land lukes to another timeral provider if a future pro-position if a future pro-position if a future pro-position in the balls

coul corner as nother cremininfurm. Deputy CAO Joins Wm solid that SCI alreat has an existing lease t (ii 1026, and they do used to have to alasti-ment to have to alasti-ter ball?

CVRD chair addresses referendum



On June 18, many residents and homeowners in the first phase of the proposed south sewer project will be able to vote on a proposed plan for moving forward with a community wastewater system in the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD)'s Royston and Union Bay areas.

It's an admittedly expensive project – because infrastructure generally is expensive, and because, while the SSP covers a large area and focuses on the core residential areas of high-density communities, it includes a relatively small number of connections for the initial phase.

However, it's also a very important project. While there are of course, cases of well-maintained on-site treatment systems and those existing septic systems which are relatively new, there is still evidence of failing systems in the waters of Baynes Sound. There are properties that would be challenged to host systems that could meet today's rising standards.

Ten years ago this same community voted in a referendum to support the creation of a service like this and we're asking them to consider it again given the changes that have occurred since then.

After all this time, we believe this is a good option to put forward for consideration: Why?

High grant funding: The project team has managed to do something very few community infrastructure projects do anymore: Identify outside funding that will cover 60 per cent of the project's capital costs. It's a level of support through grants and partners that is unusual today.

Increasing Costs: Costs and regulations are increasing, which means the base cost of this project is only going to get more expensive with time. Estimated costs have doubled since the referendum in 2006: there's no reason to expect that trend to change.

Planning agreement: Years of investigation and planning - partic-ularly focused since May 2014 when the Liquid Waste Management Plan started - has identified this as the best option in terms of cost over the long-term. It has also identified outfall and wastewater treatment plant locations that are supported by stakeholders. These are hurdles that have stopped other wastewater projects in

their tracks.

Other benefits include: the proposed public-private partnership structure offers more cost security, less risk, no loss in jobs or ownership and potential for innovation. The new system will also open its doors to new connections - from within Area A or further - potentially lowering the cost for all in the years to come and offering a regional solution for the future. Community wastewater systems offer an improved value to properties and increased opportunities for growth.

We believe this is the best option for moving forward – but we know this is a big decision for the homeowners and residents involved. We expect many questions in the weeks to come and are committed to making sure everyone has the information they need to make an informed choice. Project info is available at comoxvalleyrd.ca/southsewer and voting information can be found at comoxvalleyrd.ca/vote

The status quo is simply not an option. We must correct the harm and risk being created by poorly functioning systems in our historic area.

Bruce Jolliffe is the CVRD chair and the director for Area A, which covers the Royston and Union Bay areas

BY DEBRA MARTIN Echo Staff The indust indic functions by ight at Contrasty council was meaning the base for the creation of the same for the creation of the indice of the creation of the mail case of the creation of the use wanted to estated the imal lease options to make the generic financially fea-sizes

ens) pleme co silumi be es or

In the Echo's August 12, 1016 edition, in the article the project fimmality for-size. Crematorium owner: Service Corporation Inter-national Canada is plan-ting to apened \$375,800 million SCI currently has a lease to the currently inports will be 2, 32025. Their request was for two additional options to renew, each for a hardner

In reference that a distribution of the property corrests of the property corrests of the property of the prop

10. Communication Log

10.1 COMMENT SUMMARY (AS RECORDED BY CVRD SSP STAFF)

Comment summary Date: January 2015 to post referendum

Comments made by type

Cost:	Total #						Commen	ıt Type		
Project (individual) financing		OH/Info	NL	Web	Res-reps	Telephone	In-person	Email/Letter	Comment Form	Media
Financing availability for individual residents needed; what are the payment options; who is providing financing, interest rates fluctuate with		- /						,		
market rates	32	4	1	2		1	22	2		
I have multiple properties, how much will I have to pay	3				3					
Property taxes will be high for prorated period, increased property taxes huge burden, how will this affect property taxes	6	1			4			1		
Require sliding scale depending on income	7	1					6			
Financial disaster, cost outrageous put selling of property out of reach, very difficult for those on fixed income, government should pay:										
astronomical: cost is big factor and since there are associated costs like hook-up less expensive option is the one in favor of, why costs so high,								1		
possibly all this paper advertising, live in UB and Royston area because of affordable taxes and independent sewer systems if Courtenay								1		
extends boundary now would make it less costly for small population; need firehall and water filtration too muchl, compounded property tax								1		
will be detrimental to resale; there are interests in valley that will profit highly, will sewer connection increase appraised value proportionately,								1		
will affect rental cheaper to rent elsewhere, sewer real estate sales and value of homes	53	3	17		15	5	4	9		
Interest and costs over twenty years is suitable; finance and low interest would help, small increase in property tax ok	3	2				1				
Pay 50 per cent up front and make annual payments option, make own payment plan	2	1						1		
Need tax deferral option; can capital costs be applied to annual property taxes, how are you taxing/billing the taxpayer	10	2					4	4		
No mortgage option	2	1					1			
Are lot owners able to pay the full amount up front or forced to pay over 20 years	4	1	1				2			
Can we pay full amount up-front for a lessor rate	7	3	2				1	1		
Estimates seem manageable with annual payments over time unless escalate significantly	2	1	1							
If we are not in the area will we be charged	4	1					3			
I have a new septic system - is SSP required (cost), is it manditory hook-up, I want to opt out can't afford, how can I afford this, we live in the										
rural community because we find septic systems to be very affordable - is this project happening so that in a few years the City of Courtenay								1		
will extend their boundaries and take us on when the work is completed we don't want the high taxes of the city and residents will be negatively								1		
affected like the RGS eliminated jobs and future acreage options, costs probably result in no vote	15	3	2				8	2		
Why should we be charged before we get to use the system	3		3							
Project cost complications with construction complications what is the potential for this	1							1		
In the update there is no mention of what the connection fee will be, will there be additional fees levied	4						2	2		
Parcel tax being charged before service I don't want to pay before the service	5						4	1		
Why is the interest 5 per cent, what is the assumed interest rate	3						2	1		
If phase 2 and 3 will costs go down	7						7			
Seniors/disability can defer how will this affect the project; how does deferment work	8						7	1		
I am at your merci for cost increases with my own system I have control	1	1								
Who owns debt if sell home	1							1		
In update there is no mention of what the homeowner will face regarding the physical connection to the system will be	1							1		
Can DCCs be applied to certain projects or are they general revenue	1							1		
How can capital costs be reduced in phase one unless some reduction in parcel tax is given	1							1		
How are these costs legal	1	1								
What does maximum allowable for O&M mean	1							1		
If more houses added will fee decrease	9						7	2		
How long will home-owners have to pay shortfall	1							1		
Is there a rebate for newer septics, where would the money come from for rebate, suggest financial mechanism for rebating home owners that								1		
pay the up front investment to the system	4	1	1					2		
Annual capital costs calculated with no allowance	1							1		
What will be the cost for the home owner, ongoing charges should be clearly identified at open house, what are the increases in property taxes								1		
to maintain the new system	12	1	3				6	2		
Too expensive I will move, bring down the costs and I'd likely vote for it, cost prohibitive, money should be used for updating our water system								1		
once and for all providing more sustainable long term water system and leave rural residents be with their septic systems, if it isn't affordable								1		
now in 30 years it will be worse	6	2	1				2	1		
Costs were over-stated for type 1-3 systems	1							1		
What are the options to pay for system, can defer connection requirements and costs if septic functioning, who is eligible for deferrable parcel								1		
tax	8	2					5	1		
Of the total cost how much is deferrable, deferment percent amount assessed	2							2		
I've have 2 undeveloped lots will I pay connection fee now or when developed	7					2	5	L		
Wondering how tuture connections will be charged (not in phase one now) ie KIP, if join in future (KIP) how share capital costs, are we		L .						1 .		
subsidizing KIP development or do they have a special agreement	6	2				1		3		
It own multiple lots house stradles multiple lots what do I have to pay	4	3						1		
III a full 2/3 funding was received what would be the cost per household	1	1								
How are we charged frontage or parcel	1	1						L		
What do monthly costs cover	4						4	<u> </u>		
The hand-out showed that maintenance fees doubled, contusing	10	7					2	1		
Lan 1 opt for just paying for sewer, I have good well water and don't want to pay for water	2	1					1	 		
My system is failing now what do 1 do until 1 get connected as 1 can't afford to pay twice	1	1						 		
Will businessess and residential nomes be required to pay different rates	1	1								
Who'se responsible for connecting house to SSP at property line	6	1					5	1		

Is maintanance really 618 per year because I can pump out my took for half that cost I can operate a system for much less the what am being		1	1	1	1		1	1		
is mantenance really one per year because r can pump out my tank for nan that cost, r can operate a system for much less tha what an being							_			
charged a year	8					1	/			
We need to understand that this is a unique time-limited opportunity to leverage external funding and if we pass it will cost	1							1		
I'm in phase 2 do I pay for this now	5						1	4		
Stop spending our tax dollars on studies for sever systems we have gone through this for the past 20 years at the cost of god knows how much	1							1		
being out an advance of tenerosist	1									1
Total costs to the taxpayer not transperent	1									1
Saddened that the CVRD discovered a 20M reserve which could be donated to funding a new water treatment facility when the sewer project										
demonstrably needed similar and had to resort to requiring a 11M P3 loan effectively killing the project due to its associated balloooning										
payback structure	1							1		
DCC charges will have to be paid by new developemnt that cover their portion of infrastructure - what are DCC costs currently and what										
formula will be used to determine the portion of those charges will be applied to the SSP to bring down costs to those phase 1, how will costs										
and down for phase 1 if the costs for the other phases are too experience on the other to any phase 1 if the costs for the other phases are too experience on the other phases	1							1		
go down for priase r in the costs for the other priases are too expensive now	1		2					1		
Distinct the PPP component	2		2							
Will the grant funding be lost	4					2	1			
Biggest concerns is that a private company is running this project and will have no transparency to what the profit to their company is	2						1			
Think about if you would have been willing to pay over 5,000 dollars a year in taxes	1							1		
Costs post Cumberland										
Did VoC council withdraw from SSP because they considered costs too prohibitive even with grant monies the recent decision by										
Survivoland available in a nominor because they considered costs too promotive even with grant montes - the recent decision by	0	1					6	1		
	0	1					0	1		
Need project information that doesn't adversily affect finances and quality of life; Let us know projected costs; Proceeding without defined			1							
costs is unacceptable; what are costs to homeowners now VoC has decided "no"	11		1		7		2	1		
Wont it cost Cumberland more going it alone	1							1		
Will this not mean an increase in operations and maintenance costs	5	1	1				2	1		
Entire financial scenario should be re-worked including the grants	4	2	1 .		1		2			1
Date Construction scenario stokula consider un administration for and inter-	4	4				1	2	2		
Prost Cumberning project should consider extending boundaries for project	8	1				1	3	3		
Why is cost less now post Cumberland was I subsidizing them and how do I know now that I am paying for me only	1		1	L						
Entire project should come to a hault post Cumberland as they are a part of the pollution problem which isn't getting addressed they are										
initial projects storage and light a fauth post complement as they are a part of the posterior that in the rest of the post of										
Waiting for Royston and Union bay to take on the costs of inters project and maybe come on later- will our costs be adjusted later if they do										
that	35	1	6		22		2	4		
Did VoC council withdraw from SSP because they considered costs too prohibitive even with grant monies - the recent decision by										
Cumberland counsel is concerning	1		1							
Need project information that doesn't adversly affect finances and quality of life. Let us know projected costs: Proceeding without defined										
prosts is unacceptable, what are costs to homeowners now VoC has decided "or"	9		2				4	3		
We as the exception of the second sec	1									
wont it cost Cumberiand more going it alone	1						1			
Will this not mean an increase in operations and maintenance costs	4		2					2		
Entire financial scenario should be re-worked including the grants	1							1		
	0	4						4		
Post Cumberland project should consider extending boundaries for project	2	1						1		
Why is cost less now post Cumberland was I subsidizing them and how do I know now that I am paying for me only	1						1			
waiting for Boyston and Union Bay to take on the costs of hteis project and maybe come on later- will our costs be adjusted later if they do	2	2								
Project funding	_									
Froger unlang	2						2	1		
Is there going to be any other funding; will costs increase with inflation	3						2	1		
P3 Canada and cost of repayment; who pays for PPP advancing funds; can you promise the overall costs will go down	7		2				5			
Is the person putting up the money the head of the project	2						2			
If UBCM funding primarily to assist VoC then how does this impact project	1							1		
			4				2	4		
How does a private company make a profit, if competition for P3 contracts interest thins out will costs go up accordingly	4		1				2	1		
What is the P3 minimum threshold for funding	1		L					1		
Will the P3 funding only interest national proponents	1							1		
The burden of debt percentage seems very high	1	1								
Does the PPP grant cancel out the financial impact of Cumberland's withdrawl	2		2.		1		1	1		
Why have the carrying costs percentage increased 2016 astimate (summary page)	1	1	<u> </u>							
why have the earlying costs percentage inclused 2010 estimate (summary page)	1	1						1		
Car you provide proof that the costs with 25 nave decreased 1 feet uncomfortable with this	1							1		
Where is the private component receiving their revenue after completion	1							1		
Project overall costs										
Program costs double every time have public meeting from 5000,10,000,23,000, to 27,000 (2003/2007/present)	1	1								
Cost estimates of plus or minus 30 to 50 per cent cause concern applied to todays estimates, needs to be more accurate costing finares:										
book estimates of pate of minds of to by per cent cause concern applied to totalys estimates, needs to be more accurate costing ingures,	0	1	1		1		2	2		
	8	1	1		1		3	2		
Who pays for damge to property eg. driveway repair etc, who pays for public toilets to be installed and how will this be paid for; is this the			1							
complete costs or will there be further costs (over estimated costs on board Scenario C)	11				7		4			
I want to build a carriage house what would this mean	1						1			
Seame to be a lack of accountability (records to managed costs): do not creativild	22		1		22		İ			
because of accountaionity (regards to managed costs), do not overbuild	23				23					
what are the provincial and tederal funding options, what efforts are being made for grants or funding, do we have to pay back grant, you are			1							
concealing the amount of funding	11		2	2		1	4	2		
Will the sales of skyrocket reduce costs, or where does it go, skyrocket who wants to put hormones and drugs on their garden, compost to				_						
skyrocket to be free to residents or discounted or profits back into system	17	1	1		14		1			
Cost associated with loss of secondary treatment	1		1		1		l	1	1	l
How much money is left of the original 15 million and 2 million put aside in 2013	1	1	· ·							
When the match is left of the original 15 million and 2 million parts and in 2015		1	+		<u> </u>	4	2	2		
what do Courtenay and Comox pay annually for their sewage service, Courtenay doesn't have to pay that much for sewer	/	1				1	3	2		
I have a vacant lot how much and when do I pay	7					6	1			

Annual ongoing costs look ok, supportive of costs	3	1					2			
	5	1					4			
Does costs include line to home, require total cost, what is the overall cost of the project (this isn't the first waste project in the world); like to										
know more about the costs; please add to next newsletter clear details including how actual hook-up charges are calculated, who pays costs to										
connect or to increase existing plumbing pipes ; who pays costs to house from street	57	3	4		5	6	36	3		
connect of to increase existing planning pipes , who pays costs to house from succe	51	5				0	50			
Costs similar and should not be deciding factor; concern community acceptance will be influenced by costs per lot and the right thing will be										
stilled	4	3	1							
			1				-	-		
Cost to hook-up, decommissioning old tank cost; what happens to old tank when new one connected	10				1	1	5	3		
If I refuse to pay what happens	4				4					
	((
who pays legal fees if there are any; what happens if 1 simply don't have the money to pay the contractor	0				0					
Will change of scope affect funding	1		1							
Previously the cost was 7.000 per lot, what has changed	2		1				1			
Conductor for much formation formation	- 1		-		1					
Costly to fix yard from digging it up from pipe	1				1					
Get done quickly, efficiently, within budget, sustainable	36				32		3	1		
If project stalls will septic systems be required to be upgraded at own expense; costs of this project versus costs of just fixing failing septics.										
refer fixing section	4						1	3		
	40						1	5		
Which scenario has the most/least certainty to costs, what are detailed costs of each scenario	18		1				16	I		
Would pay more if it was tourist attraction, or attract industry and people from around world or if it produced wind mills or solar or set an										
example for Victoria	21				21					
	7	1					-	1		
Does everyone pay the same regardless of where they connect to system	/	1					5	1		
Its not going to get any cheaper bite the bullet and get this thing built now	2						2			
If pay 20K installments and sell house will debt carry over to new owner if pay cash upfront will lose that money?	1						1			
Property taxes in Courtenay are lower and they have more services, taxes will be high	10		1	1	1		0		1	
property taxes in countrialy at rower and mey nave more services, taxes will be night	10		1	1	1		2			
Why have costs increased from previous estimates	8						8			
What is the cost currently is 25 long gone or is it 35 now	7				I		7			
What will the change in utility bill be	1				1			1		
When we need to be will not denote the set	1							2		
when more people join will costs change	2							2		
What are the maximum annual costs	1		1							
Shellfish industry needs to do their part in costs with move to outfall from Baynes Sound to Cape Lazo	6	6								
Are Socials costs (notice to terminate) with Encorrelevant to this process	1							1		
The source to start initiate with the provident of the provess	1							1		
Will project be retaining 15M grant by UBCM or is Cumberland entitled to a part of that AND is CVRD able to retain the whole 15M grant	3	3								
Operational:										
Location										
Treatment plant location; like to know more about location; secondary treatment plant and well location, hook-up to existing tanks	22	3	3		1		12	3		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous	7	2	2				3			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous	7	2	2				3			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing	7	2	2				3			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing	7	2	2				3			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred	7 1 7	2	2				3			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred	7 1 7	2 1 1	2				6			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred	7 1 7	2 1 1	2				6			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system	7 1 7 6	2 1 1	2				6	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system	7 1 7 6	2 1 1 1	2				3 6 3	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in	7 1 7 6	2 1 1 1	2				6	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us	7 1 7 6	2 1 1 1	2				3 6 3 5	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us	7 1 7 6 6	2 1 1 1	2				3 6 3 5	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindnift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for	7 1 7 6 6	2 1 1 1 1	2				3 6 3 5	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for severt ie in	7 1 7 6 21	2 1 1 1 1 3	2		4		3 6 3 5 9	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair. trenching a puisance.	7 1 7 6 6 21 7	2 1 1 1 3	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 7	2 1 1 1 3	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffie problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch)	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34	2 1 1 1 3 2	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1	2 1 1 1 3 2	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock added but not Spence Road when sever line goes right by that road	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1	2 1 1 1 3 2	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Wise was Road and the state of t	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2	2 1 1 1 3 2	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 _	2 1 1 1 3 2 1	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindnift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1	2 1 1 1 3 2 1	2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock include to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Niee to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Seware collection for residents on low side	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1	2 1 1 1 3 2 1	2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 (2 1 1 3 2 1	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock included to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 1 2 1 1 6	2 1 1 1 3 2 1	2 2 2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift swell - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 2 1 1 6 1	2 1 1 1 2 2	2	2	4	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase on service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked un	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 6 1 37	2 1 1 1 3 2 1 1	2 2 2 2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 4 1 33	2		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 6 6 1 37	2 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1	2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 4 4 1 33 3 5	2 3 1 1 1 3		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindnift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one	$\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ \hline \\ 21 \\ 7 \\ 34 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 6 \\ 1 \\ 37 \\ 6 \\ \end{array}$	2 1 1 3 2 1 1	2 2 2 2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 4 4 1 33 5	2 3 1 1 1 3		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tic in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock include dut not Spince Road when sever line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 6 6 1 37 6	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 4 1 33 5 1	2 3 1 1 1 1 3		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell area foult for explantion why so many areas	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 6 1 37 6 1 23	2 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 5	2	2	4 22 1 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 3 3 5 1 10	2 3 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why was Kilmarnock What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 6 6 1 1 37 6 1 23	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 5	2 2 2 2 1	2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 3 3 5 1 10	2 3 1 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning	7 7 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 23 2	2 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 5 5		2	4 22 1	2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 33 5 1 10	2 3 1 1 1 3 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how dow eknow if we will be hooked up Why was to plate out and between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not includes if am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIIIA relaxing rules	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 1 6 1 37 6 1 23 3	2 1 1 1 3 2 2 1 1 5 5	2	2	4	2 1 1 1	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 8 1 1 1 4 1 4 1 3 3 5 5 1 1 10 2	2 3 1 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdaroch) Kilmarnock inclusion before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 6 1 1 37 6 1 23 7 3 1	2 1 1 1 2 	2 2 2 2 1 1 1	2		2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 333 5 1 1 10 2	2 3 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How will pers miting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will pipes need to be	7 1 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 1 6 1 37 6 1 23 3 1 1	2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 5 1 1	2 2 2 1 1 1	2		2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 4 4 1 33 5 1 1 10 2 2 1	2 3 1 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will	7 7 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 34 1 1 37 6 1 23 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 4 1 1 3 4 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 1 1 1 1 2 	2 2 2 2 1 1 1	2		2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 4 1 4 1 33 5 1 1 10 2 2	2 3 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Will increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How well permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How well provine to hook.up	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 1 6 1 37 6 1 37 6 1 37 6 1 37 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 1 1 1 2 		2		2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 0 1 1	2 3 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tic in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Atimarnock not included in phase one Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How deep will permiting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will permiting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and Fore Kill these permits include work for homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforchand is this a benefit to the	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 1 23 3 1 1 1 1 1 3 7	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2 1 1 1	2		2	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 3 3 5 1 1 10 2 2 12	2 3 1 1 1 1 3 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIIA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner to howevers to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand is this a benefit to the project Timeline, when will be digging within 3Km of Roy Creek will these permits include work for homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand is this a be	7 1 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 37 6 1 37 6 1 37 1 1 1 34 34 34 34 34	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		2			3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 3 3 5 1 1 10 2 2 1 2 2 6			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tic in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why was recent union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not include; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Hanning How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will permet to be Project will be digging within 3km of Roy Creek will these permits include work for homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand is this a benefit to the project Timeline, when will equipment show up on our st	7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 6 6 1 1 23 6 1 1 23 7 6 1 1 23 7 1 1 1 1 33 4	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -		2		2 1 1 1 5	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 6		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for esidents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Havent you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how dow know if we will be hooked up Why way South, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How well permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA	7 7 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 23 3 1 1 1 37 6 1 23 3 1 1 1 37 6 21 2 1 1 1 37 6 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 4 2 2 3 2 3 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 2 2 2 3 3 2 3 3 2 2 2 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		2		2 1 1 1 5	3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 3 3 5 1 1 10 2 12 26			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindriff Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nike to include area between Royston and Spindriff as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outful location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Harmotk included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nike to include area between Royston and Spindriff as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outful location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Harmotk included but not spence to include (I am wery angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will peiping will piping with 3 km of Roy Creek will these permits include work for homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand is this a benefit to the project Timeline, when will equipment	7 7 7 6 21 7 34 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 23 - 1 1 37 - 5 - 1 1 - 1 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2 1 1 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 5 - - - - - - - - - - - - -		2			3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 1 3 3 5 1 1 10 2 2 11 12 26	2 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffic problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock inclusion positive, need to include Kilmarnock (Craigdarroch) Kilmarnock should be consulted before inclusion Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nie to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is there a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Haven you started digging yet get digging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how dow know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) can't tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Pill increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner to homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand i	7 7 7 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 37 6 1 23 3 1 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 34 1 1 37 34 37 34 37 34 37 34 37 37 34 37 37 34 37 37 34 37 37 37 37 37 34 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	2 1 1 1 1 3 		2			3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 1 3 3 5 1 1 10 2 2 12 26			
Concerned about location of plant, pumping stations etc as prone to be noisy and can be odorous Pump stations and processing buildings need to be asthetically pleasing Where are the preferred site locations - four options, if sites not yet identified where are the geographic areas designated as preferred Pipes along beach (gravity fed) is preferrable. Compromising beach now wouldn't be noticable in a few years; will this be a gravity fed system If gravity fed, where is the lowest point or piping going to be, is there an option to pump into line behind us instead of gravity fed to line in front of us main collection pipe run in Spindrift Kilmarnock area, keep our shorelines natural, how deep will be buried; will all be situated properly for sewer tie in Traffe problems during construction and post road repair, trenching a nuisance Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Why was Kilmarnock included but not Spence Road when sewer line goes right by that road Nice to include area between Royston and Spindrift as well - KingFisher smelly Is ther a finalized outfall location Sewage collection for residents on low side the piping will go in Kilmarnock Harmotok not tell any the gravit great gigging Am I in the phase one service area, when is phase two, how do we know if we will be hooked up Why were the houses between Union Bay and Kilmarnock not included in phase one What is plan 'A' (location) earl it tell anything from the newsletter map big concern about access and smell are polluting Baynes Sound, why are certain areas not included; I am very angry our area is not included, need explanation why so many areas Planning How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective; is VIHA relaxing rules Will increase housing density How deep will pipes need to be Project will be digging within 3km of Roy Creek will these permits include work for homeowners to hook-up Could a homeowner be proactive and prepare his or her property beforehand is his a benefi	7 7 7 6 6 21 7 34 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 6 1 1 37 3 1 1 37 34 1 1 37 34 37 1 1 37 34 37 1 1 37 34 37 34 37 37 37 34 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	2 1 1 1 1 1 2 		2			3 6 3 5 9 3 8 1 1 1 4 1 1 3 5 1 1 10 2 11 12 26 11	2 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1		

	4			1		4	1			
Kind of septic system or tank options needed for undeveloped property	1					1				
Would like to build, can we have a interim holding tank, timeline of project	85					45	39	1		
Will there be digesters	1						1			
The pipe goes through private property how is that going to be planned for	2						2			
The pipe goes under a private property, now so that going to be planted for	1						1			
is the opportunities to add natural gas to the trench at same time	1						1			
Is there opportunities to improve drainage at same time, can add other pipes to ditch once dug	5					1	4			
Connection - have commercial and residential on one property, how many connections required	1						1			
Will hydrovacing be considered	1							1		
Am L in the service area, am L in phase one, man is not clear enough need more specific man of proposed area.	103					8	93	2		
Will Curb except and the read exception of the remodel needs in the specific map of proposed and	1					Ū.		1		
win CVRD continue bidding and construction of nome owner's portion	1						-	1		
When will areas outside service area be granted service; when is stage 2	6	1					5			
How will permitting and environmental surveys be managed from homeowner perspective	1						1			
Timeline now that Cumberland is no longer a part of the project	3						2	1		
Is the project still a go now that Cumberland is no longer a part of the project	3						2	1		
When we have been and not involved when our control backs	1							1		
why was not creek not included, why not Garley beach	1							1		
What is the actual septic pollution in Baynes and could it not be made better with enforcement	1							1		
Concerned about loosing Cumberland	1							1		
Are options presented as fair and unbiased	1							1		
Will CVRD be able to obtain required federal permissions to build/install collection lines below bioh water mark or if not how will expropriate										
rights-of-way	1							1		
negeno ve uny Charde de concerte en la cel en entre en de concellar en de concel d'active de concellar de concellar en de conce	1							1		
onould refocus on local treatment options that utilize most up to date and flexible small volume options	1							1		
Only replacing some of the septics is like putting a band-aid on a problem that will blow-out down the road	1		1							
Holding tank is it viable, how often pump-out	6						6			
Is the timeline still 2018-2020, when will construction start	3						3			
Is Kensington going to join is this project getting ready for KIP development the developer should take care of that himself developer cost										
be area of here have one and how in it and project getting ready for terr development in electropic should take the of that million, development one and how in it advantage of the standard on other development most according to most the standard on the standard on other development most according to most the standard on the standard on other development most according to most the standard on the standard on other development most according to most the standard on the standard on other development most according to most the standard on t										
Interge do they have one and now is it calculated; if Cumberland or other development won t costs go down; now will costs go down after										
referendum	11	2	2				6	1		
Ensure opps for things like storm water/road upgrades are met by working closely with MoTi and CVRD water etc.	9						9			
Should have manditory inspection and regulatory	7						7			
Minimum lot size we have an acre lot have we been looked at incorrectly.	1						1			
In the under the size we have an action what level of decompositioning of trails and associated costs, what is the cost to decomprission an old task it.										
in the update increasing of the increasing of the associated costs, what is the cost to decommission an old tank it							4	4		
could be expensive, what do you do to decommission tank	8						4	4		
Ensure archeological permitting for collection system good for all residents so they don't need individual permitting, will there be a need for										
permitting and archeologists	4		1				2	1		
We feel picked on that we are in phase one and have to pay while other phases do not better if we were all in this together, postage stamp										
approach	2							2		
I thought we were grandfathered to the type of system we could put on property	9						9			
I mogni we were grandradieted to the type of system we could plat on property	1	1					,			
Do property owners need a permit to decommission their tank	1	1								
Run-off water still coming from failed septic in houses in Royston above/errosion/drainage is there going to be some money put into this	7						7			
Have a large amount of water flowing through property very concerned about pumping more down to area	1	1								
Are amalgamated Courtenay properties included	1							1		
Thank you for the volunteers who work with paid staff on project	1		1							
Thank you for the volumeets who work with paid start on project	1		1					1		
Would like to see agreement between CVRD and KFN	1							1		
What are new builds to do before the three year hook-up	1	1								
Why are we not connecting to south Courtenay, what discussions have taken place re linking to Courtenay existing has there been consideration										
of this, with the loss of Cumberland and 58 per cent of properties why is the area not being increased	8	8								
I am a part of Courtenay can Lhook-up to the SSP	1						1			
Will a share of counterny can record up to the or	1	1								
with not allow gravity main to go unough property	1	1					_			
What is the per centage of failing septics in the area, why does the CVKD not charge people with failing septics	12	5					/			
How do we get hooked up to the system how do the pipes work and where does it go after that, where does the piping go	2						2			
Will sewer lines run across beach rather than along streets, what happens with sewer lines when cross archeological portions of beach line and										
who would pay or be responsible for this	3	3								
Running sewer lines may cause erosion in Gartley Point which is already a problem	1	1								
When does place 2 and 3 commance	7	1					6			
	1	1					0			
How do we decommission our tank	1						1			
How do I opt out	1							1		
With two of the three south small communities on sewer in the RD and not all areas it is inconsistent so is this the early stages of the RD										
phasing out and amalgamating with the city	2	2								
This will increase land value, this will increase property value which means the big fancy houses will come into the area	10						9	1		
As a ston-gap measure residents should (must) be given a short term pump and but service reasonably priced	1						-	1		
What is also place 2 consist of	1						1	1		
what is phase 2 consist of	1						1			
Expectations of lot	2						2			
Should be way to opt out; can we opt out of the service area; and any consideration for properties with adequate existing service methods, and										
have a new septic can I opt out, shouldn't be forced to connect	12						12			
What are the next steps	5					2	3			
Will we be able to keep our septic systems for the next 15 years	1					1				
Am a huge supporter of having a sever system in place	1		1	1	1 1		1	1		
A new solution is required quickly a required with the base and provide jobs but can not do this without knowing what south are point to be as if			+ ·							
is negative solution to require up a case of our noise and provide jobs but can not do this without knowing what costs are going to be of it	2		1			1		1		
property values are affected by fack of certainty	2		1	1	1	1	1	1 1	1	

Will community sewage become mandatory in the next few years	1							1		
If you are so concerned about pollution find the obvious source and fix that	1							1		
	1							1		
we own property in the area and wonder if it is recommended to start a new sewage system project on our property	1							1		
Why can't the 3 towns join together to create ONE decent and highly efficient environmentally responsible sewerage treatment system work										
why care to 5 towns join together to treate one back and mighty encounter the information property responsible severage treatment system - work										
together instead of lighting each other- learn from victoria's mistakes; a comprehensive region-wide plan is needed to deal with the issue of	-		1				4			
haling septic systems; any comprehensive optin must be all-inclusive - no exempt areas, by-passes, etc	5		1				1			2
My septic is failing - will inspections and replacements be required immediately	1						1			
I think its been pretty clear since I served on advisory councils for Area 'A' that the consensus of south shore residents does not favor the big										
long pipe solution	1		1							
Why did you not include the APC planning group	1						1			
Dely having had 950 parents of property is down right impractical	1							1		
Only having had 500 parcets of property is down right impractical.	2						2	1		
Its suspicious why ney net some areas out, leaving out areas meant that would have to turn mes at least twice to service areas at a fater date	5						2			
Your options are fairly obvious - less management more boots on ground, identify and require compliance, options for combined mini-systems,										
a valley wide system for water and wate water management, amalgamation/governance review, consider smaller localized systems what was										
proposed was overbuilt and unnessary	2		1				1			
Appreciate work made for good of majority - will pay increased taxes for basic necessities including sewage treatment	1									1
Cumberland leary of one regional water, sewer body	1									1
Combenant Dant										
Treatment Fran										
Have briardate residents been informed about proposed treatment plant, does public have input, why should we have the treatment plant if we										
are not going to be hooked up for another 30 years, We've already been blessed with the noise of the Geoduck hatchery	5	2	1			1		1		
Why were residents in the immediate area not consulted with like pump station residents as WWIP would have far greater impact to										
neighboring residents	1	1								
Kilmarnock wastewater treatment plant location NO not happy as own property there, what possessed board to think this was an accentable										
place to put sever	4	2					1	1		
Which is the preferred property and what are the other properties	2		-	1	1		2	· ·		
when is the preferred property and what are the other properties.	2	-			-		4			
what type or treatment plant will it be (smell etc); worried it will smell how will you ensure it won't, others said they wouldn't smell but they		-								
did, odor negative affect on local business ie resorts	11	3				2	3	3		
Are the lots big enough, size of lot, who ownes the Briardale land and why is just over three acres out of total considered usable?!	5	3				1	1			
Would like to see a graph illustrating the life cycle of a 15 year comparison of costs	1		1							
Where is the outfall will it be ground discharge	1						1			
Do you have schematic or picture of plant	2					1	1			
Exercise Televise access is proof (on bend) does not feel is a good selection	1					1	1			
For site <i>D</i> site access is poor (on being) does not reer is a good selection	1						1			
Could it not be further away, strongly opposed, project down island further away from homes and businesses, our property is in hole near this										
and water levels are already a problem	4	1						3		
Water travelling through area already adding would cause pollution problems in Briardale	1	1								
Noise horrendous, environmental hazard	2	1						1		
Reduce property values, considering selling home worried about noise and smell	6	3				1		2		
Accident hazard on busy corner of the old island highway	1							1		
Where will the force main rule for the out and rule of the out of	1					1				
where will be to be internet of treatment plant - officient pay	1					1				
Briardale least desirable as most tranc and most visible, not supportive of Briardale because you have not considered Gartiey in phase 1, way										
too close to subdivision, Briardale no don't believe there will be no odor, property too wet in fact access will be problem with soggy ground and										
fish habitat, a local farm said proposed site on Briardale owner had requested easement on neighboring farm due to wetness on lower portion,										
spillage into the Trent	14	10	3					1		
Briardale seems to make the most sense, advantage to this location is the proximity to the pump stations	3	3								
Use KEN land as best choice: where on KEN land will WWTP be located	4	3						1		
The site and as befored the use of chamicals to reduce smalled	1	1								
The site gay includence the use of chemical to reader since site	1	1								
Should the CVRD ban microbeads in the system?	1	1								
When will location be determined	2	2								
Have you done wind studies as this is a flat air area and will hold odor, concerned about odor	3	2						1		
What is the preferred location and why	2	2								
Is Cape Lazo set in stone or re-visted	1	1								
If KFN land would it be purchased out-right or leased land	1	1								
Wil the WWTP be a 'base plant' with add-ons later	1	1								
Value V has not rote	1	1								
Option a maximy vote	1	1					1			
Is the wwith built to be expandable for Cumberland or other	1						1			
The size of the plant	1							1		
Selling resort please change name "lot at Lynn Maur corner" as don't want associated with WWTP	1	1								
Why are we building another WWTP and not amalgamting with structures we have	4		1				3			
Interested in seeing analysis fo life-time energy costs of each site	1							1		
Pump Station: DID NOT receive newsletter or nump station letter - word of mouth										
Want information regarding pumpstations location and such	2						1	1		
There are an end of the second purposed on a second	-						1	1		
r unip station. General - DiD receive newstetter or pump station letter		-								
Request for pictures of pump stations; map for pump stations; more information on pump stations locations etc	3		1					2		
What is the impact of pump stations such as noise and odor, what is the size	3		2			1				
What happens if the pump station fails	1						1			
Needs to be underground where ever it is located	1	1								
Not happy with either location for pump station	1				1		1			
What power back us is required	1	-		-	-		1	1		
wina power oakwap is fequiter	1							1	4	
	1	_	-						1	
Liney always smell so recommend venting on top of facility "up" similar to the bus exhausts to dilute smell quicker	1		L	I					1	
Any pump station site if it includes a washroom	1	1	1	1	1					

Hone there would be considerable landscaping included	1	1								
It was mentioned in Royston that a diesel backup generator for pump station but there is natural gas right there could that not be used	1	1								
Do not want to pump 'up'	1						1			
People ged to know that the pump station doesn't carry much risk	1						-	1		
Pump Station: Kilmarnock - Sandborn beach earch area								-		
How and why did you come to this decision - disappointing, shouldn't be on the list	2	1						1		
Beach access used by community - noor decision family kent clear for years use more grown in heach accesses	2							2		
We house is there - do not appreciate this decision at all NO. only access maintained by residents, right in middle of community only								-		
swimming beach fish bearing	8	3					1	3	1	
Better suited Montrose and Kilmarnock Drive not unset the community	4	1						3	-	
See you at the open house to discuss	1	1						1		
Dut at Armie Road	3						1	2		
Where will the arwiny lines be supplied along foreshore or along Kilmernock	2						2			
What exercise accessed over a will be back lack	1							1		
Not everyon and strong monitoring the structure stick out into good be a notantial carrier monthly have ad-	1							1		
White building over and stream working so average.	1						1	1		
Puere facts ustance naving to pump	1						1			
Funne station: Knimaniok - Montrose (green-space)										
I support Montrose location, preferred location as less obtrustve and disturbs area least, caster to camonouge, like dual purpose with Rus	12	-						1	7	
playground as promised years ago, impact to stream and tailure risk tess and needs no set-backs for streams	15	5						1	/	
Preterence is Montrose Park location as less impact and improve appearance	5	4						1		
Don't want pump station to be visible from street, further into park/what is the cost difference to do so, underground as much as possible,	16									
	16	1				1			14	
If considering playground please consider your maintenance budget; support playground	2								2	
Would preter underground system, underground wring	2								2	
Using this site would open it more to the public	1	1								
This is too much of residential area	2	2								
Concerned with having right at main entrance to a park	1	1								
If use Montrose put pump station in middle of park	6								6	
Pump Station - Royston and Marine Drive										
Prefers Hayward instead	1						1			
Concerned about smell should be closer to lower priced homes, concerned about the stability of the ground in area	2	1					1			
Would prefer to not have at Hayward because lives near/ugly	1						1			
A high profile building at this site is poor choice and not polite thing to do	1	1								
Site too wet and beside major dam	1	1								
Favor with washroom at Marine	2								2	
Pump Station - Hayward										
Do not want at Hayward because floods in this area, how would you protect equipment from weather, decrease property value in a dense										
populated area	3	1					1	1		
Devalue the park	1							1		
Concerned about fuel spills at site including fuel transfer	1							1		
Public washroom invites other activities to the site	2						1	1		
Other										
What does standard of treatment mean	4	1					3			
How long do you have before you have to hook up, can L do my own hook up or who cave who is a qualified contractor	0				6	1	2			
Loss viola dutta and class to fits state.	8				8	1				
Less visua cutter and chan up and serves	0				0					
Will a dise about this	23		1		21			1		
Where will the head up to on the property line on one plan	6		1		21		6	1		
Where will the hook-up be on the property line so can plan	1						0	1		
Director involvenient	5		1		1		2	1		
We should stay with sepue, mine works nine	5		1		1		3			
water and waste water should be kept public, not interested in naving a private company involved, would it become private or CVRD retain	2	1	1					1		
possession	3	1	1					1		
Environment:										
Food supply										
See no environmental impact re discharge to Baynes Sound if effluent properly treated; maintain the health of Baynes Sound for all fish,										
shellfish, wildlife	19	2			13		3	1		
Industry like aquaculture should NOT be a factor	1	1								
Our drinking water smells like dirt and needs system upgrade, there is a lot of leakage	1		1							
More concerned about impact on environment food supplies from ocean over the cost of project	1	1								
What is the impact on shellfish industry if discharge is into Baynes Sound, is there an impact on shellfish, etc due to the introduction of non-										
salt water and subsiquent change in ph levels	20	1		2	14		3			
Waterway										
Concern as to the impact on watersheds and Salish Sea. Trent River is dead due to Cumberland sewage	4	1			3					
No effluent not matter how treated on the threatened ecosysem of the Salish Sea	1	1								
Byproducts including ammonia, nitrogen, phosphorous leak into algal blooms - you could be sued	1							1		
With option to Sandy Island, would outful on into Dawnes Saved then up into Sandy Island and down into Course Struct burner 4 Sand Island	1	1								
with option to sandy island, would outfail go into baynes sound then up into Sandy Island and down into Georgia Strait beyond Sand Island?	1	1								
Coal mines and Texada becoming a coal transfer port	13				13					
Will hook-up not passing over Roy Creek be considered or even preferred by the district.	1	1								

Scenario 'A' concern is impact on water quality in Baynes Sound for recreation; where in Baynes Sound is outfall being considered and where will treatment be	5	2				3		
Just stop putting untreated sewage from failing systems into Baynes Sound/Comox harbour	7	1	1	5				
Overall environmental concern								
Treatment of sewage must be done to minimal pollution	15	1	1	1		12		
Area smells, dogs have died, toxins	24			21		3		
Are levels of pharmaceuticals and personal cosmetic products significant enough contaminants to affect human and or environmental health	1						1	
Would like to know more about the impact of transporting the waste to the different sites	3		1			2		
Consider forest alternative	1						1	
How much feed coliform is removed by the treatment plant	1	1						
Can we legally separate grey water from black water and use for irrigation of our lot	1						1	
What is the net benefit for water quality to running sewer through a plant versus current	1	1						
Is this for wastewater only or for solid waste as well	1		1					
Must publish hard numbers regarding amount of pollution of Baynes Sound and adjacent waters is actually occurring due to detective septic systems; Hard numbers on the # of defective septic systems	1						1	
Question running pipe to Cape Lazo under water	1	1						
Can CVRD push Cumberland "not" to dump sewer into the Trent River now they have pulled out of project	1	1						
Has Environment Canada done testing to find out if pollution in Baynes Sound is marine or human waste - why or why not	3	3						
Choose best scenario for environment; "poop away" with a good system to keep our bay and yards clean; and positive impact on environment,								
a modern system more efficient and 100 per cent different	14	4		10				
Secondary use								
Use for watering plants along the road or anything commercial ie golf course; allowed to reuse water	18			16		2		
MUST BE REQUIRED to re-use	31			31				
If water is so clean why not put it back into the water system, use for irrigation or livestock; if almost drinkable no sense piping it long way off,								
need for secondary use	35	1	2	24			8	
Scenarios:								
Scenario 'A'								
Scenario 'A' 2nd best option	3	1		1			1	
Scenarion 'A' from cost perspective best choice; best choice if high standards of treatment and volume control are met	8	4	2				2	
Scenario 'A' unacceptable will affect water quality, bad for aquaculture residents and visitors; have worlds best oysters in Baynes, why would we								
discharge there, remove option now!	41	1	3		3		34	
allowed to flow into the sea	1		1		-			
anover to how more the sea	1		1					
Section A where is usednage	1		1	 				
Scenario 'A' are examples of high quality effluent being discharged near aquaculture and what are the results	1		1					
Scenario 'A' does it have additional environmental risk due to outfall in Baynes	2		1				1	
Scenario 'A' most logical; best to protect Baynes Sound	8		4				4	
Scenario 'A' have First Nations objections been overcome	2		1				1	
Scenario 'B'								
Scenario 'B' takes it out past Tree Island to go curent flow in Georgia Strait. Present Comox outflow gets some flow in Baynes Sound which								
has weaker current	1	1						
Scenario 'B' provincial park at Tree Island, why would we discharge there	2		1	1				
Scenario 'B' best option; choice as it eliminates problem of pollution in Baynes Sound	4	2	1				1	
Scenario 'B' is 2nd best option	1	1						
Scenario 'C'								
Scenario 'C', are there issues crossing into another electorial area	1	1						
Scenario 'C' is best, the existing sewer outlet at Cape Lazo has worked for years. With a breakdown, raw sewage would be much diluted before								
reaching the shore, especially Baynes Sounds. The extra cost of \$3,500 hook-up would be well worth it compared to Scenario 'A' or 'B', best								
ecological solution	11	1	6				4	
Scenario 'C' concerns about discharge into sensitive areas	1			1				
Scenario 'C' keeps sewage well away from spawning creeks, rivers and shellfish along shoreline in Bavnes Sound	1	1						
Scenario 'C' is third best option	2	1	1					
Scenario 'D'								
Scenario 'D', will this effect wells, seems like a bad idea; needs a lot more study including more observation of wells within a seasonal period of								
observation and through all hydrologic conditions which do not have based on current time-lines. Has bio-fowling and encrustation problems,								
costs over time, or contact with existing wells in Royston, Union Bay, Gulf Islands, through fractures in the rocks been considered. How will								
any fractures discovered be able to handle the large volumes of wastewater injected. Will there be time to research this appropriately least								
preferred, should not be down-welling effluent as no good implications on where discharge will end up; will this work in a wer climate with								
ground water closer to surface	7	3	3				1	
Scenario 'D' how do we know it will not contaminate ground water, until see exploratory report cannot go with scenario D: no more than a			-					
elorified septic system	7		3	1			3	
Scenario D' is best choice; critical you go with option d as waterways dving, death of starfish, pollution, acidic, high levels of cadium, plastic	8	3	4				1	
Scenario 'A' to 'D'							-	
First three scenarios; with an acceptable level of treatment	3	2					1	
Not enough details on various options at this point to comment further, requesting further details on scenarios	27		1			26		
None are right and costs of any are too high compared to benefits, should follow places in world diallowing any effluent (treated) to be piped								
into ocean	8	1	1				6	
Choose the most cost efficient scenario that benefits the environment to the fullest and allows for population growth, scenario that causes the								
least to none at all impact on the environment	3	1	1				1	

Survey D. P. C. since matters what there	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Scenario B & C - pipes rupture, what then	1	1	1				-			
Need map pointing where the discharge scenarios are located	0	1					5			
No ground water discharge area, natural flows are too wet; no ground discharge dryland treatment with clear water	2	2								
Scenario - other										
Have you picked an option yet	12					4	8			
Pipe sewage from Area 'A' to Courtenay to join the outfall off Cape Lazo. Is Courtenay existing system due for upgrades? Would that affect the										
south sewer project?	2	1	1							
			Ì		Ì			1		
Response to outcome:										
Impressed with the amount of work done and clear communication	1							1		
Does Cumberland need to be on board	2						2			
What is the option	2						2			
Evenencia no advertação long distanço vilu os for avez	2						2	1		
Experience, no advantages, long distance, will so far away	2	1						1		
Kemain concerned re cost and potential doubling of taxes	3	1					1	1		
Delighted; strongly in favor of scenario c for both environmental and cost reasons	2						1	1		
Other:										
If no public acountability with this process will organize against it	1	1								
Get started before it costs more: and while grant is available; and about time, hire an expert environmentalist and do it	17	7	5		1	1	3	1		
Need (will there be a referendum they will different district have a cap how enter one through their district minimum of the second sec							t Ť	· ·		
will note on a reference in, now will different districts have a say now system goes through their district; minimum petition on project, 1	12	2	-				2	1		
win voit no	12	3	3				3	1		
phone be way to opt out; can we opt out or the service area; and any consideration for properties with adequate existing service methods, and have a service area; and the service area; and any consideration for properties with adequate existing service methods, and	22	,			1.4	,	10			
have a new septic can 1 opt out, should t be forced to connect	32	3	2		14	3	10			
Bigger and more boards at open house with better cost information	2	1			1					
Not enough information to make any decisions; NOT ENOUGH INFO; and residents need to be kept in loop, island residents need more	_									
information, still very unclear of the process	5	3	1			1				
Denman not well represented (not everyone agrees with Denman representatives point of view)	3						3			
Good work; Good luck; good for community; I feel informed	9	2	2		4			1		
What is odds of sewer being available for hook-up before project end September 2018	5		1		1		3			
All Baynes sound should be informed consider fbaycalling@hotmail.com and Fanny Bay flyer at flyer@fannybaycommunity.com	1							1		
Where is the project at now?	9					2	7			
Can I separate out my gray water (ie sink water) legally to another system prior to the SSP being implemented.	8					2	6			
Treatment before discharge more important than where discharged	1							1		
How can I as a resident help now that Cumberland is no longer a stakeholder, when Cumberland has smells how do we put an end to that	2		1				1			
The CVRD doesn't necessarily have the expertise	1							1		
SSP just gives piecemeal information without presenting the overall picture	1		1							
Why do we need two separate systems in the valley!, how does this merit the extravagance of multi administrations, treatment plants,										
forcemains etc - how was this evaluated	2							2		
I'll be dead before I get connected	2	2								
Staff too young to have opinions about project	2	2								
Lots of discussion around boards and how the project, financing and other elements will play out	2	2								
Is the manager a contractor or a regional district employee	7						7			
Was SSP aware that is affecting local real estate market/economy with uncertainty, what will the affect on the market be	2						1	1		
Stop communication with us we don't care its astonishing that people still don't have sewage disposal anyway (not buy in area due to these										
additional costs)	1		1							
Look forward to the project moving forward, support long overdue, looks good to me, can't wait to connect, sign me up I don't care what it										
costs will it ever et done?	7	6						1		
Can I find the newsletter on website	1		1		1		1			
Where is CVRD providing access (i.e. website) to documentation in its entirety	5	1	-				4			
Need CVRD leadership and clairty now	3						· · ·	3		
Shouldn't the signage be changed	2						1	1		
KIP not being a participant in the SSP is why project rejected	1						1			1
Look at this problem seriously	1							1		1
Will this project he dumped or funding withdrawn in light of oil prices and Canadian dollar down or just plain politics; can anything stop from										
win dis project de duripet, di futuria winder avit di ante en de caractaria dovari di fuse pran pontes, cara anyting stop from	20	1				2	16	1		
	20	1				4	10	1		
Overall referendum										
Will there be another open house for public to comment on referendum wording	1		1							
I live in Alberta will I be able to vote, I live in Vancouver will I receive a vote by mail, I live here 6 months of year and can I vote it is not fair I										
cannot vote	7	1	2				2	2		
It is unfortunate that there needs to be a referendum think people will not vote for although needed as the environment has changed people										
only interested in cost; support with no referendum	4						4			
When will the referendum be is there definitely going to be a referendum	5	1					3	1		
Eventual the shale to rest to estive meaning all shares	4	1	1		1		t Ť	· ·		
Everyone should be able to vote together meaning all phases	1	1								
Need a referendum on this project, support referendum	2	1						1		
Shouldn't be based on referendum of 2006	1							1		
Do tenants/renters get to vote, how many votes do I get if I have multiple properties	8	6					1	1		
How are well award to yoth who is allowed to yoth one yoth one how held or one yoth per person of maintim	5	1					2	2		
prow are you anowed to yote, who is anowed to yote, one vote per nousenoid or one vote per person or majority	5	1	1		1	1	4	4	1	1

	1		1	1	1		1		1	
If I have two lots or co-own more than one lot do I get two votes or how many votes	4	4								
With a referendum so close I'm very surprised the costs are not more nailed down, residents need information sooner before referendum	2							2		
What is the general feeling of public yes/no	2						2			
Vote no	7						7			
Why is a referendum required	3	3								
I'm in phase 2 but unable to vote for future obligations and expense I think that is wrong, can I vote in phase 2 or 3; all phases should be able										
to vote and I'm mad	9						5	4		
Where to get package information	1							1		
What we do not not not not not not not not not no	2					1	1	1		
what was the outcome of the vote	5					1	1	1		
Disappointed with results, a yes vote would have been best for longering protein property values & environment, the environment issue is not going unave the archieve is containing in a grant of the second s										
away inc protecti is containination in Dayles Sound where elevated recar contorni counts are considered a risk to public relative siterinsi betraction	3						1	1		1
	5						1	1		1
We are unsure what to do now with results of referendum and our property	1							1		
Not a resident couldn't vote, would have voted yes	2						1	1		
No voters expressed regrets on their vote	1							1		
My impression is that folks recognize that there was/is value to community LWMP and hope it will come to pass sooner than later	1							1		
With Learning the to be board and and the way to have to community but in the hope it will come to pass sooner than mer	2					2	1			
with last vote you took should stand valid for a good ten years	3					2	1			
Glad it was a no vote	1		1							
You just don't get "no" for an answer do you	6		1			2	2			
With the no vote what happens next	1							1		
Feeling like being told to yote yes or else makes me anary	1		1							
recting the being total to vote yes of else makes the angry			1				-			
If there is a no vote on then what	5						5			
Communications:										
All communication concerns										
Dismayed Cumberland not receiving newsletters	1							1		
Why no Q&A session at open house, no Q&A seems were evading questions and experts were too, you were herding people, why was there no										
open mike you failed the public	9	9								
When looking at boards it seemed main concern was to protect shellfish industry and not promote the protection of the environment	1	1								
I was surprised that so many people knew nothing or little about the whole process	1	1								
When is the next newsletter or other meetings	7						7			
Where there notices delivered to the neighbors of the neighboring properties	1	1								
Need more compelling information to persuade unconvinced residents to vote yes for project	1	1								
Government lies	7						7			
It is not communicated well enough that the connection costs are included in the (bylaw) ammortized rate	5					2	3			
If you can pay off the debt and if it is advantageous needs to be much better communicated before the vote	4						4			
Where do we voice concerns or ask more questions if we have them	2						2			
You need to tell people much better what will happen and will be required if the vote is no - that status quo is not an option	4						4			
I received communications but now find out I'm not getting sewer as not in phase one - confusing, angry	4						4			
Too many unanswered questions regarding the entire sewer system	1								1	
Go door to door	1							1		
Its NOT Kilmarnock subdivision it is CRAIGDARROCH subdivision	1							1		
Propie need to be reminded now antiquated the sewer system currently is	1	1								
Ad 1 - Message if vote no seems threatening and I'm very angry about it	5	1					3	1		
Threatening message, draconian, not very subtle, unacceptable	3		3							
and taxpaers for a transparent process with frequent updates	1		1							
Residents expressed voting no the most often due to the belief that phase one landowners were paying for all the costs and subsequent										
landowners/developers/Cumberland etc joining later were getting a better deal - while this was not true, and addressed through										
communications, this obviously did not get through to voting residents	1							1		
Please communicate the values more before the referendum	9					3	6			
Next steps:					1					
Recommendations for next steps:										
Ideally some other mechanism CVRD or province can bring to bear on problem so sewer goes ahead as planned	1							1		
Excited about new changes inside and outside office, does it include conservative action plan	2					1		1		
Formal assurance from CVRD that any property owner that invests in septic system after the referendum would have that investment protected										
by either exempting them from participation in the sewer system or by providing them a reasonable credit for the value of the septic system if	2							2		
compelled to join sewer										
Village of Cumberland										
Media VoC										
Options to be presented at open house include connection to CVRD sewer system and send fully treated water - Aug 2016	1									1
Feedback form scoring short list of discharge options - September 2016	1									1
The committee also decided that if the two storage options don't prove feasible, then the next options for evaluation are deep ground discharge	1									
to old coal mines, conventional ground disposal or to send fully-treated water to the CVRD.	1									1
Total comments	2383	334	177	8	405	138	938	331	37	10