

Minutes of the meeting of the Sewer Extension South (SES) Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) Addendum Joint Technical and Public Advisory Committee (TACPAC) held on March 14, 2023 in the CVRD Civic Room at 770 Harmston Avenue, Courtenay, and via Zoom conference commencing at 9:02 am

PRESENT:

A. Habkirk, Chair and Facilitator	Facilitator
R. Dyson, Chief Administrative Officer	CVRD
M. Rutten, General Manager of Engineering Services	CVRD
D. Monteith, Manager of Liquid Waste Planning	CVRD
V. Van Tongeren, Environmental Analyst	CVRD
C. Wile, Senior Manager of Strategic Initiatives	CVRD
A. Mullaly, General Manager of Planning and Development Services	CVRD
T. Trieu, Manager of Planning Services	CVRD
M. Briggs, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD
I. Snyman	WSP
M. Levin	WSP
N. Clements, Island Health	TAC
E. Derby, Island Health	TAC
M. Mamoser, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy	TAC
L. Johnson, Ministry of Health	TAC
I. Munro, Electoral Area A Alternate Director	PAC
M. Hewson, Association for Denman Island Marine Stewards	PAC
N. Prins, BC Shellfish Growers Association	PAC
M. Cowen, BC Shellfish Growers Association	PAC
A. Gower, Comox Valley Chamber of Commerce	PAC
N. Prince, Craigdarroch Resident Representative	PAC
R. Steinke, Craigdarroch Resident Representative	PAC
T. Donkers, Royston Resident Representative	PAC
K. Newman, Royston Resident Representative	PAC
J. Elliott, Union Bay Resident Representative	PAC
R. Lymburner, Union Bay Resident Representative	PAC

Item	Description	Owner
3.5.1 9:02- 9:03am	<p>Call to Order and Territorial Acknowledgement</p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 9:02 am.</p> <p>The CVRD acknowledged that the committee is meeting on and the proposed Sewer Extension South Project will be constructed and operated on the traditional unceded territory of the K'omoks First Nation.</p>	A. Habkirk
3.5.2 9:03- 9:04am	<p>Welcome</p> <p>A. Habkirk reviewed the goals for the meeting and requested any comments from the committee.</p>	A. Habkirk
3.5.3 9:04- 9:16am	<p>Meeting #3: Meeting Minutes, Follow Up Items</p> <p>MOTION: Adopt the minutes of the December 12, 2022 SES LWMP Addendum Joint TACPAC meeting. – I. Munro</p> <p>SECONDED: A. Gower</p> <p>CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>D. Monteith gave an overview of what was discussed at the previous meeting. The committee was provided briefing notes to address questions from the previous meeting.</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren provided answers for questions not addressed prior to the meeting. Property owners who opt for property tax option can't change to option to pay lump sum at a future date. Would be registered to title and future property owners who purchase the property would be locked into property tax option. In regards to if Capital Improvement Cost Charges (CICC) apply to secondary dwellings, CICC's are paid per dwelling unit. Staff are looking into options for financing CICC's.</p> <p>Q: Stated per dwelling unit, so are they defined as a structure? Includes secondary dwellings? A: Dwelling units typically are units where someone can reside in full-time, so includes secondary dwelling.</p> <p>Q: So a suite would be considered a separate dwelling? A: Could be considered that way. Based on water use and load introduced to sewer system.</p> <p>Q: So would they pay two CICC's? A: Yes, based on staff interpretation of bylaw.</p> <p>Comment: Requested breakdown of costs that can be deferred and what cannot be deferred. Response: Can go into more detail at next meeting. Generally capital costs that will be borrowed can be deferred (CICC's and capital), and operating costs cannot be deferred.</p> <p>Q: How much is the CICC? A: \$6,941.</p>	A. Habkirk / CVRD

	<p>Comment: For those homes with secondary suite, should we issue forewarning or guidance for those who may choose to decommission unused suite? What would be the process for recommissioning the suite?</p> <p>Comment: Some clarity on what constitutes a secondary dwelling would be beneficial.</p> <p>Q: If charging two CICC's, will we be providing two connections? With septic system, there would presumably be a second connection for a secondary dwelling or separate septic system. This should be defined in the Comox Valley Sewerage Service (CVSS) bylaw and would need to be considered by the Sewage Commission (SC), so would this need to apply globally outside south area?</p> <p>Comment: Bylaw is currently applied only by Courtenay and Comox for the connection of homes there, it is not currently applied anywhere in the electoral areas. Will need to check in with municipalities to ensure it is applied consistently. Will check in with CVRD wastewater staff as well and get back to the committee near the end of the meeting if we are able to get a response.</p> <p>Comment: Definition of dwelling unit may be different for each municipality.</p> <p>Comment: Municipalities usually only ever allow single connection per property.</p>	
<p>3.5.4 9:16- 9:18am</p>	<p>Meeting Overview: Committee Decision Points D. Monteith gave an overview of the committee decision points provided to the committee to consider.</p> <p>A. Habkirk reviewed the TACPAC decision making process.</p>	<p>A. Habkirk / CVRD</p>
<p>3.5.5 9:18- 9:50am</p>	<p>CVRD Updates and Briefing Notes – On-site Septic Systems #1: Septic/Sewer – 50-year cost comparison V. Van Tongeren gave an overview of the cost comparison between sewer and septic. Estimated that costs for sewer would be \$2,000 per year and septic would be \$3,060 per year.</p> <p>#2: Septic Regulatory Program V. Van Tongeren reviewed the concept of a septic regulatory program. Would see mandatory inspection in high risk areas and mandatory pump out for remaining areas. Shared the proposed timeline for implementation of program. Costs cover administration and enforcement, with other costs such as repairs or maintenance being borne by the property owner.</p> <p>Q: Would the proposed costs just be staff costs? This wouldn't cover pump out trucks and repairs required? A: Correct, just staff costs.</p>	<p>CVRD</p>

	<p>Staff are actively discussing with the province options for the CVRD to gain necessary authority for a septic system regulatory program. Additional information and options will be presented to the Electoral Areas Services Committee (EASC) later in the spring.</p> <p>Q: What happens after the mandatory inspection? What happens if you fail?</p> <p>A: Inspection would include recommendations to rectify issues. Would be responsibility of property owner to act on recommendations.</p> <p>Q: There will be properties where it will be impossible to remediate current system. Are there means to require remediation if homeowner can't afford it?</p> <p>A: Definitely an issue that will need to be considered going forward.</p> <p>Q: Does CRD have an enforcement component to their program?</p> <p>A: Don't believe so. Developed on premise that once property owner is notified of deficiencies, they are now provided with the necessary information to act on it. Options proposed in 2020 staff report include option for mandatory enforcement that would see inspector follow up at later date to ensure recommendations have been implemented.</p> <p>Q: Would Island Health determine when a septic system is a health risk and perform enforcement?</p> <p>A: Island Health would follow up on any complaints directed to them and address any public health risks by issuing orders to implement repairs.</p> <p>Comment: Looks like referral to Island Health would be the enforcement action.</p> <p>Comment: 44 per cent of people in Union Bay with no record of septic system, so obviously will not want to put in \$50k system and would be coerced to favour sewer.</p> <p>Comment: Acknowledged that doing nothing is not an option, leaving property owners with a difficult choice. There will be properties that require expensive work, but we have to move forward with something that protects the environment.</p> <p>Response: The option of an enhanced onsite septic disposal program was considered during previous LWMP process, but not deemed feasible.</p> <p>Comment: Having more information on septic enforcement helps the committee and the public realize that sewer is the better path.</p> <p>Q: Part of Hornby Island are shown on the inspection map. Is the intent to cover the rest of Electoral Area A as well in the inspection requirement area?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>A: Option being discussed internally that could apply throughout all electoral areas and phased in over five-year period. Will be a decision considered by the EASC, while this committee is discussing whether they support a regulatory program within the plan area.</p> <p>Comment: Financial analysis based on a type 2 system every 25 years. Systems being recommended by Registered Onsite Wastewater Practitioners are often pressurized type 1, so need to clarify how that part of the industry will be brought into decision-making in the area. Choice of system type and how often they need to be replaced is greatest determinant of the overall presented cost for septic enforcement. Need to clarify why we chose type 2 system and 25 years for cost comparisons. May need to justify during public consultation. Response: Type 2 was determined to be middle point for cost estimates, but can look into providing more details for open houses.</p> <p>Comment: Looking at situation in Union Bay where there are small properties with likely failed septic systems that would have to install a type 3 system, those people are more motivated to support sewer. Would be good to have low-medium-high examples instead of just middle point.</p> <p>Comment: Easy to make assumption that there are failed systems. Criteria should be as Island Health defines it, if creating a health risk. System can fail after 25 years, but if only one person in house may last 50 years or more, and not all older systems have failed. All based on soil conditions and use.</p> <p>Comment: If including larger area in program, should provide communication to Denman and Hornby or include in consultation if included in program. Response: If EASC supports program, will outreach to affected property owners in first year of implementation.</p> <p>Comment: Had discussed passing on enforcement to Island Health and not using heavy-handed approach, but from experience developing program without clear and effective enforcement process is waste of time. Need clearer idea on how it would work.</p> <p>Q: We must respond to health risks, but what is the lower standard? Is a different standard required for environmental risks compared to health risks? Island Health enforcement may not be enough to address environmental issues and require more nuanced approach. A: Health authorities should be able to adequately address environmental risks, since they overlap with health risks and there's always both. Type 2 is benchmark, since most likely to be used based on size of lots. Type 2 and 3 are fairly similar, with difference usually only UV treatment.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Comment: Island Health requires very definitive evidence of risk, shown through dye test or pooling effluent. Harder to find evidence if contamination dilutes into Baynes Sound. Need to be able to defend issuance of orders or tickets in court if needed.</p> <p>#3: New Septic Systems – Deferral Program Options V. Van Tongeren presented options for a deferral program for newer septic system, based on example by City of Langford. Options assessed include septic systems less than five years old or type 2 and 3 systems less than five years old. May range from \$30-260 per year based on systems included and whether financing is covered.</p> <p>Q: What are costs in reference to? Homeowner cost per year? A: Incremental cost to sewer service. Example, if five per cent qualified and all participated, would not be paying into operating costs for several years, so costs would be for those currently paying into service.</p> <p>Q: Initial plan included everyone connecting. Could those deferring receive connection and pay operating costs, but defer capital costs? A: Yes, would be roughly \$80 per year.</p> <p>Q: Did you consider frontage tax, so pay \$x if line runs in front of property regardless of participation? Is CICC just for sewer? A: Just for sewer.</p>	
<p>3.5.6 9:50- 10:18am</p>	<p>Committee Recommendations – On-site Septic Systems 1. Does the committee support a septic regulatory program in the plan area?</p> <p>MOTION: To support a regulatory program in the plan area. – I. Munro SECONDED: A. Gower The committee further discussed the motion.</p> <p>Comment: Second question may modify motion. Would like to better understand enforcement options. May need something more than Island Health enforcement. Can modify motion subject to greater understanding of proposed bylaw on enforcement.</p> <p>Comment: Hard to narrow down due to numerous factors to consider. Should keep motion general for now. Maybe extend to all areas in the regional district with small lots.</p> <p>MOTION: To support a regulatory program in the plan area. – I. Munro SECONDED: A. Gower CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p>	<p>A. Habkirk</p>

	<p>The committee was asked if they would like to make a motion on enforcement.</p> <p>Comment: Issue is nuanced and technical, but maybe motion should be that staff bring back additional information on what enforcement might look like.</p> <p>Comment: Keep in mind that not all on-site systems are bad. Enforcement should be based on environmental or health risk, not on age of system. Should define enforcement as not just including replacement but repairs as well.</p> <p>Response: May be option to put on title. May be softer option to encourage owner to act.</p> <p>MOTION: That an internal enforcement program be developed by the regional district that addresses the gap left by the Island Health regulatory scheme. – A. Gower SECONDED: T. Donkers & I. Munro The committee further discussed the motion.</p> <p>Q: Are there examples of similar programs in other regional districts? A: This would be first enforcement program by a regional district in BC.</p> <p>Comment: Would be good to gain better understanding from others who may have considered similar programs, especially from those with similar environmental issues such as a nearby sensitive body of water.</p> <p>MOTION: That an internal enforcement program be developed by the regional district that addresses the gap left by the Island Health regulatory scheme. – A. Gower SECONDED: T. Donkers & I. Munro CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>The committee was asked if they had any other motions they'd like to put forward regarding the regulatory program.</p> <p>2. Does the committee support the concept of a sewer connection deferral program?</p> <p>Q: Sewer connection has multiple components—CICC and private connection. Private connection would be greater financial burden. Would deferral just be for CICC or other financial aid? A: Various options, but doesn't include physical connection to property line. Can install later if deferring.</p> <p>Q: If opted for deferral due to newer system, you would still pay capital and operating costs?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>A: Various options, but looking for guidance on what preferred program would look like. The more costs deferred, the greater impact on remaining service members. Comment: If line runs in front of property, there definitely should be a cost. Frontage tax may work. Maybe timeline for how long property has to connect based on current system.</p> <p>Q: Deferment of capital costs seem high. Will there be similar reduction in costs following end of deferral program? Can it be levelled out to show costs over time? A: Costs show what it would be during deferment. Could take closer look at how financing schedule could work. Q: In principle support deferral to help owners who just installed new system, but don't want to raise costs for participating members. Is there a way to extend beyond five years? Should acknowledge those who did the right thing.</p> <p>Acknowledged that the committee has expressed support for a deferral program in principle, with everyone eventually connecting. Requested details for what such a program would entail.</p> <p>Q: Seeing as earliest connection is likely in next three years, what happens to systems currently five years old or people building houses at the moment? Might end up putting freeze on new construction until sewer system is complete or builders will face a dilemma on what to do. Some areas in later phases might not connect for years down the road. A: The five years would be for systems built within five years from the time when the area is connected. Deferral program would just be for properties in first phase, and similar program to be considered for later phases. Q: Shouldn't we be thinking about entire area? Seems unfair that some areas may not receive deferral. A: Deferral can be offered for all areas, but the cut-off dates would be different based on when that phase connected. Comment: Timing should be based on when septic system first becomes active, so you get five years from when it was installed to connect to sewer. Comment: Should be set years when system was installed that would be covered by deferral program. For example, those who installed system in 2022-2027 if sewer is installed in 2027 would get five years.</p> <p>Q: When is first connection expected to be installed? A: Possibly 2027.</p> <p>Q: Need more details. What about those who installed new Type 3 system designed to last 50 years? Staff should come back to committee with a few more scenarios on how a deferral program would work.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>A: There are options for those who know sewer service is expected. Could install holding tank if sewer service is a year away, but need to be clear on timeline when sewer is installed.</p> <p>Q: Does deferral program need to be nuanced to address different types of systems? A: Really dependent on conditions of individual systems.</p> <p>Comment: Some Type 2 systems fail in 5 years, so many different factors that may impact when a system fails.</p> <p>MOTION: Support in principle the concept of a deferral program. – I. Munro SECONDED: R. Lymburner CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>The committee requested that the agenda be varied to bring forward agenda item 3.5.8.</p>	
<p>3.5.8 10:18- 10:41am</p>	<p>Kilmarnock Collection System – Design Considerations and Cost Update</p> <p>I. Snyman presented on the Kilmarnock collection system. When designing system, collection system requires velocity of 0.6m/second. Need to consider minimum (1m) and maximum (4.5m) cover for trench. Minimum pipe size of 150-200mm required for upstream sections if future extension not possible. Pipe designed to flow at maximum capacity of 80 per cent. If relying on slope to allow flow, will see extensive excavation near pump station, so looking at additional options such as flushing with additional flows of 3-5L/second of water. Need to consider where future development may occur. 46 properties identified as needing Low Pressure Sewer (LPS) based on LiDAR data.</p> <p>Cost estimates provided for options 1 and 2 for Kilmarnock collection system. \$3,475,000 for option 1 and \$3,460,000 for option 2, so only \$15,000 difference.</p> <p>Comment: CVRD Parks department looking at installation of playground and other infrastructure in Montrose Park, with public meeting held on site in two weeks. Montrose Park is reasonably large, so should be space. Opportunity for coordination to better develop park. General neighbourhood opinion is to leave back of property undeveloped to maintain buffer.</p> <p>Option 1 included pump station on beach, but avoided due to foreshore location. Pump station in Montrose Park will need to be constructed near corner of Montrose Dr and Kilmarnock Dr as low-lying part of park.</p>	<p>WSP</p>

	<p>Q: Assume that pump station would be mostly unobtrusive based on previous discussions?</p> <p>A: Yes. Only kiosk would be above ground, while most infrastructure would be below grade, accessed through manholes. Can look at building option if needed, but will add additional costs and require more space.</p> <p>Comment: Plan for playground is to be on Kilmarnock Dr, so need to ensure CVRD Parks department is aware of proposed plans for pump station. Maybe member of project team should attend March 31 meeting in Kilmarnock neighbourhood.</p> <p>Cost estimate provided for the Kilmarnock pump station. Option A is estimated at \$2,024,000.</p> <p>Q: Pump station being designed to support four times the households that currently exist in the Kilmarnock area, so do the current owners end up paying for the entire pump station while remaining development also gets the benefits? Does costing account for future development contributing down the line?</p> <p>A: Can address at future meeting.</p> <p>Q: Any motion required?</p> <p>A: Just looking for general comments.</p> <p>Q: Because it's a park, is there the option for a bathroom facility?</p> <p>A: Should be easy to tie-in bathroom to system.</p> <p>Q: Preferred option is for location at Kilmarnock side of Montrose Park, but can it be moved elsewhere in park? Playground should be small, so will be more of which one is on which side of frontage.</p> <p>A: Yes, but will lead to additional costs if placed closer to highway due to deeper trenching required. Should be little difference if one of two proposed locations.</p>	
<p>3.5.7 10:41- 10:54am</p>	<p>Break The committee broke for recess at 10:41 am and resumed its session at 10:54 am</p>	
<p>3.5.9 10:54- 11:25am</p>	<p>CVRD Updates and Briefing Notes – Collection System #4: LPS Considerations</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren gave a presentation on LPS. Two factors when considering use of LPS: avoiding infrastructure on foreshore and limiting excavation depths for gravity mains and pump stations. Proposed reliability/equity measures include CVRD providing pump-outs during prolonged power outages, initial installation cost being included in service costs, and CVRD keeping a supply of pumps to provide to property owners at cost.</p> <p>Maps of the areas where the use of LPS is proposed were shared, with 44 properties in Union Bay, 20 in Royston, and 45 in Kilmarnock.</p>	<p>CVRD</p>

	<p>Q: LPS seems right technical decision, but involves inequity between properties for costs. Seems unfair to pay for pumps at all, and should be covered by service. How do we make it easy for LPS properties to support sewer so they aren't taking on additional costs?</p> <p>A: Based on usual design for sewer systems, LPS is on private property and responsibility of owner.</p> <p>Comment: We are imposing responsibility on specific property owners.</p> <p>Q: What is initial cost of pump?</p> <p>A: Depends on size of chamber. Pump itself is around \$3k, but \$5-7k if including pump chamber.</p> <p>Comment: Lots with house farther from property line will need to pay more for connection to service than house near property line, so cost inequity is everywhere and unavoidable. Gravity might be too expensive due to deeper trench. To make it equal to everyone, should provide service and owner pays to connect at property line.</p> <p>Comment: Does not having to dig deep trench offset costs of LPS? Could be considered fair that entire service benefits from specific properties using LPS.</p> <p>Response: Generally see LPS required for higher valued waterfront property. Fairness should be that owner pays for their own connection. When reaching a certain depth, trenching costs increase exponentially.</p> <p>Comment: Collective decision impacts everyone. Not everyone can afford LPS.</p> <p>Response: Could argue similar for those who need to connect on a certain side of the property. Owner should pay for their own connection.</p> <p>Comment: Should have additional financial aid for those who will have LPS system. Maybe those on LPS should have different program.</p> <p>Q: CVRD will provide initial LPS pump? Should highlight at open houses.</p> <p>A: Cost estimates include allowance for initial pump.</p> <p>The proposed reliability/cost equity measures were reviewed. The CVRD does not have ongoing responsibility on private property. Program can cover initial costs, but up to property owner afterwards.</p> <p>Comment: Would like option for those who prefer LPS option to be able to participate in LPS program.</p> <p>Response: May have property owners who choose LPS once they know CVRD will cover costs. May lead to properties being subsidized by service.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Q: Are there maintenance issues related to the LPS pump? Does the CVRD provide support for ongoing maintenance? A: Case study of area that installed LPS systems in early 2000s. Systems performed better than anticipated, and failures were usually due to installation challenges. There are maintenance issues, but can be mitigated by proper installation.</p> <p>Two questions on collection systems were presented to the committee to be considered. Which of the collection options does the TACPAC prefer (hybrid, gravity, LPS)? For the hybrid (gravity/LPS) option, does the committee support LPS to minimize installation of infrastructure along the foreshore and to limit excavation depths, and are there other application where LPS should be considered?</p> <p>Decision Matrix A decision matrix for the collection systems was shared with the committee to assist with decision making. The matrix was pre-populated with values by the technical team, but to be adjusted by the committee as needed.</p> <p>M. Levin gave an overview of the matrix, comparing various components of a gravity, LPS, and hybrid system categorized by technical, affordability, environmental, and social. Affordability given 50 per cent weighting, technical 20 per cent, and environmental and social 15 per cent each.</p> <p>Q: Are the current scoring values from the technical team? A: Yes.</p> <p>It was noted that the CVSS LWMP TACPAC used a similar exercise. Affordability weighted higher due to feedback from earlier meetings. Committee can adjust weighting as needed.</p> <p>Q: Is the committee already supportive of the hybrid system before proceeding?</p> <p>Q: Why is LPS rated lower from an environmental perspective? A: Considered greater risk for climate change adaption and groundwater sources due to greater susceptibility to storm events and power outages. LPS also uses more electricity, and pressured system so more likely to experience leaks.</p>	
<p>3.5.10 11:25am- 12:10pm</p>	<p>Committee Recommendations – Collection System 3. Which of the collection options does the TACPAC prefer (hybrid, gravity, LPS)?</p> <p>The committee was asked if they wanted to consider options or support a system.</p> <p>MOTION: To adopt the hybrid (gravity/LPS) system. – R. Lymburner</p>	<p>A. Habkirk</p>

	<p>SECONDED CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>4. For the hybrid (gravity/LPS) option, does the committee support LPS to minimize installation of infrastructure along the foreshore and to limit excavation depths, and are there other application where LPS should be considered?</p> <p>The committee was asked if they supported the hybrid system as proposed in the conceptual design.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the hybrid system as proposed. – R. Steinke SECONDED: I. Munro CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>Staff have put forward a number of options to provide greater equity in the system. Seeking feedback on options for LPS cost equity or if property owners should pay for everything on their lot.</p> <p>Comment: Support accommodations put in proposal. Should accept proposals for those properties designated LPS by the committee, but not those who choose LPS.</p> <p>MOTION: To adopt the proposal for LPS support as written. – I. Munro SECONDED: K. Newman The committee further discussed the motion.</p> <p>Comment: Opposed that costs be covered by the service. Property owner should be responsible for connection to property line. Technical committee likely didn't look at every lot, so there may be additional lots that require LPS.</p> <p>MOTION: Recommend that chambers and grinder pumps be provided for properties where LPS is not optional. – I. Munro</p> <p>Several abstains were noted from TAC members. Clarified that abstains were treated as votes in support, so a revote was requested with votes to be counted individually. Staff stated that they would bring up the Terms of Reference (TOR) to clarify if both the TAC and PAC are required to vote on all issues.</p> <p>The motion was repeated, with concerns raised about the definition of "not optional." A reworded motion was suggested replacing "where LPS is not optional" with "designated as an LPS connection by the design."</p> <p>Comment: There will be properties that may not be designated as LPS in the design but may require it.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Response: Not optional meant whether a property could connect by gravity or not would be determined once we know the depth of the main, so if below grade is not optional and would require LPS.</p> <p>MOTION: Recommend that chambers and grinder pumps be provided for properties designated as an LPS connection by the design. – I. Munro</p> <p>Any amendments to the motion were requested.</p> <p>MOTION: That grinder pumps and chambers be provided for any property so desiring. – J. Elliott The motion was denied due to not qualifying as an amendment.</p> <p>Comment: Will be some properties where there might be a rock in the way of the line or other issue, which may not be identified by the committee, making LPS a more cost-effective option.</p> <p>The TOR for the TAC was reviewed for motions and voting. Recommendations to the Steering Committee will be made by consensus. Recommendations may be recorded as non-consensus if after adequate deliberation members are not all in accord, and the non-consensus party must provide a written submission outlining their rationale.</p> <p>Comment: Should be able to come up with wording for where LPS is used for properties where gravity is technically difficult. Current wording implies LPS chosen by whim.</p> <p>Staff raised concerns regarding option for deciding who gets grinder pumps. If lay of land allowed for gravity, would have gone for gravity as preference. Not ready as project team to allow people to pick and choose whether they want LPS or gravity. Costs so far only include LPS for those properties previously considered. Costs will be higher if additional properties opt for LPS.</p> <p>Q: Is there anything preventing someone with a gravity connection changing to LPS later? A: Everything up to property line is traditionally the home owner's responsibility.</p> <p>Q: If it's the property owner's choice, they pay for it. Is there a legislative or technical reason for why you wouldn't want LPS as option for properties where it's not required? A: Will look at municipal bylaws to see what they require. Will we even know if home owner decides to install grinder pump? Project team not quite ready to allow people to choose LPS when not required, since it could change the collection system from the proposed design.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Comment: “Where possible” is key wording. Where gravity is not possible, LPS should be used. If doing it for some homeowners, should offer it to all properties where gravity is not possible.</p> <p>Q: Isn’t that what was originally proposed?</p> <p>A: Original motion limited provision of pumps to those properties designated by the technical committee.</p> <p>MOTION: That LPS, grinder pumps and chambers as recommended are provided where a gravity connection is not possible as determined by the design team. – I. Munro</p> <p>Comment: Some properties by a gravity main may require pump to connect due to placement of house and configuration of lot.</p> <p>Response: Then that would be considered not possible as determined by the installation team. Will get finer level of detail of who can and cannot connect by gravity later in project.</p> <p>Comment: LPS system is where property is fronted by shared LPS forcemain, but may have some properties fronted by gravity main but require pumped connection. Only fair way is for homeowner to pay for everything on their property.</p> <p>Q: If fronted by a gravity main, can a grinder pump connect to it?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p> <p>Comment: Where installation team says LPS is needed, that’s where it should be applied.</p> <p>The committee reviewed the proposed motion, providing LPS where a gravity connection is not possible as determined by the design team, and the core of the motion was noted as whether the project or property owners pay for grinder pumps. Input was sought from the committee.</p> <p>Several TAC members noted that they did not feel appropriate voting on the matter or providing input as part of a regulatory body or due to viewing the issue as a community decision.</p> <p>Comment: Owner should pay for everything on property.</p> <p>Comment: Only way to define something as vague as fair is to go with what was done in the past and have owner pay for everything up to the property line.</p> <p>Comment: Should go for gravity system, but if not technically feasible should utilize grinder pumps that should not be at the expense of the homeowner. Confusion could be ameliorated if motion better clarified what the committee wanted.</p> <p>Comment: If the initial pump is provided by the CVRD, everything else to the property line is the homeowner’s responsibility.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Staff noted that the CVRD proposal includes provision of initial pump, pump out in case of emergencies, and stockpile of pumps to be provided at cost to property owners. Clarified that motion is on if CVRD taking on initial costs or if everything up to property line is property owner's responsibility. Motion is intended to implement proposed CVRD program for LPS.</p> <p>Comment: CVRD should pay for anything provided by the CVRD, but property owner pays for everything else.</p> <p>Comment: Property owner should pay for everything up to property line. Providing stockpile of pumps may be problematic due to various sizes of pumps.</p> <p>Comment: Assumptions may have been made that connecting by gravity is cheaper, but that may not be the case for properties that require deeper connection or due to other factors. Haven't looked at costs for properties not currently identified as LPS, so can't assume LPS will be more expensive. Most equitable approach is to provide service at property line and owner pays for rest.</p> <p>Comment: Committee is getting lost in definition of fairness and equitability. Need to focus on procedural fairness. Could be argument that project should subsidize those properties forced to use LPS because they can't connect by gravity, but could potentially have unfair situation where you're forced to use gravity. Most procedurally fair option would be that the owner pays for everything up to the property line.</p> <p>Comment: Suggested amending TOR for TAC regarding what matters to vote on.</p> <p>It was noted in the Master Municipal Construction Document that the regional district may consider approving an LPS system where a gravity system is not possible or there is not economic justification for a pump station. Technical team may not have all details on where property will connect. Properties with basement suite may need to connect at lower depth, but CVRD will not know that. Municipalities traditionally put in core infrastructure and it's up to the property owner to connect, whether by gravity or LPS. Cannot feasibly design for every house.</p> <p>Comment: Looking to lessen financial impact on homeowners.</p> <p>The committee was asked if they are comfortable with only the PAC voting. The committee agreed, noting a potential conflict of interest for TAC members.</p> <p>The PAC members were asked if they supported the previously proposed motion.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>MOTION: That LPS, grinder pumps and chambers as recommended are provided where a gravity connection is not possible as determined by the design team. – I. Munro IN FAVOUR: I. Munro, K. Newman, R. Lymburner, T. Donkers, M. Hewson OPPOSED: N. Prince, R. Steinke, A. Gower, J. Elliott, N. Prins NOT CARRIED</p> <p>Comment: Those in support should write up explanation for why they voted that way to provide to the Steering Committee, and same for opposition. Response: Representatives from each side should provide one-page statement on their reasoning and provide to the committee within a week.</p>	
<p>3.5.11 12:10- 12:40 pm</p>	<p>Lunch The committee broke for lunch at 12:10 pm and reconvened at 12:38 pm.</p> <p>M. Rutten provided an update on CICC's in follow-up to a previous question on secondary dwellings. The CICC bylaw for the CVSS states per parcel, but references a table in the bylaw that states per unit. Currently interpreted as one charge for single building (including suites), but second charge for detached dwellings. Bylaw will require review.</p>	
<p>3.5.12 12:40 12:47pm</p>	<p>CVRD Updates and Briefing Notes – Project Phasing #5: Phase 1A Scope Methodology D. Monteith provided an overview of the proposed project phasing. Phase 1A includes historic Union Bay and Royston, two pump stations, and 13km of sewer main. Properties were chosen for first phase due to oldest septic systems, smallest lots, technical considerations (system hydraulics, pipe sizing, etc.), and project funding (creating a service area that maximizes successful grant funding, etc.).</p> <p>#6: Cost Equity between Phases D. Monteith discussed staff consideration of cost equity between phases. Noted that future grant funding could allow for cost equity, and smaller amounts required due to most infrastructure having been constructed during first phase. Many uncertainties surrounding timing, inflation and grant funding make cost equity difficult to achieve. Costs in briefing note only include collection systems, not pump stations. Recommend that the committee put forward policy statements.</p>	CVRD
<p>3.5.13 12:47: 1:08</p>	<p>Committee Recommendations – Project Phasing 5. Does the TACAC support Phase 1A as proposed? 6. What policy statements would the TACPAC like to see added to the plan to address cost equity between phases? 7. Does the TACPAC have other comments regarding costs?</p>	A. Habkirk

	<p>Q: Have other areas in Royston and Union Bay been considered? What about those with larger lots that won't benefit from sewer as much? A: Those with larger lots have been considered for future phasing due to lower risk.</p> <p>Q: Is Royston Elementary not currently in Phase 1A? Is there a reason it wasn't included? A: Correct. Focused on waterfront area, so wouldn't be continuous. Staff have discussed with SD71 and WSP has looked into possibility of connecting Royston Elementary. SD71 are considering their options. Currently investigating way to include in project, but wanting to make sure not to impact per property project costs.</p> <p>Q: Does Union Bay area include K'ómoks lands near McLeod Rd? A: Only includes existing Union Bay area, but capacity for K'ómoks lands to connect to system.</p> <p>Q: Any update on grants? A: Still outstanding, but expecting response in spring.</p> <p>MOTION: To adopt Phase 1A as proposed. – A. Gower SECONDED: J. Elliott CARRIED</p> <p>Q: Is discussion on Royston Elementary about being connected to service? When will the committee be advised of the outcome of discussions? A: Correct. If committee considers connecting Royston Elementary in first phase a priority, it can be expressed via motion.</p> <p>MOTION: That the committee support the addition of the Royston Elementary School to Phase 1A subject to costing and design considerations. – R. Steinke SECONDED: N. Prince The committee further discussed the motion.</p> <p>Q: How would CICC apply to a school? A: CICC bylaw does speak to institutions, so charge based on square metres of building.</p> <p>Comment: Was mentioned that school board looking at other options. Isn't it prudent to wait for what SD71's alternative options are?</p> <p>Q: Why would connecting the school in the first phase be an important thing to do? A: Based on how school catchments currently work, they are moving kids away from south area due to capacity issues related to septic system.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Comment: Not sure if connecting to Phase 1A is the school's best option. Upgrading septic system may be ideal solution if need immediate solution.</p> <p>Response: Maybe instead of including them, should request more information on both options, how short-term the issue is, and if adding them to the service would solve any problems.</p> <p>R. Steinke and N. Prince withdrew their previous motion.</p> <p>MOTION: That the committee request more information from School District 71 on the options being considered so the committee can better understand how short-term the septic system capacity issue is and if it would be of value to the community to have Royston Elementary added to Phase 1A – R. Steinke</p> <p>SECONDED: I. Munro</p> <p>The committee further discussed the motion.</p> <p>Comment: SD71 has member on committee, although isn't currently present. Can request additional information for next meeting.</p> <p>Comment: Is there any intent for there to be an addition built onto the school that prompted this discussion? It is public infrastructure so it will come out of public funds regardless. If expansion planned, good investment to connect to sewer rather than put in new system and connect down the road. Septic also affects available footprint for additions.</p> <p>MOTION: That the committee request more information from SD71 on the options being considered so the committee can better understand how short-term the septic system capacity issue is and if it would be of value to the community to have Royston Elementary added to Phase 1A – R. Steinke</p> <p>SECONDED: I. Munro</p> <p>CARRIED</p> <p>Q: Regarding Kilmarnock, pump station is being costed out on existing connections but will support much larger catchment area. How do we ensure cost equity when pump station pertains to overall collection system and supports additional development? Should some of funding from project partners be dedicated to pump station?</p> <p>A: Developers will need to pay Development Cost Charges when developing land that will contribute to service.</p> <p>Comment: Unsure how much infrastructure is being put in for just Kilmarnock, a larger catchment area, or the whole service. Should develop policy statements capturing overarching idea for cost equity, but good to clarify details for open houses.</p> <p>Response: Due to uncertainty around timing and funding, difficult to break down how costs for Kilmarnock pump station will be shared.</p>

	<p>Should be split between existing properties and new developments. Support including policy statements from committee.</p> <p>Q: How much of infrastructure is being put in initially for consideration of future phases?</p> <p>Comment: Can include policy on everyone paying their fair share and current occupants won't take on a disproportionate burden for development costs.</p> <p>Comment: Statement as presented says all phases, so implies future phases. Need to be clear that all anticipated phases join existing catchment area have their costs rebalanced to ensure equity between phases.</p> <p>Comment: Problematic to impose too many details. Comfortable with statement as written.</p> <p>MOTION: To adopt the policy statement as written: "The Comox Valley Regional District will make all reasonable efforts to identify and secure additional grants, partnerships and funding opportunities to help create equitable costs between all phases of the Sewer Extension South Project." – I. Munro</p> <p>SECONDED: A. Gower</p> <p>CARRIED</p>	
<p>3.5.14 1:08- 1:12pm</p>	<p>CVRD Updates and Briefing Notes – Value Planning #7: Value Planning</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren provided a summary of the value planning process. 60 ideas presented by value management team, with four advanced for further consideration: Use the E&N rail corridor for all or some of the forcemain alignment, modify sewer loading design criteria to reduce size, use majority of native soil as backfill material, and move pump stations above coastal flood level. Technical memo in development, to be presented to Steering Committee in the spring.</p> <p>Q: Will fate of E&N railway impact potential of use of corridor?</p> <p>Q: Requested clarification on what is happening with E&N railway. A: A meeting occurred today (March 14) on the fate of the E&N railway. Federal and provincial governments announced that part of the corridor is to be returned to First Nations and further consultation to occur for the rest of the corridor.</p>	<p>CVRD</p>
<p>3.5.15 1:12- 1:23pm</p>	<p>Next Steps, Meeting #4 Preview</p> <p>A. Habkirk and D. Monteith gave a summary of next steps. TACPAC recommendations to be shared with Steering Committee on May 8, with TACPAC Chair invited to attend on the committee's behalf. Open houses will be hosted in June. Draft addendum report will be developed in July-August, including Class C estimates. Next TACPAC meeting is September 13.</p>	<p>A. Habkirk /CVRD</p>

	<p>Chair A. Gower stated that he will be unavailable for the May 8 Steering Committee meeting. The committee was asked if an alternate chair should be appointed. I. Munro was nominated as the alternate chair.</p> <p>Member of the TACPAC were encouraged to attend the June open houses.</p> <p>Q: Will we know if the grant is approved by then? A: Hopefully.</p> <p>The committee was asked if they approve I. Munro representing the committee at the Steering Committee as the alternate chair. Approved by the committee.</p> <p>Q: Sewer may be a hard sell due to previous failed referendum. Is there a plan in place for the open houses providing information in support of the project? A: Information will be prepared for the open houses, but also rely on committee to discuss project with the committee. There is an engagement plan in place. Might be worth committee members reviewing engagement plan, and can be distributed to the group again.</p> <p>Comment: Despite failure of previous referendum, have only heard positive responses.</p> <p>Comment: Request that open houses have at least one evening option. Response: Noted that CVSS LWMP open houses were usually in the evening. Will definitely host one or two meetings in evening.</p> <p>Q: Prior to public meetings, will CVRD have firm commitments from Union Bay Estates (UBE)? Concerns amongst community that UBE is proceeding with plans to discharge to Washer (Hart) Creek, so commitment will help assuage concerns. A: UBE is key partner. Working to amend Master Development Agreement to better align with project and current goals. Will be investigating options such as contribution agreement, but unsure what will be completed by time of open houses.</p>	
<p>3.5.16 1:23- 1:28pm</p>	<p>Roundtable The meeting was opened to comments from the committee.</p> <p>The committee members thanked each other for the candid and respectful discussions. CVRD staff expressed appreciation to the public members for their input and technical members for their insight, and commended the members for their contribution to their community.</p>	<p>A. Habkirk</p>

	Comment: May be worth bringing in outspoken people and getting them involved in public outreach to help diffuse situation by bringing them onsite. Worked well for Comox Valley Water Treatment Project.	
3.5.17 1:28pm	Adjournment The committee adjourned at 1:28pm.	A. Habkirk

GENERAL:

The next SES LWMP Addendum Joint PACTAC meeting will be held on September 13, 2023 commencing at 9:00 am in the CVRD Civic Room at 770 Harmston Avenue, Courtenay, and via Zoom conference.

TERMINATION:

The meeting terminated at 1:28 pm.