

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 Wednesday, November 22, 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
J. Warren, 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
M. Briggs, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD
I. Snyman	WSP
S. McNally	WSP
C. Davidson, City of Courtenay	TAC
M. Hall, Island Health	TAC
E. Derby, Island Health (Alternate)	TAC
M. Mamoser, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy	TAC
L. Johnson, Ministry of Health	TAC
D. Arbour, Electoral Area A Director	PAC
M. Hewson, Association for Denman Island Marine Stewards	PAC
T. Clinton, Association for Denman Island Marine Stewards (Alternate)	PAC
N. Prins, BC Shellfish Growers Association	PAC
C. Pierzchalski, Comox Valley Conservation Partnership	PAC
A. Gower, Comox Valley Chamber of Commerce	PAC
I. Heselgrave, Comox Valley Schools	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
<p>4.1 9:02 – 9:03 am</p>	<p>Welcome and Territorial Acknowledgement 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'ómoks First Nation.</p>	Facilitator
<p>4.2 9:03 – 9:05 am</p>	<p>Meeting #3.5: Meeting Minutes, Follow-Up Items MOTION: Adopt the minutes of the March 14, 2023 SES LWMP Addendum Joint TACPAC meeting. – K. Newman SECONDED: T. Donkers CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>The terms of reference for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Public Advisory Committee (PAC) were revised to allow TAC members to abstain on community decisions or where there may be a perceived conflict with the member's role as a regulatory body and the PAC to abstain on technical matters that don't impact the community.</p> <p>Motion: Adopt the revised Technical Advisory Committee and Public Advisory Committee terms of reference. – R. Steinke SECONDED: M. Mamoser CARRIED UNANIMIOUSLY</p>	Facilitator
<p>4.3 9:05 – 9:14 am</p>	<p>Communications Update C. Wile gave an overview of public engagement for the project since 2021. Staff have held three open houses and two webinars, and have sent out three mail updates to residents in the project area. The project page has been viewed 2,500 times and staff have responded to 170 email and phone enquiries. 50 per cent of traffic was directed from the CVRD website, and 32 per cent from direct contact (mailout, email, etc.).</p> <p>The CVRD hosted open houses in June, attended by staff and several TACPAC members. Topics discussed with</p>	CVRD

	<p>residents included phasing, funding, resident and project costs, pump station and conveyance system location and designs, the LWMP process, and the timeline for the project.</p> <p>Topics of most interest to the community during public consultation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • costs/affordability; • timing/costs for future phases; • interested in connecting to system now; • no option for referendum/AAP; • project being prioritized to benefit private property development; and • “get the job done” as quickly as possible. <p>Several residents from future phases also asked to be added to an earlier phase, and some residents who recently installed a septic system requested a deferral option.</p> <p>Over 200 people attended the June open houses, with 34 feedback forms submitted. 43 people attended the webinar, with 201 views on YouTube in total, and 12 feedback forms submitted online. Letters communicating project updates were mailed to over 900 households. An electronic update will be distributed to the project email list next week, providing a high-level summary of this meeting, a link to the What We Heard report, and notification of upcoming open houses in January. For January, will post draft addendum online and mail out invitations to open houses to residents in project area. Staff will report back to the committee in March/April.</p> <p>Staff have engaged with K’ómoks First Nation (K’ómoks), as well as 14 other First Nations. Four First Nations have provided responses and the rest have no questions or comments so far. First Nations were provided an update on the LWMP process, and staff will share the draft addendum. There will be two more opportunities for input for the draft addendum and the Stage 3 LWMP.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>4.4 9:14 – 9:18 am</p>	<p>Roundtable</p> <p>A. Habkirk requested any comments or feedback from those TACPAC members who had attended the June open houses.</p> <p>Comment: Attended Royston open house and noted a surprisingly positive feeling in room. Only met one person who was opposed to project and just wanted to express opinion.</p> <p>Comment: Attended both open houses and surprised that most people were resigned to project happening even if not all happy. Cost is a big concern to residents. Union Bay still recovering from \$5 million water treatment plant and upcoming water rate increases. Most acknowledge sewer will happen sooner or later.</p> <p>The agenda was varied to bring forward agenda items 4.6 and 4.7.</p>	<p>Facilitator</p>
<p>4.6 9:18 – 9:50 am</p>	<p>Overview of draft addendum report</p> <p>D. Monteith gave an overview of the LWMP process and how it fits into the Comox Valley Sewerage Services (CVSS) LWMP process. Provincial approval of LWMP gives local government ability to borrow for projects. LWMP is effective for regions where there is considerable growth and development or where there is a need to protect public health and the environment. Purpose is to protect environment and properly consult public.</p> <p>I. Heselgrave joined the meeting at 9:19 am.</p> <p>The draft LWMP Addendum Report includes seven sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1 – Introduction • Section 2 – Consultation: Includes summary of TACPAC meetings and consultation with K’ómoks and First Nations, as well as public consultation. Will be updated with activities in early 2024. • Section 3 – Service Area, Land Use, Development, Population: Provides context for how servicing plans for the south region were developed, 	<p>CVRD/ WSP</p>

	<p>including service area boundaries, population projections and land use policies. Mostly addressed at TACAC Meeting #1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4 – Regulations & Guidelines: Includes guidelines for inflow and infiltration, wastewater volume reduction, source control and septic systems. Most topics covered by CVSS LWMP, so mostly includes details specific to south region, such as septic systems. Island Health presented on septic systems at previous meeting, and this section will include details on a septic regulatory program. • Section 5 – Project Design: Includes project design summarizing flows and load projections for the region and discusses design considerations accounted for during development of system configuration. Bulk of report details proposed phasing and infrastructure for collection systems, pump stations and the forcemain. • Section 6 – Environmental Impact Study (EIS) – Summarizes Draft EIS developed by Current Environmental and presented at TACPAC Meeting #3. Current Environmental will be updating the EIS to include Phase 1B, to be presented at the next meeting. EIS identifies environmentally sensitive areas and contaminated sites, along with mitigation strategies. Section also includes archaeological survey from Baseline Archaeological Services in 2015. • Section 7 – Project Cost Impacts: Includes Class C cost estimates for Phase 1A and 1B, updated in October 2023. Also includes estimates for cost escalation and CVRD internal costs for administration and land negotiations, as well as the TACPAC policy statement regarding cost equity. Costs for Phase 1A property owners have been reduced by \$200 since last presented. <p>I. Snyman gave an update on the collection system design. Described the engineering design process from conceptual to detailed design. Steps involve identifying problems, determining if feasible, determining if the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>design is practical, and then proceeding to detailed design where design is optimized. Detailed design is about 40 per cent of process. Currently in preliminary design phase, with detailed design phase to occur with the Stage 3 LWMP.</p> <p>Conceptual design involved high-level information to show where pipelines will be, made based on past practices and assumption that rights of way will be used. Residents expressed concerns about rights of way through their property so investigated options that avoid private property where possible. As progressed into preliminary design, added additional information using LiDAR and performed hydraulic modelling for pipes. Conducted value engineering to identify potential issues or alternatives for design.</p> <p>Maps were shared showing the difference between the conceptual design and preliminary design for Royston and Union Bay. Kilmarnock went straight to preliminary due to extra information gathered from Royston and Union Bay.</p> <p>Q: As you refined the designs, did you look at change in impact on residents by altering the collection system? Did you look at cost changes from moving pipes around?</p> <p>A: Looked at cost implications, both on capital and residents, and did best to reduce costs. Moving out of rights of way into road may see additional costs if going to low pressure sewer (LPS) from gravity, but also removes costs of right of way negotiations and does not account for peace of mind of not having pipe on property.</p> <p>Q: Could you give an example of what moving a pipe from private property to the road might look like on the map?</p> <p>A: Shared map of Union Bay where pipe originally proposed between properties along 6th and 7th St. Route would require costs for lawyers and negotiations with residents, which is difficult to account for in costing, so opted to move pipe to road to avoid these complications.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Cost estimates are made more accurate over time as design is refined and more information is available. Cost estimates were updated due to additional information from LiDAR and hydraulic modelling, fluctuation in construction costs, design updates, changes to highway and railway crossing, and input from the public. An overview was given of the changes to capital cost estimates from last TACPAC to October 2023 estimates, with the cost for the forcemain decreasing by \$4.4 million, the Royston collection system increasing by \$6.5 million, the Kilmarnock collection system decreasing by \$690k, the Union Bay collection system increasing by \$3.5 million, and the Kilmarnock and Union Bay pump stations increasing by roughly five per cent. Mostly due to changes in design and proposed service area.</p> <p>R. Lymburner joined the meeting at 9:47am.</p> <p>Q: Is the Union Bay portion of the forcemain included in the North Royston and South Royston forcemain costs? A: Yes, includes total cost of forcemain to Union Bay.</p> <p>Q: If the costs go up or down, will the residents pay or save the difference? A: More information on resident costs to be shared later in meeting. There has been a slight increase in project costs but also greater allocation of grant funding, which has impacted the costs for residents.</p>	
<p>4.7 9:50 – 10:18am</p>	<p>Committee Considerations</p> <p>D. Monteith shared updated resident costs for Phase 1A with the committee. One-time costs now include LPS equipment for those who may require it, but have not changed for gravity connections. Borrowing costs have been reduced by \$200 following allotment of \$3.6 million reserve grant funding and the addition of \$1.25 million in community works funds.</p> <p>Q: What page are the costs shared in the report? A: Table 12 on page 55. The table in the addendum does not include previous cost estimates.</p>	<p>CVRD</p>

	<p>M. Rutten gave an overview of a staff report on projected tax escalation for the south region presented to the Electoral Areas Services Committee (EASC) and referred to the TACPAC. This committee focuses on sewer, but there are more service pressures in south region. The staff report identified cost pressures in south region, including the impact of the SES, Water South Extension Project, recreation facilities, enhanced garbage collection and the utility water rate review. The Water South Extension Project includes providing K'ómoks south lands with water from the Comox Valley Water System, as well as providing water to Royston and disconnecting it from the Village of Cumberland water system so the Village can better support its own growth. All of the CVRD participates in recreation service, with major refurbishment required. Potential for enhanced garbage collection for Royston, as collection companies move to automated bins and trucks. The CVRD conducted asset-management focused work on all water systems, including Royston and Union Bay. Rate increases projected for water systems to save funds for infrastructure replacement in the future. Fire hall replacement planned for Union Bay.</p> <p>Analysis completed based on information available at time. Staff used Class D estimates for SES, with costs already reduced in Class C estimate. One-time connection costs were not included in analysis. Values were calculated based on single family residential property.</p> <p>Comment: Analysis based on \$500k-800k property value, which does not seem accurate. Property values in south region are likely higher now.</p> <p>Response: Used \$500k for older years, but \$800k used for 2023 as median from BC Assessment as average across entire area. Could be different for Royston and Union Bay.</p> <p>Shared projected tax estimates for Royston and Union Bay for 2023 and 2027, which does not include SES. Royston projected to go from \$2,170 to \$3,135 and Union Bay from \$3,132 to \$3,866. Water and fire services mostly driving increases. SES Phase 1A borrowing and operating costs</p>	
--	--	--

are expected to add roughly \$2,190 to the 2027 charges, down \$200 from when the staff report was published.

Q: What is unique services tax?

A: Unique services tax is mostly for fire services for Royston and Union Bay. Staff report further explains how numbers are developed.

Comment: CVRD letter outlining water rate increases mentioned replacement renewal. Suspect watermains will be upsized for future development, but didn't see increase in Capital Improvement Cost Charge. Costs should be put on future development.

Response: Agreed, and included in staff report. Upsizing costs will be covered by future development, not existing homeowners.

Q: Where do subsequent fees collected from Union Bay Estates (UBE) properties go? Does it go into general revenue or back to residents who initially paid for the system?

A: Speaking for collection system, forcemain, or both?

Q: All infrastructure. If new properties join after system is complete, will presumably be charged connection fee.

Fees collected should go back to residents who paid for system, but suspect will go back into general revenue.

A: A new service will be created for new collection systems and all revenue will go into that service. If a new property joins an existing service, fees will go towards paying off debt. New neighbourhoods will go through same process with a new system required and with separate costs and service area. Anyone who connects will be paying a user rate and parcel tax. All money collected for project will go towards just that project.

Comment: Money collected from late adopters should go back to early adopters. Early adopters are subsidizing late adopters, since if they joined earlier it would have meant lower costs.

Response: Scenario assumes that the existing system would not need to be expanded. If the system needs to be

	<p>extended to include new properties, that would require additional costs borne by the late adopters.</p> <p>Comment: System will be designed for expansion to include UBE and K'ómoks south lands.</p> <p>Response: There is a difference between collection system infrastructure and conveyance system. For collection systems, new properties added to service area will share in borrowing costs, and overall costs would be reduced if a significant number of properties joined the service. For conveyance system, new properties will pay Development Cost Charge towards new infrastructure or upsizing to accommodate development. With combination of grant funding and partner contributions, residents will not be paying towards conveyance infrastructure but only their collection system.</p> <p>Q: Will there be a Development Cost Charge for new development?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p> <p>W: Are these numbers based on mandatory connection? Have staff addressed what to do with mandatory connection?</p> <p>A: All properties in the service area will have to connect, with an option for deferral offered for those with new septic systems.</p> <p>Q: If all the borrowing costs are paid, do property taxes go down?</p> <p>A: Yes, once the debt is retired, taxes would be reduced.</p> <p>Director Arbour joined the meeting at 10:15 am.</p> <p>Q: Can we see a wider range of cost impacts for higher-valued properties? Some properties are valued at \$1-2 million.</p> <p>A: Staff can get back with estimates. Some costs are parcel taxes, so same for each property, while others are based on property value.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>4.5 10:18 – 10:31am</p>	<p>Break The committee broke for recess at 10:18 am and reconvened at 10:31 am. The agenda was varied to bring forward agenda items 4.9 to 4.12.</p>	
<p>4.9 10:31 – 11:04am</p>	<p>Committee Considerations (continued) V. Van Tongeren provided an overview of discussion paper #1 (collection system design considerations). From conceptual to preliminary design, went from 43 (Royston) and 64 (Union Bay) rights of way on private property to 4 and 4 respectively, and LPS connections went from 20 (Royston) and 44 (Union Bay) to 88 (Royston) and 111 (Union Bay). Kilmarnock’s numbers, 4 right of ways and 46 LPS connections, have not changed. Numbers are on conservative side, and will have better understanding on grades and depths required for pipes after topographical survey. Q: Is there a map that shows the changes in rights of way and LPS connections between designs? A: Preliminary design shows most changes, but still in early stages. Updated map will be shared at next open houses. Comment: Rethinking committee decision on LPS. Can the committee revisit the topic and has anyone rethought their decision? With an expected increase in taxes for residents in south region, this is one spot where the committee can impact costs for residents. Was not aware of full picture at time of voting. Q: How has reducing the number of rights of way versus increasing the number of LPS connections affected costs? A: Have not quantified total costs of acquiring rights of way, but estimate that costs would be 50 per cent of land value where right of way is located. Comment: Committee had previously discussed an option for the CVRD to provide a stock of grinder pumps at no cost to property owners, but now there are more</p>	<p>CVRD</p>

	<p>estimated LPS properties. Would like to reconsider decision on LPS.</p> <p>Q: Are the rights of way versus LPS changes negligible? A: Table shows estimated difference in numbers of each.</p> <p>Q: Are you proposing including LPS grinder pump costs in overall project costs? A: Yes, since number of LPS connections was lower at time of vote. Not proposing design change or anything with rights of way, but just revisiting LPS decision. If no support for revisiting LPS, then would just like to express opinion.</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren shared proposed changes to phasing and boundary changes from discussion paper 2. The proposed changes include adding properties along Hyland Rd and Royston Rd to Phase 1B, and moving properties near Marine Dr up into Phase 1A. Staff are also in discussion with the Kingfisher Resort and Spa regarding a potential connection in an earlier phase.</p> <p>Comment: If can expand system with little to no increase in project costs, adding additional properties will help to better fund system.</p> <p>Q: Had previous discussion about Royston Elementary School but never resolved. Does adding the school to Phase 1B solve their problem? A: Proposed properties are those not already in service area. Royston Elementary is already in Phase 1B, but still in discussion with Comox Valley School about moving up to Phase 1A.</p> <p>Q: All new properties would be added to Phase 1B subject to cost analysis? A: If the committee supports including properties in service area and there is minimal impact to project costs, staff will approach the property owners.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Comment: If there are more owners who want to join the service area and the cost impacts are minimal, the committee should support their inclusion.</p> <p>A. Habkirk asked the committee if they were generally supportive of the proposed additions to the service area. There were no objections from the committee.</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren gave an overview of the draft addendum report. The report included design changes for the collection system, Royston pump station (flood risk mitigation) and a potential alternate forcemain alignment along the E&N railway.</p> <p>D. Monteith summarized the next steps for the project. Staff will be presenting the draft addendum report to the LWMP Addendum Steering Committee and CVSS LWMP Steering Committee. Staff will host open houses and a webinar in January 2024, where staff will provide updated costs estimates and preliminary design. The updated LWMP addendum will be presented in March/April to the TACPAC for review and comment, and then presented to the steering committees in April.</p> <p>A. Habkirk asked the committee if they were comfortable with the draft addendum report in its current form, or to discuss any concerns or issues.</p> <p>Q: After the draft addendum report is sent to the province, what is the timeline for a response and estimated construction start date?</p> <p>A: Estimate provincial review time is six months. Once reviewed by province, the report can be revised accordingly and then attached to the CVSS Stage 2 LWMP. The project will proceed into a combined Stage 3 LWMP, which includes more detailed design work, updated cost estimates and an additional public consultation process.</p> <p>Q: When do you estimate final approval of the Stage 3 LWMP?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>A: Estimate submitting Stage 3 LWMP to province in summer/fall 2025, and depending on review process and feedback, will then proceed to tender process for construction.</p> <p>Q: Mentioned potential changes for flood risk mitigation for Royston Pump Station. Will this be discussed?</p> <p>A: Had included measures at previous meeting and incorporated in all designs. Once designs and costs are further refined, can bring back to committee.</p> <p>Q: Can anything be shared about partner funding contributions? Has there been any progress? What is the timeline for when it will be finalized?</p> <p>A: Negotiations are confidential, so difficult to discuss and be transparent. Partner contributions from K'ómoks and UBE would support conveyance pipe, since it also supports their development. In general partnership is split a third between each party, but grant funding is also there to support residents and K'ómoks, with UBE paying their full share. Trying to ensure system provided meets requirements of UBE Master Development Agreement. UBE is in full support of SES as long-term solution and discussions are going well.</p> <p>Q: What would be reasonable timeline to have commitment?</p> <p>A: Early 2024 for UBE, but later in 2024 for K'ómoks due to treaty process.</p> <p>Comment: Important to gain security and certainty for project. Grant funding was first step in providing stability. K'ómoks and UBE recognize need for project. Have not given up on finding other ways to fund project, and may be other resources available for project.</p> <p>A. Habkirk asked the committee if they were comfortable with the draft addendum report proceeding to the steering committee as is. There were no objections from the committee.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>4.10 11:04 – 11:22am</p>	<p>Updates</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren gave an overview of the proposed septic deferral program. Approved by the LWMP Addendum Steering Committee in May 2023. Septic systems under five years in age at date of required sewer connection (~2028 for Phase 1A) are eligible. Deferred costs would include the operating and private property (connection and septic decommissioning) costs, and can be deferred for five years or until property is sold.</p> <p>Q: Is 2028 date based on installation of Phase 1A? A: Estimated date for when pipes are all installed and properties will be required to connect. Program will include all systems installed within five years of that required connection date and can defer for five years. Q: Five years from installation of septic system? A: No, would be looking at five years from date of required connection, so connection likely deferred until 2033.</p> <p>Q: Based on the 2028 date, would this essentially exclude anyone with an existing septic system and only include new builds starting from this year? A: Correct.</p> <p>Q: Will any notice be given to people after project approval to not put in new septic system unless necessary? A: Staff will provide constant communication with community. There may be temporary options, including a holding tank.</p> <p>Q: If 2028 is expected connection date but proposed taxes are for 2027, would that impact the costs? Would the charges start when properties connect or when the forcemain is installed? A: 2027 is an estimate. When discussing connecting in 2028, pipes will be in ground with construction having occurred. Will require funds before then for construction to occur. Once construction occurs and CVRD has taken</p>	<p>CVRD</p>
--	---	-------------

	<p>out loan, debt payments will start. Conceivable that charges start year of construction.</p> <p>Q: Would just charge the capital costs and not operational initially, or the full amount?</p> <p>A: Operational costs would not be charged until system is operational.</p> <p>Comment: Should provide clarification on financing at open houses or next committee meeting.</p> <p>Q: Had originally discussed residents not paying until residents had service. If holdup in construction, residents would be paying for service they don't have. Not fair to pay for service that residents cannot use yet. Could be archaeological discoveries or material shortages that may delay project.</p> <p>A: Will discuss with finance staff and determine timeline and financial options.</p> <p>V. Van Tongeren gave a summary of the septic maintenance program. Presented region-wide program to EASC in October. Program would include mandatory inspections for high-risk areas and mandatory pump-outs for all other areas. Program would also require order in council from BC Cabinet, with public engagement in spring and request to be submitted summer 2024. If approved, service establishment would proceed in 2025 and could see implementation in 2026. Inclusion in addendum report allows program to proceed for SES service area if region-wide system does not proceed.</p> <p>Q: If included in addendum report, can proceed with septic maintenance program if order in council not successful?</p> <p>A: Would still require order in council.</p> <p>Comment: Support concept of mandatory pump-outs and septic program. Should use carrot rather than stick approach, and should think outside box to find ways to fund systems and have subsidy to support homeowners.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>50 per cent subsidy for properties in Phase 1A could be about \$5 million. Priority should be to protect Baynes Sound.</p> <p>Q: If addendum report is approved, will this septic program not occur at all? A: Septic program is on parallel track. If SES proceeds, service area would not fall under program because they would no longer have septic systems. Program would apply to other CVRD areas.</p> <p>Comment: Regardless of what happens in SES process, UBE Master Development Agreement still requires expandable service, so may be source of funding.</p>	
<p>4.11 11:22 – 11:36am</p>	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>A. Habkirk noted that the next TACPAC meeting was scheduled for January, but will be moved to March or April.</p> <p>D. Monteith thanked the committee for their participation and invited them to attend the January open houses.</p> <p>Q: Did we vote on the Royston pump station design? A: The committee voted on location and supported building with amenities. WSP has looked at additional flood risk mitigation, which is included in report. Location is the same with alternate options to look and feel. Staff need to take a closer look during detailed design phase to determine cost implications, then come back to committee.</p> <p>Q: Have we discussed the Union Bay pump station? A: Union Bay pump station proposed to be located on UBE lands. Still in discussion with developer on exact location. Will discuss building or kiosk option with landowner and the committee.</p> <p>A. Habkirk advised the committee that there will be a motion to support the LWMP addendum report at the March/April TACPAC meeting.</p>	<p>Facilitator</p>

	<p>Q: Concern in community about other projects occurring at same time, such as water, and don't want the roads being dug up multiple times. Would like streamlined, so is this something being considered? Can we put water and sewer lines in trench at same time?</p> <p>A: Staff intend to minimize impact and will coordinate where possible. Sewer and water infrastructure usually end up on opposite sides of the road due to setback requirements. The Water South Extension Project is expected to happen ahead of the SES, but makes sense to have at different time since pipes will be on opposite sides of road and will likely extend to Argyle Rd. Water distribution system upgrades estimated for 15-20 years down the road, so can't coordinate with more recent projects.</p> <p>Q: Whole concept of project is to protect Baynes Sound. What empirical data was used to determine that there is an impact on Baynes Sound? What reports were used and when were they conducted? A few committee members will be attending EcoForum on Sunday and would like to discuss who has this data.</p> <p>A: Need to acknowledge that there are multiple contributors to health of Baynes Sound. Project will only cover part of sound, so this is why septic program also proposed.</p> <p>2015 report served as basis. A 2009 groundwater monitoring study was completed by Payne Engineering and Environmental Canada has conducted water quality monitoring in the area. Island Health has provided data on septic system age and related health concerns. Multiple norovirus outbreaks in area, known to be mostly caused by sewage from unknown sources. BC Centre for Disease Control is starting genome mapping project in Baynes Sound next year to assist in determining source of sewage contamination. Multiple agencies involved regarding health of Baynes Sound. Four reports included on public consultation site and can distribute via email as well.</p>	
--	---	--

4.12 11:36am	Adjournment The committee adjourned at 11:36 am.	Facilitator
------------------------	--	-------------

GENERAL:

The next SES LWMP Addendum Joint TACPAC meeting, currently scheduled for January 16, 2024, will be rescheduled to March/April 2024, to be held in the CVRD Civic Room at 770 Harmston Avenue, Courtenay, and via Zoom conference.

TERMINATION:

The meeting terminated at 11:36 am.