

**CRD CORE AREA LIQUID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT INFORMATION REPORT**

**INFORMATION REPORT #EHQ 09-117
10 NOVEMBER 2009**

**SUBJECT PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR ESQUIMALT AND VICTORIA – CORE AREA
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROGRAM**

DISCUSSION

At its meeting of 07 October 2009 the CALWMC were informed of the open houses planned for Esquimalt and Victoria to provide an update on the wastewater treatment project including potential sites identified in those communities. The open houses were intended only for educational purposes and not full public engagement since no sites have been selected.

Open houses were held in Esquimalt and Victoria October 19th and 20th respectively. They were attended by a total of 88 people (72 in Esquimalt, 16 in Victoria) and 39 residents provided feedback on comment forms.

Appendix A, *October 2009 Esquimalt / Victoria Open House Public Feedback Summary*, is a compilation of this feedback. The summary is not representative of public opinion, but provides suggestions, areas of indicated support, concerns and general comments from attendees.

Future anticipated public education and engagement initiatives include West Shore sites (following discussion with Colwood and Langford directors), a biosolids energy centre in Victoria, and re-engagements with the community regarding siting in Saanich East-North Oak Bay.

Dwayne Kalynchuk, PEng
Project Director, Core Area Wastewater Treatment

TJ:jta
Attachments: 1

OCTOBER 2009 ESQUIMALT / VICTORIA OPEN HOUSE PUBLIC FEEDBACK SUMMARY

Suggestion Received	Percentage of total written feedback responses received
Hartland as site for treatment	5.13%
Explore possibility of Cattle Pt. site in Upland	2.56%
Look at High rise style "vertical treatment" as is being done in Paris	2.56%
A partnership with BC Hydro for power generation	2.56%
Look at sludge processing techniques deployed at DND for ships	2.56%
Assess Royal Victoria Golf Club as potential site	2.56%
Retain "one of the best" landscape architectural firm	2.56%
Island View as a better alternative site than McLoughlin	2.56%
Citizen Review Committee to direct questions to PRT	2.56%
Pickup service for household toxins similar to bluebox program	2.56%
Archie Browning P Lot as alternative	2.56%

Indicates Support for Wastewater Treatment System and Specific Issue	Percentage of total written feedback responses received
Exploration of industrial lands, such as Victoria Harbour as potential site for WWT and Biosolids production	33.33%
Biosolid processing and WWT together on one site	17.95%
Consideration of emerging alternative treatments	17.95%
Support for de-centralized planning	7.69%
Centralized treatment, close to where materials can be used/sold	7.69%
West Shore Treatment Plant	7.69%
Integration of liquid and solid waste (garbage) management on one site	7.69%
Incorporation of alternative energy sources	5.13%
Supportive of secondary treatment	5.13%
A phase-in approach to fully assess new technologies	2.56%
Siting at McLoughlin Point	2.56%
Support for a publicly financed and managed WWT system	2.56%
Support for Option 1B	2.56%
A bypass road to avoid excess Esquimalt Traffic	2.56%
BC Hydro site in Rock Bay, but concerned with interference with proposed bike-pedestrian trail	2.56%

Appendix A
 Esquimalt/Victoria Open House Public Feedback Summary
 Page 2

Concerns Identified	Percentage of total written feedback responses received
McLaughlin site size restrictions	25.64%
The deadline and rushing decisions	20.51%
Impacts to community using McLoughlin Pt. (real estate value, traffic, access, tourism, user impacts etc.)	15.38%
Potential transportation process for sludge and community impacts (e.g. trucking)	12.82%
Decisions being made without public influence	12.82%
Odour impacts	12.82%
The expense of project	10.26%
Shoreline inappropriate location	10.26%
Siting decisions are before technology decisions	5.13%
Opposed to Option 1A	5.13%
Victoria's siting costs	2.56%
Potential site failure (e.g. Halifax)	2.56%
Proposed treatment capacity to treat grease, chemicals, pharmaceuticals	2.56%
Lack of community compensation process	2.56%
Locked into proposed sites submitted with amendment	2.56%
Opposed to Esquimalt and West Shore working independently	2.56%

General Comments Received	Percentage of total written feedback responses received
Resource Recovery is a priority, and requires a proactive approach	30.77%
Appreciation of CRD outreach and education efforts	23.08%
A shoreline is an inappropriate location for WWT	10.26%
A baseline impact assessment required of site	5.13%
A state of the art facility is needed	5.13%
Planning needs to focus on Source Control and recycling	5.13%
Compliments CRD and municipalities cooperative I&I reduction planning	2.56%
Seismic risk assessment and planning required	2.56%
Public Participation and input is imperative to this process	2.56%
Further investigation of partnerships with UVIC needed	2.56%
What is the park potential with proposed sites?	2.56%
Interested in learning more about biosolids applications	2.56%
Are CRD plans flexible enough to incorporate alternative technology if they prove themselves (e.g. Colwood Pilot Project)	2.56%
The financial bottom line should not have biggest influence on decision	2.56%