

MINUTES of a special meeting of the COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE of the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the District of Oak Bay, held in the Oak Bay United Church, 1355 Mitchell Street, Victoria, B.C., on Wednesday October 5, 2016 at 6:30 PM.

PRESENT: Mayor N. Jensen, Chair
Councillor H. Braithwaite
Councillor M. Kirby
Councillor K. Murdoch
Councillor T. Ney
Councillor E. Zhelka

STAFF: Chief Administrative Officer, H. Koning,
Deputy Director of Corporate Services, M. Jones,
Director of Engineering Services, D.Horan,

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM.

Mayor Jensen welcomed the public to the meeting, noting that the venue was selected to allow for greater public attendance. He briefly reviewed the background of the project and noted that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to review the information that has been gathered over the past eighteen months and to hear from the public. Mayor Jensen introduced the following additional staff in attendance for this special meeting: David Brozuk, Superintendent of Public Works; Grace Espedido, Engineering Assistant; and Caroline Duncan, Archivist, Meeting Recorder

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. ***Project Manager's Presentation - Uplands Combined Sewer Separation - Project Recommendation***
 - ADDENDA – Presentation, Project Manager, 5 Oct, 2016
 - Report - Project Manager - Sept. 28, 2016
 - McElhanney Report - Project Recommendation - Sept. 22, 2016
 - McElhanney Rpt. - Appendix A - Reduced Copies of Options Drawings and Figures
 - McElhanney Rpt. - Appendix B - Options Data and Calculations Tables
 - McElhanney Rpt. - Appendix C - Unit Price Cost Estimates for Each Option
 - McElhanney Rpt. - Appendix D - Additional Work Directed by the District
 - McElhanney Rpt. - Appendix E - Description of Cost Estimating Assumptions
 - ADDENDA – Corresp., Sep.30-Oct 5, 2016

Jack Hull, Project Manager, HJA Consulting, Kathi Springer, Communications Consultant and Ian Whitehead, McElhanney Consulting Services Ltd. in attendance for this item.

The Project Manager made a presentation to the Committee as outlined in his report dated September 28, 2016. He noted that all options were technically feasible and would comply with the regulations. In concluding the presentation, the Project Manager made a recommendation for the implementation of option 4.

Following the conclusion of the presentation the Project Manager responded to questions from the Committee with respect to: the proposed amount of the contingency funding; bylaw requirements with regards to sewer connections; and pump installation and operating costs to the homeowner.

The timeframe of the project was discussed and the Committee questioned the thirty-year period and whether there would be benefit to a longer implementation period. The Project Manager responded that thirty years was expected to be an acceptable time frame for the Ministry and that he would not recommend extending it beyond that.

With respect to a question by the Committee regarding the Capital Regional District's funding formula and whether reducing sewage volume would result in reducing costs, the Project Manager commented that it was his understanding that the cost of treatment is based on the biological loading and as such there would not be a significant cost difference, but that he would provide additional information in this regard.

It was noted that new grant opportunities recently announced at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities could potentially assist in funding this project.

The Director of Engineering Services responded to questions from the Committee regarding the need for and funding of pipe rehabilitation throughout the Municipality.

The Chair expressed appreciation for the work of staff and consultants and invited comments from the public.

Pourandokht Ahmadisatari, Oak Bay resident, asked whether Uplands residents will be paying for work elsewhere in Oak Bay and whether grants will apply to all parties or the municipal portion of the work only. She expressed concern regarding the cost burden on Uplands residents and asked for clarification as to what is considered a major renovation.

In response to Ms Ahmadisatari, the Chair noted that the costs to the municipality include all Oak Bay taxpayers and that a major renovation is defined as more than \$100,000. The Project Manager noted that grants apply to the municipality and that government funding restricts grants to private individuals.

Scott Gryba, Oak Bay resident, spoke with respect to the timing of the project and asked if it is contingent on the sewer treatment plant. He expressed his support for the project but questioned its benefits in the absence of regional sewage treatment.

In response to Mr. Gryba, the Chair noted that a decision has been made at the Capital Regional District to proceed with sewage treatment.

David Black, Oak Bay resident, expressed a number of concerns. He noted that many good ideas had come forward at earlier meetings that had not been included in the plan. With regards to pumps, he expressed concern regarding reliability, expense, and the need for generators. He commented that the municipality should be more precise about the potential costs to homeowners with regard to pumps. The project overall is unreasonable, he said, given that the overflow of 1-2 days per year is not a major environmental problem.

He questioned what actions had been taken to explore the use of easements in order to reduce the number of pumps needed and expressed concern on the impact the project would have on roads in the Uplands. Mr. Black also questioned if there would be a need to flush the sewer pipe once storm water was handled separately. He asked if the properties along the ocean currently discharging stormwater directly into the ocean will be required to hookup. Mr. Black concluded his remarks by asking the Chair if the First Nations have been consulted.

In response to Mr. Black, the Chair noted that there might be an opportunity to include some of his suggestions during the implementation phase but that extra costs would need to be examined. Mayor Jensen noted that the District continues to invest in a good relationship based on respect with the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations and that they had been advised of the process and future consultation opportunities. He further noted that archaeological issues will exist regardless of the option selected.

In response to Mr. Black, the Project Manager clarified the outcomes of the geotechnical study and spoke to the proposed project phasing. He acknowledged that there will be disruption in the area, but that it would not be continual.

Roger Bernard, Oak Bay resident, commented about onsite storm water management. He noted that his own, and other, properties in the Uplands currently work very well with onsite storm water management and that the proposed plan would require him to purchase a pump, generator and an electrical panel upgrade in order to redirect water that is currently well managed onsite.

In response to Mr. Bernard, the Chair reviewed the proposed requirements to connect to the system.

Committee discussion ensued with members providing comments on the challenges of being mandated to pursue this project and on the value of addressing stormwater management in the future.

The discussion having concluded, the Chair referred to the Project Manager's recommendation and asked if anyone has a desire to put the motion on the floor.

MOVED and seconded: That it be recommended to Council:

1. The District of Oak Bay approve the recommendations of the pre-design report namely:
 - a. Option 4, a shallower gravity based storm system, including two isolated areas requiring municipal stormwater pumps;
 - b. Design by catchment area and not by construction phase;
 - c. Construction on a phased project basis, beginning with the Humber catchment, with contract packages at a minimum of \$2 million each; and
 - d. Development of a plan for rehabilitation of the existing pipes; and
2. The District of Oak Bay approve the submission to the Capital Regional District requesting an amendment to the Capital Regional District's Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan.

A member of the Committee expressed concern that the proposed 30 year time frame was too limiting.

MOVED and seconded: That the motion be amended by adding “and that this submission not commit us to an end date”.

A discussion ensued in which it was noted that an open end date would not be acceptable to the Province.

DEFEATED
Mayor Jensen and Councillors Braithwaite,
Kirby, Murdoch, Ney against the motion

In further discussion of the initial motion, the Committee commented that while other initiatives might have a greater environmental benefit to Oak Bay, the separation of the sewer is mandated by the Province. They reviewed the benefits of the proposed plan: the ability to carry out work in stages, the possibilities for addressing specific homeowner circumstances, the extensive work by staff and consultants over the past eighteen months, and the valuable public input.

The question was then called.

CARRIED

The Chair noted that the next step was for the recommendation to go to Council on October 11.

ADJOURNMENT:

3. *Motion to Adjourn*

MOVED and seconded: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 9:26 PM.

Certified Correct:

Chair

Deputy Director of Corporate Services