

Minutes of the **Liquid Waste Management Plan Stage 2** Advisory Committee Meeting #1 of the Regional District of Central Okanagan held at Regional District Offices, 1450 KLO Road, Kelowna, BC, on November 27, 2007 @ 4:00 p.m. Kaloya Room

Members:	Edna Thiessen	Ellison Area Resident
	Al Strachan	Country View Estates (Ellison area)
	Bob Calder	Sunset Ranch Golf Course (Ellison area)
	Emma Rantucci	Joe Rich area resident
	Bill Berry	Wastewater Manager, City of Kelowna
	Bob Hrasko	Kel. Joint Water Committee/BMID/GEID
	Keith Duhaime	Agricultural Support Office for the RD
	Hilary Hettinga	Director of Engineering, RDCO
	Tim Forty	Quaran Environmental
	Jan Enns	Jan Enns Communications
	Lynn Brown	RDCO, Minutes

Absent:	Carl Withler	Ministry of Agriculture
	Conrad Pryce	Ministry of Environment
	Trudy Peterson	WFN, behalf of Jim Mountain, Dan Brown
	Ray King	Public Health Inspector, Interior Health
	Martin Collins	Agricultural Land Commission
	Jean-Francois Ferry	Environment Canada
	Jules Morris	Joe Rich area resident

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jan Enns thanked and welcomed everyone to the first meeting of Stage 2 of the Advisory Committee to develop the Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) for Central Okanagan Area East. The main purpose of today's meeting is:

- To have a quick review of Stage 1
- Review next steps for Stage 2
- Review the options from Stage 1 and prioritize them into 3 categories

Round table introductions followed.

Handouts: Presentation of LWMP process, LWMP Options with Pros, Cons, and Cost Estimates, list of Options from plan, Open House Exit Survey Results.

(Copies available by email at lwmp@cord.bc.ca or simply call Lynn Brown at 469-6327.)

2. REVIEW OF STAGE 1, TIM FORTY

Tim reviewed the following points:

- What is a LWMP
- Why we develop a LWMP
- How we develop a LWMP
- Septic tanks and what we can happen without a LWMP

3. OVERVIEW OF MEETING, JAN ENNS

Tim will present the pros, cons, and rough cost estimates for each option. Then the committee will discuss each option and place them into one of the following three categories:

- Options that will go to the public for feedback
- Options that need more info (may go to public for feedback)

- Options which are not practical (would go to public for information only)

Hilary made note that the intent of showing costs in the following options is to get that magnitude to help us make some decisions; not to rely on the costs as an accurate cost but more of a relative cost at this point.

1. PRESENTATION ON OPTION, TIM FORTY

The committee reviewed and categorized each of the options as follows:

Option 0: Everywhere in RDCO Area East - Status Quo – leave everything as it

Discussion

- This option is for all areas until something goes wrong in the specific area
- Okanagan East the majority of land in the ALR. The OCP and Rural Land Use Bylaw don't envision much more development in the next five years
- Option is a great starting point
- The smallest permitted subdivision in Okanagan East is for no less than 2 hectares. Not possible to subdivide from 4 hectares to 2 hectares unless you have community water

Decision

- Option 0 is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 1: Everywhere in RDCO Area East - Enhanced Status Quo – education program

Discussion

- Easy to implement, short term option that can be implemented quickly
- Great idea!
- Not too many people pay attention to what is given to them in regards to their septic tank when the septic tank is put in
- Country Roads gives every new owner a DVD developed by Ministry of Health on how to take care of their septic tanks

Edna Thiessen arrives at 4:40 pm

Decision

- Option 1 is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 2: Everywhere in RDCO Area East – Septic tank pump-out program

Discussion

- Some of the Capital Regional District electoral areas are moving forward with a similar program. They plan to have the hauler who empties the tanks register through a system at the Treatment Plant and track that way
- The GIS system could do a similar thing, the database is there
- If we are asking the public which option they want they are going to choose the education option 1. We should take it to the public and say that option 2 is a back-up option, if option 1 fails

Action

- Increase small additional cost from \$7 - \$10 to \$15 - \$20
- Hilary will look into more of the costs

Decision

- Option 2 is an option that will go to the public for feedback with costs adjusted as noted as an Action item

Keith Duhaime arrives at 5:05 pm

Option 3: Everywhere in RDCO Area East – Monitoring program of health and environmental impacts

Discussion

- From public survey, the public doesn't feel they can make an educated decision without knowing the health and environmental impacts
- Monitor problem areas, such as springs and creeks
- Work with water districts as they sample and monitor their intakes

Action

- Add to "Pros":
 - Study grants
 - Identifies problem areas and allows public to know the status of each area
- Hilary to look into how much would it be per year for a parameter analysis for potential impact areas

Decision

- Option 3 is an option that will go to the public for feedback with costs adjusted as noted as an Action item

Option 4 Sunset Ranch – Status Quo

Discussion

- All phases including existing phase and new phases of Sunset Ranch are being serviced by City of Kelowna

Decision

- Option 4 is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 5 Sunset Ranch – Serviced by RDCO

Discussion

- All phases including existing phase and new phases of Sunset Ranch are being/will be serviced by City of Kelowna

Decision

- Option 5 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 6 Sunset Ranch – Serviced by private company

Discussion

- No discussion; as above

Decision

- Option 6 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 7 Scotty Creek – Petition City of Kelowna for Sewer Service

Discussion

- \$10,000/lot without a grant is unrealistic at this time \$12,000 – 14,000/lot maybe more realistic but in 5 years it could be more
- City DCC would be ineligible for a grant but maybe possible to receive a grant if it were something different such as a “Capacity Usage Fee”.
- Current grant MRIF –Municipal Rural Infrastructure Funding Program
- Explain to public if all else fails this option could apply; this does not mean that you have to go with the city. It means that a public consultation will be done explaining the option and cost and a formal petition will need to be signed before they could even join the city
- Feedback from the survey suggested that most people in the area wanted to stay within the Regional District
- If Scotty Creek wanted city sewer ASAP they would have to join the city according to current City policy

Action

- Change cost per lot from \$10,000 to \$12,000 – 14,000
- Bill to look in to grant opportunities

Decision

- Option 7 is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 8 Scotty Creek – Serviced by RDCO

Discussion

- Good idea but not practical with the city trunk running through subdivision

Decision

- Option 8 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 9 Scotty Creek – Serviced by Private Company

Discussion

- No discussion; as above

Decision

- Option 9 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 10 Ranch Road Mobile Home Park– Petition City of Kelowna for Sewer Service

Discussion

- Ranch Road mobile home park has an on-site sewer system already
- Collection system is still in place; it would just be the cost of a main line to the trunk at Sunset Ranch
- Might not be able to get a grant; with cost so low
- Need to ensure that everyone will pay their share of the local service area cost of connecting to sewer

Action

- Need to look into more accurate cost for city connection charge and local collection system costs
- Remove the 4th point under the Pros
- Bill to look into to see if City connection charge/per lot, it maybe less than \$4675.00

Decision

- Option 10 is an option that needs more info (may go to public for feedback)

Option 11 Ranch Road Mobile Home Park – Serviced by RDCO

Discussion

- No discussion; as above

Action

- Hilary to look further into more accurate costs for inclusion in the report and public information materials
- Bring this option back to committee after costs have been reviewed to see if they still feel it is not practical

Decision

- Option 11 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 12 Ranch Road Mobile Home Park – Construct own sewage treatment system

Discussion

- No discussion; as above

Decision

- Option 12 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 12a Country Lane – Serviced by City of Kelowna

Discussion

- Currently they don't have an on-site sewer system

Action

- Hilary to look further into more accurate costs

Decision

- Option 12a is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 12b Country Lane – Serviced by RDCO

Discussion

- Currently they don't have an on-site sewer system

Action

- Hilary to look further into more accurate costs for inclusion in the report and public information materials

Decision

- Option 12b is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 12c Country Lane – Construct own sewage treatment system

Discussion

- Currently they don't have an on-site sewer system

Action

- Hilary to look further into more accurate costs for inclusion in the report and public information materials

Decision

- Option 12c is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 13 Country View – Serviced by City of Kelowna

Discussion

- If septic fails, would there be enough room to fix them?

Action

- Make recommendation to strata to start reserve fund to collect money for a future sewer system
- Change the 1st point under Pros to read "Capacity designed into Country Roads trunk"
- Change the 2nd point under Cons to read \$20 instead of \$22

Decision

- Option 13 is an option that will go to the public for feedback

Option 14 Country View – Serviced by RDCO

Discussion

- Currently they don't have an on-site sewer system

Decision

- Option 14 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 15 Country View – Construct own sewage treatment system

Discussion

- No discussion

Decision

- Option 15 is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 16 Falcon Ridge – Serviced by RDCO through septic system

Discussion

- Add to Cons: Finding a location for septic system
- Add to Cons: Meeting regulations

Action

- Talk to Gundie regarding regulations

Decision

- Option 16 is an option which needs more info (may go to public for feedback)

Option 16a Falcon Ridge – Serviced by RDCO via sewer system

Discussion

- Add to Cons: Finding a location for treatment plant

Action

- Hilary to look further into accurate cost for treatment plant for inclusion in the report and public information materials

Decision

- Option 16a is an option which needs more info (may go to public for feedback)

Option 17 Greystokes/ Dion Road – Serviced by RDCO via septic system

Discussion

- With large lots and no wells in the area there would be more opportunity to relocate system if they ever failed
- Too far in the future to consider at this time; area has no current problems. To be reviewed next time the LWMP is updated.

Action

- Add to Cons: Finding a location for septic system
- Hilary to look further into more accurate costs for inclusion in the report and public information materials

Decision

- Option 17 is an option which will go to the public for feedback

Option 17a Greystokes/ Dion Road – Serviced by RDCO via sewage treatment System

Discussion

- With large lots and no wells in the area there would be more opportunity to relocate system if they every failed
- Too far in the future to consider at this time; area has no current problems. To be reviewed next time the LWMP is updated.

Action

- Hilary to look further into accurate costs for inclusion in the report and public information materials

Decision

- Option 17a is an option which is not practical (would go to public for information only)

Option 18 June Springs – Continue to use sewage treatment & disposal system

Discussion

- Too far in the future to consider at this time; area has no current problems. To be reviewed next time the LWMP is updated.

Decision

- Option 18 is an option that can go to public for feedback

Option 19 McCulloch – Continue to use sewage treatment & disposal system

Discussion

- Too far in the future to consider at this time; no known concerns or issues. To be reviewed next time the LWMP is updated.

Decision

- Option 19 is an option that will go to public for feedback

Option 20 Chute Lake & OK Mountain Park – Continue to use sewage treatment & disposal system

Discussion

- Too far in the future to consider at this time; no known concerns or issues. To be reviewed next time the LWMP is updated.

Decision

- Option 20 is an option that will go to public for feedback

Option 21 Southern Tip of Lakeshore Road – Continue to use sewage treatment & disposal system

Discussion

- No discussion

Decision

- Option 21 is an option that will go to public for feedback

Option 22 Southern Tip of Lakeshore Road – Serviced by City of Kelowna

Discussion

- No discussion

Decision

- Option 22 is an option which is not practical at this time but may be relevant in the future (would go to public for information only)

Option 23 Stormwater Management in Plan Area

Discussion

- No discussion

Action

- Remove 2nd point under Cons

Decision

- Option 23 is an option that will go to public for feedback

Option 24 Agricultural Wastewater Management in Plan Area

Discussion

- Concern regarding current feedlot that has moved into the Ellison Area

Action

- Add in the LWMP that intensive farming operations need to show that they are not having an impact on the environment

Decision

- Option 24 is an option that needs more info (may go to public for feedback)

6. ADMINISTRIVIA

- Materials will be sent by email. Anyone requesting a hard copy can simply reply back and we'll send!

7. NEXT STEPS

- Putting this information back into public consultation materials i.e., newsletter, posters
- Next Meeting: Reviewing information to go to public consultation meeting. May have a meeting or may just get committee's feedback via mail, email, fax or phone. Please advise if you have a preference!
- Host public consultation meetings sometime in the spring.
- If you have any questions, comments, or ideas, please feel free to submit directly to: lwmp@cord.bc.ca or call Jan at 769-3627.
- Thank you for your time, energy, and interest!

8. MEETING ADJOURNED @ 7:10P.M.

These minutes are in the writer's best interpretation of discussions held during the meeting. Please inform the writer of any noteworthy omissions or errors.