

**Date:** November 12, 2013 **File:** 20132344.00.A.04.01

**Time:** 12:30-3:00 pm **Page:** 1 of 5

**Project:** Port Alberni Wastewater Upgrades

**Subject:** Wastewater Advisory Committee Meeting #4

**Client:** City of Port Alberni

**Location:** City Hall, Argyle Street, Port Alberni, BC

**Present:** Kelly Bush (KB) – Associated Engineering (AE) (by phone)  
Jason Clarke (JC) – Worley Parsons  
Guy Cicon (GC) - City of Port Alberni  
Quinn Crosina (QC) – AE  
Larry Cross (LC) – Catalyst Paper  
Phil Edgell – AVEA  
Sheena Falconer – West Coast Aquatic  
Elysha Gordon (EG) – Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans (by phone)  
Hugh Hamilton (HH) – AE / Summit Environmental  
Wendy Lee Kerr (WK) – City of Port Alberni  
Jack McLeman (JM) – City of Port Alberni  
Andrew Olson (AO) – Tseshah First Nation  
Tom Robinson (TR) – AE  
Dean Shiskowski (DS) – AE  
Michal Simhon (MS) – AE (by phone)  
Jana Tondou (JT) – AE / Summit Environmental (by phone)  
Ken Watson (KW) – City of Port Alberni  
Brad West (BW) – McGill & Associates Eng.  
Kirsten White (KW) – Ministry of Environment (MOE)

**Distribution:** Those Present  
James Arnott – Environment Canada  
Rick Avis (RA) - Somass Estuary Management Plan Committee / Alberni Valley Enhancement Association (AVEA)  
Steven Baxter (SB) – Port Alberni Port Authority  
Jeanine Bond – Ducks Unlimited  
Stephanie Bruvall – Ministry of Health  
Bill Collette – AV Chamber of Commerce  
Andy Daniel – Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District  
Wendy Gallic – Tseshah First Nation  
Joe Holmes (JH) – Western Forest Products  
Kim Hyatt – Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans  
Baljeet Mann – MOE  
Dave McCormick – Port Alberni Port Authority  
Ashley Popovich – Catalyst Paper  
Scott Smith (SS) – City of Port Alberni  
Steve Tatoosh – Hupacasath First Nation  
Ivy Whitehorne – Ducks Unlimited

## RECORD OF MEETING (Revision 1)

Subject: Wastewater Advisory Committee Meeting #4  
November 12, 2013

- 2 -

This Record of Meeting is considered to be complete and correct. Please advise the writer within one week of any errors or omissions, otherwise this Record of Meeting will be considered to be an accurate record of the discussions

**Action By:**

**Discussion:**

**1 INTRODUCTIONS**

Info Introductions were made around the table.

**2 BACKGROUND**

Info TR presented a brief recap of the work and discussions carried out to-date. He noted that the task at hand is to establish the preferred discharge location.

Info It was noted that the location shown for the Somass River option has moved upstream since the previous WAC meeting. DS noted the reasoning is that it is then out of the area of influence of saltwater (different from tidal inundation), in other words, out of the area defined by the MOE as an estuary.

Info TR noted that the current activity is being considered a screening exercise, which entails an evaluation of pass/fail criteria based on attributes required for an option to be viable. He emphasized that this is different from a comparative evaluation, which would be the next step, should more than one option be carried following the screening stage.

**3 DISCHARGE LOCATION SCREENING EXERCISE**

Info DS presented a table (appended) summarizing the findings related to the screening exercise. He explained the process, the format of the table, and the definitions for each colour code. He then led the discussion based on the contents of the table.

Info PE asked about where in the table environmental factors are considered. DS and QC responded that several environmental factors are implicit in the attributes identified, although they are not explicitly laid out as being environmental considerations.

Info PE referenced prior archaeological work in the area. GC responded that the same lead archaeologist, Denis St. Claire, will be involved in this project.

Info DS noted that 'Mill-Related Contaminants' (outside of the known fibre mat area), was added to the list of attributes for consideration since the last WAC meeting. TR noted that there is currently no reason to suspect this is an issue, but that it is prudent to consider and investigate the possibility.

Subject: Wastewater Advisory Committee Meeting #4

November 12, 2013

- 3 -

**Action By:**

**Discussion:**

**3.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: FRESHWATER RIVER DISCHARGE**

Info DS discussed the effluent quality requirements with respect to the Vancouver Island Phosphorus Objective, which would apply to Alternative 1 – Freshwater (Somass) River discharge. He noted that treatment to sufficiently reduce phosphorus levels is achievable but would have a considerable capital cost, and also a considerable operating cost (likely in the order of \$60,000 - 80,000 annually). There would also be additional social and environmental considerations associated with the treatment.

Info DS noted that dilution may not be sufficient to reduce coliform levels to meet regulatory requirements and that disinfection will likely be required for all of the alternatives.

Info PE asked about risks associated with tsunami inundation. DS responded that mitigation will be considered during the design. JC commented that the risk is likely the same for all four alternatives and it is important to balance risk and mitigation costs.

**3.2 ALTERNATIVE 2A: ESTUARINE DISCHARGE  
(SHORTER PIPELINE TO SHALLOW LOCATION)**

Info DS commented that ammonia data from the sampling was inconclusive as to whether ammonia would need to be targeted during treatment.

Info AO noted that purple varnish clams were seen near the existing outfall location. Although they are a non-native, invasive species, they may still constitute a potential harvest. DS commented that a harvestable shellfish species in sufficiently close proximity to the discharge location may turn that attribute red. KW confirm that an invasive species is treated (by the regulation) the same as a native species if it is being consumed.

Info PE noted that there could likely be freshwater clams near the Alternative 1 discharge location.

**3.3 ALTERNATIVE 2B: ESTUARINE DISCHARGE  
(PIPELINE TO DEEPER LOCATION)**

Info It was noted that there is ongoing development of the terms of reference for an archaeological investigation and that if significant archaeological sites are found,

Subject: Wastewater Advisory Committee Meeting #4

November 12, 2013

- 4 -

**Action By:**

**Discussion:**

mitigation is likely possible (such a modification to the effluent pipeline route) and therefore this attribute is not expected to be a showstopper for this alternative.

Info

LC asked if the attribute pertaining to the fibre mat should be shown as yellow in the table. TR responded that the engineering team is fairly confident that a route for the pipeline that avoids disturbing the fibre mat can be found. JC agreed but noted that there is no data available for the adjacent mud flat, which is why that attribute is shown as yellow.

Info

DS noted that the ammonia dilution would need to be proven during the Environmental Impact Study (EIS).

TR/HH

AO noted that an investigation is required in order to confirm that there are no bivalve shellfish of concern (harvestable) in the proximity of this discharge location. It was agreed there would be follow-up on this issue.

### **3.4 ALTERNATIVE 3: INTERTIDAL ZONE WETLANDS**

It was noted that this alternative was given a 'red-flag' FAIL judgement early on in the screening exercise, largely because it is an environmentally sensitive area that serves as habitat to for blue- and red-listed plant, waterfowl and shorebird species along with juvenile and migrating adult salmonid species.

Info

DS asked for any overall or specific comments.

## **4 NEXT STEPS**

Info

TR noted that the next steps will involve activities and investigations that will turn the 'yellow' boxes 'green'. The focus will be on Alternative 2b, which appears to be the preferred option *due to its lack of red-flagged FAIL judgements*. Planned work includes archaeological investigations, sediment sampling and a shellfish survey.

Info

GC noted that along with the archaeological investigations, the City will be engaging an ethno-botanist to survey for traditional use plant species. The City would also like to involve Rick Avis and other with an interest and related knowledge.

Info

The project team is currently developing the draft Stage 2 document for the Liquid Waste Management Plan, as well as the Part 1 Environmental Impact Study (EIS).

Subject: Wastewater Advisory Committee Meeting #4  
November 12, 2013

- 5 -

Action By:

Discussion:

Info PE asked whether consideration has been given to decommissioning the lagoon(s) and building a mechanical treatment plant. DS responded that the cost for a mechanical plant would be in the order of tens of millions, plus conveyance modification/upgrade costs as well as annual operation and maintenance costs. It is not economically viable for the City. TR noted that the effluent discharge location would still be up for discussion. GC noted that the current work does not preclude the possibility of a mechanical plant (or similar) at some point in the future.

Info JM asked how large the outfall pipe will be and whose land it will traverse. DS responded that it will likely be in the order of a 24" pipe. GC commented that for the routing currently shown, it traverses Port Authority (Crown) land.

Info KW spoke a bit about the overall liquid waste management process (LWMP).

Info JM asked about the unlikely scenario that one or more of the attributes shown as 'yellow' for Alternative 2b, turn to 'red'. HH responded that it's important to remember that the Environmental Impact Study will consider baseline conditions and that the proposed work will be an improvement over the status quo.

Info Regarding the upcoming public consultation stage, JM noted that costs will be of interest. AO commented that costs should be presented for alternatives. SF commented that public consultation should also include reference to the implications that would result if no change is made from the status quo.

TR/QC It was agreed that the next WAC meeting would be tentatively scheduled for December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013, during which the project team will present an overview of the draft Stage 2 document developed to date.

Prepared by:



Quinn Crosina, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.  
Environmental Engineer

Reviewed by:



Tom Robinson, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.  
Project Manager

QC/TR/lp