

MINUTES - WASTEWATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – MEETING #2
Liquid Waste Management Plan for Gallagher Lake & Vaseux Lake



Meeting: June 22, 2011 @ 6:30pm at the Oliver Community Centre, Room 1

Attendees:

- Allan Patton – Director Area C
- Tom Styffe – Alternate Director Area D
- Tim Forty - AECOM
- John Van Andel - AECOM
- John Beaupre – Interior Health
- Carl Wong, Interior Health
- Rob Bitte - MOT
- Mike Sokal - MOE
- Liisa Bloomfield – RDOS
- Doug French – RDOS
- Alf Hartviksen – RDOS
- Evelyn Riechert – RDOS
- Hugh Chown
- Karen Kari
- Arlene Loverin
- Ray Moon
- Bill Morey
- Joy Nobel
- Mike Sarell

Absent:

- Roger Cavadini - MOE
- Barry Barisoff
- Gordon Bonnett
- Swaranjit Chahal
- Lawrence Green
- Dale Hyworon
- David Nason
- Dot Ryrie
- Madelon Stevens
- Ron Worth

Meeting began 6:35 pm

Meeting Chair – John Van Andel, AECOM

- Introductions of all members
- Presentation by Tim Forty, AECOM

- Statement: Allan Patton – apologized for not attending last time as he considers sewerage in Gallagher Lake top on his priority list
- Question: *What is the mobile home park price listed?* – calculated a typical cost for each unit in parks

- Question: *Evelyn Riechert inquired about the relationship between LWMP/OCP/RGS? Is there a place to discuss Gallagher lake as secondary growth area and indicate that it may be time to look at the area?*
 - OCP dictates how growth will occur
 - LWMP will say what is needed if the OCP dictates that it does
 - May need to amend OCP – due to new infrastructure going in
 - OCP has to comply with RGS – Gallagher lake is growth area in RGS

- AECOM comment – the lot count done with current population areas according to RGS and 2% growth factor and projected 20 yrs into future – mainly to facilitate sizing of the pipes to get cost estimates

Questions/statements during presentation

GALLAGHER LAKE AREA OPTIONS

Option 1: OIB WWTP

- Statements
 - Deer park will not be in other options as initially calculated, so prices will be higher per connection for other options than what is provided tonight
- Question: *Why is the connection fee of \$7500 so high?* It is the set amount asked for by the OIB.

Option 2 – Okanagan Falls WWTP

Option 3 – To Oliver WWTP

- Question *-why is the Oliver connection fee so much lower than OIB? –*
 - OIB includes the upgrades/conveyance./capacity unlike the Oliver cost which just has the connection fee and then adds the capital expansion cost as an extra.
 - Statement - Oliver operations and maintenance annual fee is \$330, just like OIB
 - Connection fee is lower but still have to contribute to increasing the capacity (John VA)
- Statement - Vincer line is only 4" so likely not big enough to handle Gallagher lake as well

Option 4 WWTP satellite in Gallagher Lake

Option 5 – satellite plant in Vaseux Lake area

- No space for discharging effluent

Option 6 – non-viable – not discussed further

Overall cost for Gallagher lake

- Question – *Do we have to do a lump sum payment or amortize over 20 yrs?*
 - Will be up to the residents and the RDOS
- Question – *There is one owner of country pines, so is it up to them how it will be paid off?* Yes
- Question - *cost per km on pipeline – how is it calculated?* flow calculations were used to determine the size of pipe, then determined length of pipe, took total cost and divided it by the total length to get a price per meter or kilometer.
- Question - *Deer park will likely be hooked up to OIB before LWMP is finished?*
 - Allan Patton – Correct; things are moving along and came on faster than anticipated;
 - Had to take advantage of the expansion to get lines under the highway before it is upgraded

- Has \$150,000 from gas tax, the OIB is forgiving \$150,000 of their portion to allow for the pipeline to go in now, and Deer Park is paying for the majority of pipeline now.
 - KOA may want to put in mobile homes but then they would contribute a higher portion of wastewater (campsites versus mobile homes) so they could contribute more funds
- Question – *Is the pipe sized big enough?*
 - Yes, it would take all of the capacity in the Gallagher lake area
- Statement – IHA wants to ensure the RV park, pub would also be part of the design
- Question – *Do we all automatically go in with Deer Park?*
 - No they need to sign on with OIB in a letter of intent
- MOE concerns: *what do we know about the treatment facility – was there an environmentally impact assessment completed?* Yes, there was one done for the Federal government
 - Statements - concerned about lack of control on the operations and the level of treatment; effluent disposal?, nutrients removed? Local government control?
- **ACTION for MOE:** write all concerns with going to the OIB system so these may be addressed during LWMP process
- Statement – an agreement between the OIB and RDOS will be done up front; the OIB annual rate will be equal to what Oliver charges; there would be one large agreement that will take in the other smaller agreements currently worked out with developers.
- Statement – Deer Park is pursuing sewers as they wanted the water for fire protection and OIB required that both be taken

MOTION

Hugh Chown moved that Option 1, going to the OIB treatment plant be the preferred solution for the Gallagher Lake area; seconded by Joy Nobel; All voted in favour. MOTION CARRIED

- MOE – requires all concerns be addressed (will provide in a letter/email)
- IHA – cost wise looks best; always in favor of centralized sewer and getting away from onsite treatment
- **ACTION for AECOM** – update the cost estimates for the public given recent events
- Question - *Is there any room for negotiation with the OIB connection fee?* Don't know yet
- Statement – concern raised with the connection fees that the OIB is charging after INAC has funded the plant and pipeline; could be an issue to fund foreigners coming to the plant
- Statement - Politically it is easier to go to provincial government to convince if we are in partnership with OIB as the BC government likes partnerships with local governments and other municipalities and Indian bands.

VASEUX LAKE OPTIONS

- Question – *Is the Parks area included within the calculations?* No, the Park area is not included at this time
- Statement – The calculations currently have the pipeline going on land, but in the lake may be shorter and less expensive; all homes could be fed to lift station
- Deer park equipment – may be worth buying if there is somewhere to put it;
 - currently services 69 lots; but it's an older system and would need to be upgraded; capital cost may reduce but the operational cost may be more
 - not recommended to pump it up the hill for disposal as their water system comes from the area
- Question: *Oasis campground sewer plant? -what do they have?* Not large enough capacity
- Question – *What about new systems that would service 2-4 homes?* would be an IHA decision as they are enhanced septic systems;
- Statement – big difference in the water quality in Vaseux lake; suds on beach and large amounts of the algae; something needs to be done and not stay status quo
- Question - *Is there anyone you can go ask to do an inspection of a septic system? Knows of 2 lots for sure leaching on the lakes; is there something that can be done to monitor the lakes?*
 - IHA – yes, contact them with a complaint on individual septic systems that appear to be failing but lake monitoring would have to be done by other agencies (MOE, DFO ?)
- Possible solution presented - Enhanced status quo – monitoring; education programs; future development in either direction may help costs in the future to tie into a treatment plant
- Question - *Is MOE aware of the problem?* yes but they have limited data on Vaseux Lake – long term monitoring can be part of the plan; MOE doesn't have jurisdiction with the onsite disposal; IHA is only investigating on a complaint basis, not out there sampling regularly,
- Statement – as part of the enhanced status quo could add mandatory inspections of treatment systems to identify any problems; then there wouldn't be any finger pointing; need to determine what is in the ground
- Question – *Is there any grant money for testing?* Possibly from Infrastructure planning grants
- Question – *Are holding tanks an option?* No, don't want to go there; in Osoyoos they are doing this as sewer is coming soon; pump and haul is not an option
- Statement - Not enough people to spread the costs around yet; if there are some development then it would reduce the cost; this could come up at the next LWMP review in 5-10 years

MOTION

It was moved that the Enhanced Status Quo be the preferred solution for the Vaseux Lake area; seconded;
All voted in favour. MOTION CARRIED

- Question – *Can individual system be turned over to the RDOS?* No, only municipal systems
- Statement – to be included in the Enhanced Status Quo

- Education systems, water testing in lake along the homes, need to get people to report the problems and get IHA to investigate
 - education needs to continue as turnover of owners happens
 - renters for summer can cause problems
- Statement – Owner decides if wants sewer system in community but once sewer is available in an area, all owners will be given a timeframe and they must connect; cost would have to be passed on to the renters of the park; if don't hook up to it then you still have to pay for it
- Statement - Fear from the residents is if sewer is there then the land could be redeveloped
- Statement – If don't put in sewer system then it could be more likely to redevelop but if do put it in then the redevelopment is less likely to happen as won't want to take out and move the pipes
- Question – *For Vaseux Lake options, can the eastside route be looked at too?* Yes as Gallagher is no longer in the picture; will also look at deer park existing treatment plant
- Question - *What will we do with the options for Vaseux Lake that included Gallagher Lake? Will they be in the report?* – Yes, they will be in the report with notes that show what was changed; old costs and new costs; could leave original as an appendix
- **ACTION – AECOM:** Statement - in the report the terminology needs to be clarified regarding the specifics of renters versus owners. Will need to be in service area bylaw as well.
- Statement - Number of units is incorrect in calculations – much more than 136 SFU; i.e. cotton woods has 22 and country pines has 110
 - Response – the OIB do not consider the mobile homes as a full single family unit (SFU) and a campsite is very small SFU equivalent; so the calculations may be correct
- 9 pm meeting adjourned

Next meeting will be the Public Meeting to be scheduled for September 2011.