

Date: October 6, 2016 **File:** 20132344.00.A.04.01
Time: 1-3 pm **Page:** 1 of 4
Project: Stage 2 LWMP
Subject: WAC Meeting #8
Client: City of Port Alberni
Location: City Hall
Present: Tim Pley – The City
Scott Smith – The City
Wilf Taekema – The City
Brian Mousley – The City
Guy Cicon – The City
Ken Watson – The City
Larry Cross (LC) – Catalyst Paper
Sheena Falconer – West Coast Aquatics
Ron Kyle – Port Alberni Port Authority
Brad West (BW) – McGill Engineering
Margaret Wright (MW) – DFO
Phil Edgell (PE) – AVEA
Rick Avis (RA) – Somass Estuary Management
Committee
Tom Robinson (TR) – AE
Hugh Hamilton (HH) – AE
Michal Simhon (MS) – AE
Jason Clarke (JC) – GreatPacific
Distribution: Those Present

RECORD OF MEETING

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

Introductions were made around the room.

2 BRIEF PRESENTATION

TR and MS provided overview of project history to date. HH provided a summary of the highlights from the Draft Part 2 EIS Report.

Subject: WAC Meeting #8

October 6, 2016

- 2 -

Action by

Discussion:

3 DRAFT EIS PART 2 OPEN DISCUSSION

AE

The summary of the DO assessment indicates a decrease in DO of 0.24 mg/L at a depth of 4 to 6 m. There was clarification that the 0.24 mg/L is based on BOD. MW suggested to use percent saturation of oxygen as another way of assessing potential effect of the effluent discharge. This will be incorporated into the Final EIS Report

RA inquired on whether there will be an EIS along the on-land portion of the outfall route to investigate the effects on rare plant species (such as Oregon Ash). This will be completed as part of the Construction and Operational EIS that will guide construction of the upgrades to the wastewater treatment system (e.g. rare plant surveys will be completed in advance).

MW inquired on whether there will be a metal analysis on the wastewater effluent. HH indicated this testing could be completed as part of the monitoring completed during the initial year. However, the presence of metals in the is unlikely as the main source of wastewater is municipal (with no significant industrial contribution). *[Note: Metals were analyzed in the sludge in the lagoon and no metals exceeded the applicable guidelines (for industrial land use)].*

GC mentioned that a visit to the Cranbrook WWTF may be warranted as they have both diffused aeration system and in-pipe UV disinfection.

RK and SK mentioned the possible risk for commercial fishing and other vessels getting caught on the buried outfall, or leading to loss of nets.

With regards to the proposed pipes conveying wastewater across the existing municipal lagoon to the proposed new screenings facility, the sequencing of construction needs to be considered. The pipes will be buried along the northern portion of the existing lagoon. TR confirmed that conveying six smaller pipes across the lagoon is most cost effective than conveying one larger pipe.

SF and MW indicated that they are looking at installing a bridge or culvert in the road where the proposed screening facility is located as part of the estuary restoration plan. TR confirmed that the location for the screenings facility is not set, and could be relocated. However, operator truck access with an adequate turning radius needs to be considered.

PE inquired on whether there will be soil stability testing completed on-site. TR confirmed that a geotechnical investigation will be required to establish the bearing capacity of the ground as part of the Detailed Design. Piles will likely be required.

RA indicated that access to the lagoon area for Ducks Unlimited staff on various occasions throughout the summer was denied due to the dredging contract. This was to adhere to the contractor's Health and Safety requirements. In the future, communication between all parties involved would be helpful.

Subject: WAC Meeting #8

October 6, 2016

- 3 -

Action by

Discussion:

SF inquired on whether the Catalyst effluent was accounted for in the modelling. JC confirmed the Catalyst effluent is included in the Box Model (water balance), so the model was therefore conservative.

SF inquired on whether there is a large temperature difference between the lagoon effluent and the river. TR confirmed the temperature difference would not be significant, especially due to the the long retention time of the effluent in the lagoon and cooling that would occur.

BW inquired on whether there is a 3D figure illustrating the dispersion effect of the effluent from the diffuser ports. JC confirmed the model used does not have 3D capabilities, as it is primarily a regulatory tool and design, intended to determine if water quality guidelines will be met at the edge of the Initial Dilution Zone. Nevertheless, the field work that was undertaken to support the modelling observed a distinct river jet flow towards Poly Point.

SF inquired on the possible copper source found in the sediment samples, which exceed guideline limits. JC indicated copper can be found naturally in rock deposits. HH also confirmed once that the sampled sludge had no exceedances for any metals. The construction plan will include provisions to minimize sediment disturbance.

KW inquired on whether specific ammonia treatment would be required. The report indicates an average of 58 mg/L in 2015 and a significantly lower average of 14 mg/L in 2014. The limit stated in the EIS is 27 mg/L. The data will be reviewed and older data included to assess variation. GC added that the source of ammonia may be from the landfill leachate.

SF inquired on the ability to hold flow in the summer during the sensitive time period for the fish. TR explained the various challenges including having adequate depth for the aeration diffusers. AE is also waiting for feedback from sonar investigations on the bottom profile of the lagoon.

MW inquired on the timing of the monitoring program presented in the EIS. Coordination with Catalyst and FCM would be extremely beneficial. LC indicated the next monitoring for Catalyst is scheduled for 2018. It is unlikely that Catalyst will be reducing the sampling program.

The City / AE

RA mentioned the next meeting of the Somass Estuary Meeting occurring on October 25. There may be additional comments on the Draft EIS part 2 report as a result of that meeting. The City will send a representative to this meeting.

4 NEXT STEPS

TR discussed the next steps for finalizing the archaeological work, First Nation consultation, presentation of the Draft Stage 2 LWMP report, and public consultation.

Subject: WAC Meeting #8

October 6, 2016

- 4 -

Action by

Discussion:

5 WAC MEETING #9 – DRAFT STAGE 2 LWMP REPORT

WAC Meeting #9 will be planned for the first week in December.

Prepared by:



Michal Simhon, M.A.Sc., P.Eng., ENV SP
Wastewater Process Engineer

MS/lp