

Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant

**Public Advisory Committee Meeting Summary:
June 26, 2012**

August 7, 2012

6344009



**metro
vancouver**

www.metrovancouver.org

LIONS GATE PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

Summary of the Public Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1 on “Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant” held June 26, 2012 at the Pinnacle Hotel – Pier Salon, 138 Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

CALL TO ORDER

The Public Advisory Meeting on “Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant” (LGSWWTP) was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

Discussion Session

*The following abbreviations are used during the Discussion Session:
Q/C=Question/Comment, R=Response from Metro Vancouver and/or Facilitator*

1. Welcome and Introductions

John Forsdick, Process Facilitator, Context Research Ltd., welcomed participants to the first meeting of the Public Advisory Committee for the Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant (LGSWWTP) (the Project) and explained his role during the meeting.

2. Opening Remarks

Marie Griggs, Public Involvement Division Manager, Engineering & Construction Department, welcomed members to the inaugural meeting of the Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant Public Advisory Committee (LGPAC).

She explained that the goal of the Project was to work closely with the community to build a facility that would meet the needs of both the local community and the region. To meet that goal, Metro Vancouver (MV) was creating opportunities to bring together representatives from diverse disciplines, with a broad range of experience. Primary LGPAC members and their alternates cover a spectrum of expertise with members who had made contributions to the region in the areas of: community service, academia, finance and environmental stewardship. MV was grateful to members for their willingness to serve on LGPAC. It was MV's hope to collaborate with the LGPAC and to hold meetings that allowed the LGPAC to provide input on the Project through a detailed review of the information that MV would be bringing forward.

Ms. Griggs advised that it was MV's policy not to divulge members' personal information without prior permission. LGPAC primary members and alternates present consented to the sharing of their email addresses amongst the LGPAC membership. Consent of those members not present would be sought.

Ms. Griggs introduced the staff team that would be working with the LGPAC, including:

- Fred Nenninger, Project Manager, Wastewater Secondary Treatment Upgrades
- Laurie Ford, Senior Engineer, Wastewater Secondary Treatment Upgrades
- Paul Dufault, Senior Engineer, Wastewater Secondary Treatment Upgrades
- Robin Mills, Policy Coordinator, Public Involvement Division
- Vanessa Langan, Community Relations and Consultation Coordinator, Public Involvement Division
- Sandra Niven, Administrative Assistant, Public Involvement Division
- Gord Inglis, Division Manager, Multi-Media Services

- Simon Cumming, Division Manager, External and Intergovernmental Relations
- Carol Lee, Recording Secretary
- Sam Bradd, Graphic Illustrator.

Ms. Griggs also introduced John Forsdick and Marni Robinson from Context Research.

Mr. Forsdick explained the roles of the graphic illustrator and the recording secretary. He confirmed that a summary of the meetings would be compiled, and that comments would not be attributed.

3. Agenda Review and Participant Roundtable Introductions

Mr. Forsdick reviewed the agenda, and led the meeting participants in a round of self-introductions. Meeting participants indicated whether they represented interests of the local community association, business, environment or non-affiliated citizens, and their comments were captured graphically by the graphic illustrator.

4. LGSWWTP Project Overview

Fred Nenninger, Project Manager, Wastewater Secondary Treatment Upgrades, led the meeting in a review of an overhead presentation regarding the Project, and commented on its four key objectives:

- Secondary Wastewater Treatment
 - a mandatory federal regulation
 - Burrard Inlet has a healthy ecosystem which needs to be maintained
 - secondary treatment will help ensure the ecosystem continues to be protected as the region grows.
- Sustainability
 - a foundation for MV
 - all projects are assessed against economic, technical, social, and environmental feasibility.
- Integrated Resource Recovery
 - recovery of various materials can be considered a fuel to offset what will need to be purchased from BC Hydro and FortisBC
 - examples of resources that can be recovered are solid waste organic materials, reclaimed water for industrial usage, recovered nutrients, and low grade heat, as is done at the Southeast False Creek Neighbourhood Energy Utility.
- Community Integration
 - integrating the Project into the community as an asset
 - an example is the MV Columbia Street Pumping Station, located in Gastown.

Mr. Nenninger displayed a photograph of the existing Lions Gate Treatment Plant that has served the community since 1961. He explained that the Integrated Liquid Waste and Resource Management Plan (ILWRMP) was approved by the Ministry of Environment in 2011, and ensured that liquid waste continued to be managed safely, affordably and effectively. A key action item in the ILWRMP was to provide secondary treatment at the Lions Gate Treatment Plant by 2020. The ILWRMP aligned with a Canada-wide strategy and regulation for liquid waste management.

The existing treatment plant site was identified on a displayed site map. He explained that the new LGSWWTP would be constructed two kilometres to the east, on three hectares of land purchased from BC Rail. The existing Lions Gate Treatment Plant lands would be returned to the Squamish Nation when it is decommissioned.

In response to a question, Ms. Griggs confirmed that the presentation would be made available to LGPAC members after the meeting.

Mr. Nenninger reviewed the Project phases:

- Project Definition Phase – 2012 - 2013
- Design and Construction Phase – 2014 - 2019
- Decommissioning of existing plant – 2020 - 2021.

An Integrated Design Process (IDP) was being utilized for the Project, rather than the traditional project design approach. The IDP would likely result in a better product and a more efficient design process. Mr. Nenninger reviewed integrated design team components for the Project and explained the role of each component. The Project Definition Phase timeline was reviewed.

The following questions/comments and responses, grouped by topic area, were offered during the discussion:

Project Rationale

Q/C: The material provided on the Project seems to suggest that there are two options – a new plant or an update of the existing plant, however the presentation indicates that the only option is a new plant. Please clarify.

R: The existing plant is on leased land that will be returned to the Squamish Nation. The new plant will be built at a location 2 km east of the existing site.

Q/C: I believe there was an investigation into the possibility of pumping wastewater from the North Shore to the Iona Island Wastewater Treatment Plant for secondary treatment. What were the results of the study and what are the economics? It appears that it makes sense to consolidate into one plant on a very large existing site instead of trying to fit a plant on a tiny site on the North Shore. Has this option been ruled out entirely?

R: This was investigated in 2005 during the review of the first Liquid Waste Management Plan. The results of the study were that there is not enough land at Iona, it costs more to convey the wastewater to Iona, it costs more in terms of energy to pump wastewater to Iona, there are risks with crossing Burrard Inlet and the environmental impacts to Burrard Inlet could be significant. With all the negatives, building a plant on the North Shore was chosen as the preferred way to proceed.

Q/C: I get the sense that the Project is going to go ahead. I need to clearly understand the constraints that we're under in order to understand the options that are available to maximize the benefits. We need to come to a benchmark to understand what the objectives are in order to arrive at a sustainable solution.

Q/C: It is important as a group to make it clear at the outset that there is no scientific basis for proceeding with the Project. I would like to know if there's a risk that the Project could actually make things worse environmentally. In the future, we would like to know the hurdle rate for making investment decisions, and policy on doing economics on a discounted or non-discounted basis.

Design Process

Q/C: The Iona Island Wastewater Treatment Plant is also going to be upgraded. Is a similar process going to be established for the Iona project or will it use the information derived from this process? They are different communities with different parameters.

R: Both the Lions Gate Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Iona Island Wastewater Treatment Plant will be upgraded to provide secondary treatment. The Lions Gate Wastewater Treatment Plant will be upgraded by 2020 and the Iona Island Wastewater Treatment Plant will be upgraded as soon as possible but no later than 2030. MV will be embarking on a similar process for the Iona upgrade and Metro Vancouver is just starting to work with the Vancouver, Burnaby and Richmond municipalities for the Iona upgrade. There will be completely separate processes established for each project because there are different communities involved.

Technical

Q/C: Does the discharge at the First Narrows occur at ebb tide only?

R: The discharge from the Lions Gate Treatment Plant into the First Narrows occurs 24/7.

Q/C: I contend that building a secondary treatment plant has no benefit to the environment. The treatment plant is only designed to remove food and organic materials by bacteria, that otherwise would be removed by bacteria in the environment. We need to understand the fundamental issues of what we can do from a treatment plant perspective, and determine whether it is more effective to educate people about what they're putting into the wastewater at source in order to change behaviour. Do you disagree or agree with this fundamentally?

R: We have had environmental monitoring programs in place at the Iona and Lions Gate discharge for decades. The results indicate that there is not significant environmental degradation. An Environmental Monitoring Committee made up of regulators and scientific experts will continue to monitor this. The first Liquid Waste Management Plan was submitted with the idea of building when it was necessary to do so and this was discussed for a decade. In the end, despite the science and the evidence, the federal and provincial policy was established where secondary treatment would be the base level of treatment.

5. LGSWWTP Engagement and Consultation Process

Ms. Griggs noted that this meeting was intended to discuss process. More time would be provided during the IDP Workshops to delve into the detailed questions, such as those that had been raised.

Ms. Griggs reviewed the Engagement and Consultation process:

- during the Engagement and Consultation Process, input would be sought from a variety of target audiences
- the primary focus will be those people potentially affected on the North Shore
- efforts will be made to receive input from residents across the region who are interested in liquid waste issues

- continuous updates will be provided to MV committees and the Board, North Shore Mayors and Councils, and various MV advisory committees
- several advisory committees will provide input as the Project proceeds, including:
 - Intergovernmental Advisory Committee, comprised of senior management on the North Shore, First Nations and staff from government agencies
 - LGPAC
 - Utility Management Plan Advisory Committee (a MV umbrella advisory committee intended to review the progress of the water, wastewater and solid waste management plans).
- consulting with government agencies is important because an Operational Certificate will be required from the Minister of Environment
- engagement of First Nations is key to the success of the Project; there are approximately 30 First Nations and Tribal Councils with interests in the Project area
- representatives of Squamish Nation and Tsleil-Waututh Nation have specific interests in this process and will be engaged separately
- three streams of public involvement:
 - LGPAC
 - Community Resource Forum (CRF), which includes members of the community who wish to be involved in in-depth discussions, beyond what will be available at public meetings
 - public meetings.
- opportunities exist for additional input if people are not participating in the above-mentioned three streams, via correspondence, website and delegations to the MV Utilities Committee.

Ms. Griggs reviewed the establishment, role and the composition of the LGPAC, including:

- representatives of the Norgate Park Community Association
- representatives of local and regional environmental interest groups
- representatives of the North Shore business community
- three non-affiliated citizens, to provide a broad perspective of community interests from the North Shore.

LGPAC would provide input into shaping the broader public meetings that would be open to anyone with a general interest in the Project.

Ms. Griggs reviewed the timeline for consultation events in 2012 and 2013, including:

- LGPAC meetings will be held approximately every two months with the next meeting to be held in September 2012
- Integrated Design Process Workshops will be held every two to four months, beginning in September 2012
- Community Resource Forum meetings will be held every three to four months with the next meeting in October 2012
- public meetings will be held every five to six months, as necessary
- the pattern will be repeated in 2013.

The following questions/comments and responses were raised during the discussion of the Consultation and Engagement Process:

Q/C: Will there be field trips and working meetings in addition to the scheduled LGPAC meetings? Have they been considered yet or will suggestions from the LGPAC be entertained?

R: There will be field trips and suggestions from the LGPAC are welcome. Field trips or special meetings may occur between IDP Workshops.

Q/C: How will information be shared amongst all the advisory committees involved in the Project?

R: Everything from the LGPAC, the Community Resource Forum and outputs from Integrated Design Process Workshops will be posted on the MV website.

Q/C: Will the members of the LGPAC be able to attend the Integrated Design Process Workshops?

R: Yes, the IDP Workshops will definitely include the LGPAC and the CRF members. We are still working on how to accommodate all the interests. We are working on how to make it the most valuable process possible. The IDP Workshops could be a half day or full day. LGPAC members will be canvassed with respect to their availability in order to make it effective for their needs.

6. Lions Gate Public Advisory Committee

Mr. Forsdick reviewed the LGPAC Terms of Reference (TOR) that were reviewed by MV's Utilities Committee. The TOR sets out the role and purpose of the LGPAC. The role of the LGPAC will be reviewed at the end of the Project Definition Phase.

The role of the LGPAC is advisory. There is no voting at LGPAC meetings but consensus amongst the group around issues will be noted. Areas of concern or disagreement will also be noted.

The LGPAC meetings will be open to the public as observers to the process. The public will not have a seat at the table and will only be invited to make comments at the request of the Chair. Alternates will not have a seat at the table if their associated primary member is present, however they can make comments through their associated primary member. The meeting summary and the presentations from meetings will be emailed to the LGPAC members and made available to the public via the website.

Mr. Forsdick noted that he and Ms. Griggs would be reviewing the LGPAC Operating Guidelines. Ms. Griggs would provide an overview of the roles and selection process for the Chair and Vice-Chair, as well as the role of the process facilitator in particular. He requested that the LGPAC members consider what attributes they would consider as important in an effective Chair.

Ms. Griggs provided an overview of the key components of the draft Operating Guidelines from the overhead presentation:

- role of the Chair and Vice-Chair
- role of the Process Facilitator
- responsibilities of the Project Team
- public communication
- media relations protocol.

With respect to the Media Relations protocol, it was noted that LGPAC would not have an official media spokesperson. LGPAC members were asked not to speak to the media on behalf of the committee but were entitled to speak to the media to comment on their own views and perspectives.

Mr. Forsdick reviewed the Chair and Vice-Chair selection process and the procedure and timelines involved with the self-nomination process. Nominees would be reviewed and appointed by MV. The Chair and Vice-Chair would be supported in the execution of their responsibilities by MV staff and resources. The LGPAC Chair and Vice-Chair must be primary members and are appointed annually by MV from within the LGPAC membership.

Mr. Forsdick highlighted the remainder of the Operating Guidelines indicated in the overhead presentation:

- primary and alternate members
- observers
- member rights and responsibilities
- code of conduct
- consensus decision-making
- addressing dissatisfaction
- conflict of interest
- deliverables.

The following questions and comments, grouped by topic area, were raised during the discussion of the TOR and the Operating Guidelines.

Chair Nomination and Selection Process

Q/C: Does the LGPAC have a role in selecting the Chair?

R: MV will be selecting the Chair from the self-nominated individuals. That is the reason that the LGPAC members are being asked to articulate the characteristics that they are looking for in a Chair.

Q/C: Are you ruling out the LGPAC members nominating a member for Chair? Does the selection process require that individuals self-nominate?

R: The established process requires an individual to self-nominate in order to be considered for the role of Chair.

Q/C: If a member considers that an individual would make a good candidate, they should approach that individual to suggest that they self-nominate.

Q/C: Mr. Forsdick should take on the facilitation role, rather than selecting a Chair and Vice-Chair. Is it possible to overrule the requirement that there be a Chair?

R: The concerns raised during the discussion of the selection of a Chair have been heard. The TOR were reviewed and supported by the MV Utilities Committee. Ms. Griggs could undertake to relay the LGPAC concerns with the senior management of MV and the North Shore municipalities, who also had input into the TOR.

Role of Chair and Process Facilitator

Q/C: Will the Chair be the primary facilitator? I am concerned if this is the case, as it will either not allow the Chair to fully participate or to participate too much due to the assumption of the facilitator responsibilities.

R: Yes, the Chair is the facilitator at the meetings. Whoever is the Chair will have to be very explicit about what role they are playing at any point during the meetings. The Chair will be a challenging role.

Q/C: Why was the decision made to have the Chair also serve in the role as the facilitator rather than to have an independent facilitator?

R: This decision was made in response to a perception in some previous processes where the independent facilitator was seen as a consultant paid by Metro Vancouver to manage rather than support the process. MV would like to change the tone of that. MV would like to see the process facilitators as assisting the members, with members taking full ownership of how their meetings are run. There may be opportunities to design the meetings in a manner that will allow the Chair to fully participate in some portions of the meeting and have the Process Facilitator assist the Chair in other portions.

Q/C: Does the Chair have the key facilitation role?

R: The Chair will be managing the discussion. During the recent Liquid Waste and Resource Management Plan process, the independent facilitator supported the Chair and interjected where appropriate. This was done at the request of the Chair, but clearly there is a role for the Chair in managing the discussion around the table.

Q/C: I'm concerned that a good knowledge leader will be selected as Chair but that the value that they bring to the LGPAC will be lost due to the inability to participate fully. I'm also concerned that the Chair may move the process in the wrong direction as a result of a strong personality and personal bias. The Chair needs to be unbiased.

Q/C: For clarity, the message to MV and the North Shore municipalities' senior management should be that the role of facilitation be independent from the Chair and Vice-Chair, as opposed to not wishing to select a Chair and Vice-Chair. The role of the Process Facilitator is a professional role and it will be valuable in establishing how the LGPAC will function, particularly in the early stages.

R: There is value in having a Chair who understands the issues. The Process Facilitator would be more arms-length and could assist at times that the Chair wished to participate in the discussion.

Primary and Alternate Members

Q/C: Are alternates connected to a specific primary member? Are primary members responsible for informing their alternates if they are not able to attend a meeting, etc.?

R: Each alternate is connected to a specific primary member. Primary members are responsible for keeping alternate members informed.

Q/C: Will all the alternates receive the same information regarding meeting dates, etc. as the primary members?

R: Yes, all information will be provided to both primary and alternate members.

Q/C: If an alternate attends a meeting, at which the primary member is also present, can points be made through the primary member?

R: Yes, it would be appropriate for the alternate member to raise issues through the primary member if both are present at the meeting.

Q/C: Why are the alternate members excluded from being selected for the Chair and Vice-Chair?

R: The alternates are excluded from being Chair and Vice-Chair because the primary members are expected to be in attendance at most of the meetings. The alternates are only expected to attend if the primary member is not available.

Q/C: Are alternate members welcome and expected to attend every meeting? At a minimum, alternates should attend every meeting to absorb the information so that the primary member is not required to brief the alternate after every meeting. Alternates should be sitting at the table and participating in the meeting.

R: The meetings are open to the public and the Operating Guidelines stipulate that alternate members sit away from the table if the primary member is present in order to ensure that interests are balanced. However, alternates can make a point through their primary member or they can ask to be recognized by the Chair to make their point.

Q/C: Are alternate members expected to attend every meeting?

R: The overall concern is that every area of interest be represented at every meeting. In the past, when alternates were not appointed, it resulted in difficulty having a balance of representation at the table. Alternates are not expected to attend every meeting but they are certainly welcome to attend.

Q/C: It would be good to have both primary and alternate members at the meeting and to hear everyone's views. Meetings could be structured so that only one member representing the interest could vote. If both the primary and alternate members are present, they would have to decide amongst themselves as to how to cast their vote if there are dissenting views. I understand the purpose of the design is to have adequate representation, but there is a risk that some views would be excluded.

Q/C: I appreciate the views of the previous speaker but it was made clear that the primary member would commit to attending meetings and the alternate member would only be required to attend if the primary was unavailable. It can be very challenging to have a large number of people around the table. There are other processes, such as the Community Resource Forum, where alternates can be heard. We need to ensure that the process is run effectively.

R: The Operating Guidelines specify that when both the primary and the alternate members are in attendance at a meeting, the alternate will sit away from the table and will participate through the primary or if recognized by the Chair. This is in the interest of balancing the interests at the table.

Q/C: To illustrate the point of balancing interests, as a non-affiliated citizen, there is no alternate if the member is unable to attend. I believe that the structure is appropriate to ensure balanced representation.

Member Rights and Responsibilities

Q/C: The TOR state that the role of the LGPAC does not extend to operations of the new plant. How can operations logically be ignored during discussions of the design?

R: The LGPAC will be examining operations during the process but the LGPAC will be disbanded following completion of construction. For clarity, the statement could be rephrased to “These Terms of Reference do not extend to include operations of the new plant once built.”

Q/C: I am concerned with the limitations placed on LGPAC members as a result of the statement regarding “working within the committee process”, and “not going outside of the process to resolve concerns or voice dissatisfaction to speak to elected municipal officials, affiliated community associations or other individuals with which the member has regular contact”.

R: The intention of this statement is to have LGPAC members share any concerns and dissatisfaction with the process with their fellow committee members and MV staff prior to discussions with outside parties. Ms. Griggs has requested that members speak to her directly if they have concerns with respect to the management of the process. MV prides itself on working to meet the needs and interests of people and wishes to be collaborative with the LGPAC.

Q/C: Will comments be attributed in the summaries of the meetings?

R: No, there is no attribution of comments.

Q/C: How do members add items to a meeting agenda?

R: Draft agendas will be circulated and members will be requested to identify any additional agenda items.

Consensus Decision-Making

Q/C: If votes are not held to determine the group's position, how will consensus be developed for notation? What is the difference between a vote and a consensus point that is recorded?

R: Votes are not recorded with any of MV's advisory committees. It is assumed that consensus is reached if no one around the table during the point of discussion voices an objection or a contrary opinion. However, there is a commitment to recording any information where an individual has a contrary point of view and this will be brought forward during any presentation of what has occurred during the LGPAC meetings.

Q/C: How can you express a consensus unless it is through an observation of a recorder or through a formal mechanism such as a vote?

R: MV representatives or the Chair would ask the question or ask members to speak up if they disagree with a point of discussion.

Q/C: Is there an intention to develop consensus?

R: Yes, there is an intention but this cannot be guaranteed. There will be times when consensus is not reached and staff will be responsible for bringing forward generally what the LGPAC was comfortable with, and providing the comments and queries that were different from the rest of the members. Where applicable, the Chair will ask if everyone is in agreement with a particular issue. If there is not consensus, the situation may occur where the dissenting view is not fully supportive of the position but will not prevent it going forward. In these cases, the contrary views will be recorded. The Chair will be instrumental in ensuring that this process works. While an actual vote is not recorded, it is the intention to capture the interests of the group in the summaries of the meetings. The LGPAC is an advisory committee. The ultimate decision makers are the MV Board and committees who will vote regarding how the Project proceeds.

Conflicts of Interest

Q/C: Are the Chair, Vice-Chair and all LGPAC members precluded from doing paid work for MV?

R: Yes, all LGPAC members are precluded from doing paid work for MV.

Q/C: It is important that the LGPAC be independent of MV. It is important that the Chair be independent and not be paid by MV. While the concerns about the Chair playing the role of the facilitator are important, having the Chair paid by MV can create a real or perceived conflict of interest.

Q/C: Is there consensus around the Chair being paid or not being paid by MV? The view was expressed by the participant that the Chair should not be paid or have not been paid by MV within the last 5 or 10 years. I would like to achieve consensus on the issue.

Q/C: There is a need to be very clear on what 'conflicts of interest' are. Does this mean that the LGPAC member does not have any affiliation with MV for a specific number of years? Does it mean that the LGPAC member cannot have an affiliation with a company that is currently doing or has done work for MV? Does it mean that the LGPAC member's company cannot currently be doing work for MV? Please clarify.

R: MV would consider conflicts of interest to arise from LGPAC members currently working with MV on contracts specific to this Project. Requiring that work not have been done with MV in the last 5 or 10 years is far too large in terms of scope. MV's guidelines define conflicts of interest arising where an individual is in a position of influence and the opportunity to profit from exercising that influence.

There was consensus that having a Chair and Vice-Chair selected from within the LGPAC was acceptable, so long as Mr. Forsdick was retained as the Process Facilitator to assist the Chair at certain intervals of the meeting where it would be beneficial. In the future, portions of the meetings could be structured to allow for free discussion and input from all members, including the Chair and Vice-Chair.

As a result of this consensus, it was deemed unnecessary for Ms. Griggs to discuss the revision of the TOR, based on prior comments this evening, with MV and the North Shore municipalities' senior management.

During the discussion, LGPAC members identified the following characteristics and attributes as desirable in a Chair:

- enables others to voice their interests
- able to be succinct and to keep participant comments succinct
- not on contract with Metro Vancouver
- knowledgeable on relevant subjects
- able to be unbiased
- past experience as a Chair or Vice-Chair
- quick learner
- able to summarize comments from participants.

7. Community, Business and Environmental Interests

Mr. Forsdick led the LGPAC in a discussion of the future potential of the Project. In response to the request to complete the statement "This Project has the opportunity to be" the members offered the following:

- be innovative
- treat all of the objectives that Fred Nenninger laid out as equal pillars
- create something good for the environment
- take advantage of full resource recovery on-site
- be a vehicle for education to the general public
- be attractive in the neighbourhood, not ugly buildings
- be a profit centre
- looking beyond the plant to the big picture, not just treating it as waste
- be truly integrated with the community
- be a waste treatment plant that generates clean water
- be an education resource to municipal government and the general public, linked to water use, stormwater management and resource management by citizens

- spend taxpayer dollars wisely
- make sure we don't spend dollars unwisely on trying to solve problems or meet objectives that aren't relevant
- manage and demonstrate innovation – we can show innovation, but don't necessarily need to go overboard
- be more than an engineering project
- providing education to people so they now how they are contributing to the water and sewer system
- truly engage municipalities on coordinated/integrated utility planning
- provide an asset that we can be proud of, and that can be a tourist attraction
- set examples for future projects
- be odour free – with no impact to nearby communities
- focus on the benefits
- demonstrate public engagement before design
- innovation in public finance
- demonstrate sustainability on the economic front – to be cost effective
- build what we need
- demonstrate and account for life cycle costing
- be integrated with municipal utility planning to maximize the efficiency of the utility system, and the value for taxpayers; and
- be a demonstration of leading edge technology on a small scale as part of an educational centre.

8. Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Mr. Forsdick directed the meeting attendee's attention to the graphic recording of the meeting. Sam Bradd advised that the graphic illustration intended to capture the themes from the meeting and the connections within the discussion.

Ms. Griggs advised that a meeting summary would be prepared and the draft would be circulated to the members for comment before being finalized. Once finalized, the meeting summary would be posted on the MV website. A photograph of the graphic illustration would be provided with the meeting summary.

Ms. Griggs thanked the LGPAC members for their attendance, participation and enthusiasm.

CONCLUSION

The Lions Gate Public Advisory Committee Meeting on the "Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant" held June 26, 2012 at the Pinnacle Hotel – Pier Salon, 138 Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver, British Columbia, concluded at 9:00 p.m.