

September 9, 2013

Issues, Comments, Questions and Metro Vancouver Responses

Norgate Residents' Workshop *Summary*

Wednesday, September 4, 2013, 6:00 – 8:30 p.m.
iDance Studio
#219 – 1305 Welch Street, North Vancouver, BC



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Opening Remarks.....	1
2.	Agenda Review	1
3.	Lions Gate Public Advisory Committee (LGPAC) Presentation on Study Tour	1
4.	Project Process – Evolution of Current Design	2
5.	Site Amenities and Urban Design Opportunities	3
6.	Overview of Consultation Process	3
7.	Evaluation of Consultation Process	3
8.	Planning for the Public Meeting.....	4
9.	Wrap-Up.....	4
10.	Issues, Comments, Questions	5
	Comparable Sites	5
	Sensory Impacts	5
	Futureproofing	6
	Wastewater Treatment	6
	Traffic Impacts.....	7
	Community Integration	8
	Integrated Resource Recovery (IRR) – Nutrients	10
	Integrated Resource Recovery (IRR) – Energy	10
	Public Engagement	10
	Reference Material Distributed to Workshop Participants.....	12
	Attendance	12

1. Opening Remarks

Marie Griggs, Manager, Public Involvement, Liquid Waste & Water Services at Metro Vancouver (MV) called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. and welcomed the Norgate residents and Lions Gate Public Advisory Committee (LGPAC) members to the Norgate Residents' Workshop (Workshop). MV has dedicated this workshop to Norgate residents as they are the community closest to the site and will be most impacted by the Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant (LGSWWTP). The input of the Norgate community is particularly valuable at this time.

2. Agenda Review

Andrea Winkler, Policy Coordinator, MV reviewed the agenda and the meeting objectives to:

- Provide a project update
- Review community integration
- Discuss consultation process and get feedback
- Plan for public meeting.

Ms. Winkler introduced the Metro Vancouver resources present and led a roundtable of introductions of the Workshop participants.

3. Lions Gate Public Advisory Committee (LGPAC) Presentation on Study Tour

Jan Timmer, LGPAC Member, provided a presentation during which he reviewed the tour of four modern wastewater treatment facilities in Washington State on June 12 and 13, 2013. He offered the following comments:

- The tour of four distinct plants was very informative
- Clean and/or reclaimed water were the terms used at all the plants; sewage was rarely mentioned
- Top insights about all four plants:
 - No odours were detectable in all but the oldest of the plants toured
 - Automation of monitoring saves operating costs
 - Future proofing for tertiary treatment in the event that regulations change and to allow the water to be used for different purposes
 - Create community partnerships early
 - Develop satellite stations in neighbourhoods
- Lighthouse Point, Blaine:
 - Located on the water in a park on a peninsula with a small footprint
 - Works well: "Cute"; excellent fit in the park; shell fish habitat restored
 - Concerns: All major mechanical equipment below high water mark; dam planks retaining wall already leaking

- Brightwater Center, Seattle:
 - Very large vehicle-oriented plant which has a significant energy requirement and impressive level of automation; a park was created by restoring the habitat around the plant and an education centre was built (however programming was not integrated at outset)
 - Works well: Superb odour control; automated monitoring; junkyards became restored wetlands
 - Concerns: Extremely expensive (e.g., odour control works very well but the cost was \$70 million); over-engineered distant from community; delayed education component
- LOTT Alliance, Olympia:
 - A pedestrian-oriented plant, LOTT undertook significant efforts to engage the community including an education centre, a multi-use building, and a children's water museum
 - Works well: Focus on clean reclaimed water; pursued active partnerships early on; engages entire community; pedestrian-oriented facilities; functioning community satellite treatment centres
 - Concerns: People and timing are critical to bringing the project together
- Edmonds:
 - Next door to a residential area, this twenty-year-old site incorporates a mini-park that is used by the community; the plant uses incineration and large open ponds that emit odours occasionally
 - Works well: Pride in keeping costs low; pleasant mini-park
 - Concerns: Open tanks emit odours during maintenance; reactive.

John Hunter, LGPAC Member, offered the following additional comments as a result of the study tour:

- The modern sewage treatment plants do not look at all like sewage treatment plants
- Odour was a problem at one plant, however odour can be controlled if a reasonable investment is made to do so.

4. Project Process – Evolution of Current Design

Laurie Ford, Senior Engineer, MV, provided a presentation during which she highlighted:

- Build Scenario B – one of three potential build scenarios that was presented at the public meeting in April 2013 – fared the best during the evaluation of the three scenarios and will form the basis of the indicative design that is currently being developed
- Elements from Scenario B to be included in the indicative design concept:
 - Secondary treatment
 - Discharge to existing outfall
 - Digestion on site (sewage only)
 - Biosolids sent off site for beneficial use
 - Energy recovery
 - Odour control system
- Elements from Build Scenario B that will not be included in the indicative design concept:

- Food waste imported to site
- Thermal reduction of solids.
- Odour control strategy components
 - Equipment containment
 - Foul air treatment and dispersion of treated air
 - Redundant covers over access hatches.
- Odour monitoring equipment is currently being tested at existing plants.
- Chemical storage and use:
 - Sodium hypochlorite, commonly known as liquid bleach, will be used and stored safely on-site
 - Chlorine gas will not be used on this site.
- Energy recovery for district energy.

5. Site Amenities and Urban Design Opportunities

Matthew Woodruff, Matthew Woodruff Architecture, advised that opportunities for integration with the neighbourhood are currently being considered including exterior public space development, development of public art, green space development, development of rooftop services and interior public space development.

Jeff Cutler, Space2Place Landscape Architects, provided a presentation during which he highlighted community context, the opportunity to use the property at the foot of Pemberton to increase community integration, public functions and plant functions.

Mr. Cutler posed three questions to the workshop participants:

- How might the project affect your community along First Street?
- How might a public space at the foot of Pemberton Avenue affect your community?
- What uses for the plant rooftop space would best strengthen your community?

6. Overview of Consultation Process

Ms. Griggs provided an overview of the consultation process during which she highlighted:

- Feedback is being sought on how MV can improve the consultation process
- Objective of the consultation process
- Consultation events and stakeholders engaged
- Further public involvement opportunities.

7. Evaluation of Consultation Process

Ms. Winkler facilitated a discussion on the evaluation of the consultation process. Comments were solicited to each of the questions contained on the feedback form:

- Effectiveness of public meeting/workshop notifications
- Availability of project information
- Response to public feedback
- Method of gathering public feedback
- Use of public feedback.

General comments received are reflected in the Planning for Public Meeting section that follows. Specific questions and comments are covered in the Issues, Comments and Questions section.

8. Planning for Public Meeting

Ms. Winkler posed several questions to gather input for the planning of the October public meeting. The following comments were provided in response to each question:

- In response to the question “What are the best places to advertise the October public meeting?”, meeting attendees suggested:
 - The public meeting at the school was well publicized through the notice sent home with the students from the school
 - Door-to-door flyers
 - Email notifications (for those who have opted in for updates) including reminder notices and links to relevant information
 - The notification period for the meeting should not be too long ahead
 - Two small signs were put up on Phillip Avenue and Tatlow Street two days before the last meeting
 - Flyer posted at Save On Foods.
- In response to the question “How do you like to receive information?” participants offered the following comments:
 - Formal presentation with lots of time for Q&A
 - Handouts and individual discussion groups
 - 3D model so you could see the scale from various levels or a simple massing model that also shows a car and a tower to tell the story very clearly about how big the LGSWWTP really is
 - Presentation that starts 30 to 60 minutes after the doors open to allow attendees time to look at and brief themselves on the material prior to the presentation
 - Panels arranged in an organized manner so that it makes sense when they are being viewed
 - Using the “clickers” to conduct informal real-time surveys.
- In response to the question “After seeing who has been involved in this process, is anyone missing?”, participants offered the following comments:
 - Additional participation and discussion from elected officials would be desirable
 - A representative from the educational sector.
- In response to the request for “What additional information people would like to see at the public meeting about the evolution of the project, process and responses to issues?”, participants offered the following suggestions:
 - Cost and funding model
 - Provide rationale for those issues that have been discussed and for which a decision has been made so that we do not waste time revisiting an issue that has already been decided.

9. Wrap-Up

Ms. Winkler thanked workshop participants for their time and valuable contribution. A summary of the workshop will be circulated and posted online. Norgate residents were invited to join the

Community Resource Forum (CRF) and to attend its next meeting. Participants were requested to assist in spreading the word about the October public meeting and to complete and submit the feedback form.

The Workshop concluded at 8:47 p.m.

10. Issues, Comments, Questions

The following table summarizes MV’s responses to questions and concerns provided by attendees, throughout the Workshop, organized by topic:

Issue, Comment, Question	MV Response
Comparable Sites	
Do the Blaine, Seattle, Olympia and Edmonds wastewater plants visited during the Southern Washington Waste Water Treatment Plants Study Tour service a population of approximately the same size that the LGSWWTP would?	The largest one, Seattle, serves a population of at least double the size and the smallest, Blaine, serves a population of about 5000. The Olympia plant serves a population similar to the North Shore.
Are there any odour complaints at the Washington (WA) state plants visited and if so, what process was being used to address them?	Only the one plant in Edmonds, WA had occasional odour complaints for a few days when they were cleaning out the large tanks. This plant was extremely proud of the fact that their cost to the taxpayers was the lowest in the entire US. They simply were not willing to spend any more money. People were willing to live with the odour occasionally. There were no complaints at any of the other three plants (Blaine, Seattle, Olympia).
Sensory Impacts	
Please describe the design treatment of the largest tanks on the far west of the site.	This is an industrial facility and there are big structures involved. The design is still in progress and we have been working carefully with the engineering team in order to establish a massing and location of the tanks, elevator towers, etc. that is compelling. We are starting to identify opportunities for cladding exploration so that they are not necessarily grey concrete covered grain silos. Because there is a technical requirement that they be thermally insulated, there is an opportunity to do something interesting with a number of these structures to start to make an architectural composition out of it. We are also looking at street planting to soften the edge.

Issue, Comment, Question	MV Response
Sensory Impacts	
How tall are the digesters? How many stories would they be equivalent to?	The ones at the far west end are about 30 to 32 metres geodetic elevation, which means they would be about 27 metres above existing grade, or the equivalent to five or six stories. The majority of the plant is 16 metres high.
There will be a little less light because of the building height.	We will consider sunlight and shading.
Including greenhouses on the roof of the big tanks could be a good idea for a complementary use however it would add another 10 or 12 feet to the top of the structure.	Comment noted.
Why are we not burying some of the tanks?	It is a cost issue. The water table is very close to the surface. We had considered burying the tanks but the geotechnical requirements to dig would result in costs that are very high, if it is feasible at all to do it.
What is the base elevation on site?	The current grade is approximately 3 metres above sea level. We are looking at putting the critical infrastructure at about 6 metres above sea level so that it would not be damaged should flooding occur. Road elevation would probably be in the area of 4 metres.
Futureproofing	
The large wastewater treatment plant in Seattle must have been built for the future. How much expansion will be built into the LGSWWTP?	The Seattle plant was built for expansion and the LGSWWTP should also be to some degree.
Wastewater Treatment	
What is the rationale for the selection of the level of treatment to be primary, secondary and tertiary? Why would we not need tertiary treatment now given the large population?	The level of liquid treatment performed is dependent upon the requirements of the receiving body. For example, if the effluent is discharged to a lake, tertiary treatment may be required as it deals with nutrient removal and may help prevent destructive algal blooms. The receiving body for the Lions Gate plant effluent is Burrard Inlet, and the required level of treatment for this receiving body is secondary treatment.

Issue, Comment, Question	MV Response
Traffic Impacts	
Will Phillip Avenue be the only access to the industries south of First Street?	The Phillip Overpass is part of the new development of the port by Port Metro Vancouver. All access will be via the Phillip Overpass. There will be a control gate at the foot of Pemberton to provide access to emergency vehicles only.
What will the impact be of traffic that used to go along Pemberton and will now go along First Street or Welch Avenue?	The District of North Vancouver (DNV) has done a traffic study as part of the Phillip Avenue Overpass Project. It is available on the Port Metro Vancouver and DNV websites.
Will First Street have a grade to go to the Phillip Overpass?	No. First Street will stay at the current grade. The Phillip Overpass will slope up directly from the intersection at First Street.
The addition of traffic on First Street from the plant will hardly be noticeable as opposed to the traffic that could be created from a shopping centre or similar facility.	Comment noted.
There could be black ice in the winter due to lack of sunlight.	Comment noted.
If there is an education centre, how would it be integrated in terms of traffic control and parking?	We do have to accommodate some parking on the site. If we have access to the Pemberton right-of-way we can accommodate some parking but we do not want to use that property as just a parking lot either. Currently, there is parallel parking along both sides of First Street that can make up the difference when there are more people there.

Community Integration	
Historically, there was a notion that Pemberton was going to be developed into an area like Ambleside. That would make a lot of sense in terms of this potential public space at the foot of Pemberton. Also, this space could be useful to the community if the Spirit Trail could connect to it.	DNV has just completed an Official Community Plan process. Pemberton was not identified as one of their areas of focus at this time. However we are looking a long time horizon so if we build the infrastructure and the structure now, it will be a framework that can be built upon and can help to regenerate the neighbourhood and set the tone for future development.
Are there discussions with education bodies (e.g., BCIT, UBC, school boards) in order for an education centre to be fully utilized and integrated within the community?	We have not talked with the different education bodies at this point. There is an education program within MV and there are many school tours of the facility that could be incorporated. There could be some potential for some of those higher learning facilities and this is something that may be developed, however the intention is not to make this a research institution. One other opportunity is for space sharing. A classroom that is used for an hour a day in the morning for a school group could also be used as a community meeting room.
Is there a possibility that DNV could say no to the use of the land at the foot of Pemberton as a public space?	It will be DNV Council that makes the final decision so it is possible that the answer could still be no.
What do you intend by an education centre in terms of size and facilities?	Because of the need to protect the plant from sea level rise, most of the critical functions will need to be located at higher levels. This will provide an opportunity to have ground level space that can be used for an education display, community meeting room, etc.
Consider involving Norgate School in the outreach and ongoing involvement, in areas such as the measuring process, monitoring and environmental science. For example, odour sensors could be placed in the neighbourhood and the current site for a year or two to develop a baseline and school children could be involved in the monitoring.	Comment noted.

Community Integration	
Consider including a public 360-degree viewpoint somewhere on the roof.	Comment noted.
The LOTT plant in Olympia, WA is an inspiration in the celebration of water. The Lower Capilano Marine Village is going to be a high-density centre in the future and this could be a centre that has a lot to do with the environment and water, especially as MacKay Creek is being refurbished with the help of Seaspn, BCIT, etc.	Comment noted.
People do not walk on First Street and I am not certain how you would engage the community along this corridor. You have to create a destination on the east side not along the north side.	Comment noted.
Given that we are looking at the facility to soften the noise from the south, the facility will create noise from reverberation from the natural increase in traffic from population growth. What can you do to ensure that this does not create reflective noise into the Norgate community?	We need to consider sound mitigation from reflective sound. Green space is also being considered for noise dampening
Unless the public space at the foot of Pemberton is like Lonsdale Quay and there is something to draw people there, I cannot see it being utilized much. If there is no access to the beach, stores or a place to walk a dog, it would not draw the public.	Comment noted.
Community Integration	
In nine or ten years, we will be struggling in this area to have a place to go. If there is public space at the eastern end of the existing treatment plant property, people could take their children there for a safe place to watch the trains or to look at the view. Pemberton is changing and it will look very different in nine or ten years.	Comment noted.
Consider using the public space as a dog park.	Comment noted.
Could the roof space be used as a sports field?	We have a space of approximately 150 m x 50 m on top of the big tanks. There is not sufficient space for a sports field.

Community Integration	
Part of the excess heat that the plant generates could be directed to demonstration greenhouses. Greenhouses are being located now in unused parking lot space. The need will just increase in the future. Loutet Farm is a local example of a community garden where crops are grown and sold to the community.	The roof space could be used for greenhouses. It is difficult to obtain any commitments at this time but we could provide the infrastructure such as access, power and water to allow for something to adapt to this space in the future.
Integrated Resource Recovery (IRR) – Nutrients	
Is phosphorus recovery part of Scenario B?	Based on the current business case result we are leaving space for it as a future addition.
Integrated Resource Recovery (IRR) – Energy	
Consider installing solar panels on the south side of the plant.	Comment noted.
Public Engagement	
How many people were invited to tonight's meeting?	We invited residents who have attended at least one event about the project and who opted in for future contact about the project. The meeting was intended to be small scale to allow for in-depth dialogue building on existing knowledge of the project.
When you print flyers, do you post them in the libraries and shopping centres?	We have done this in the past but things are moving toward electronic delivery. We have made a decision not to use a lot of paper. The flyers go primarily to the Norgate community. We feel the flyers are effective there. The North Shore News is the primary means of communicating with people outside of DNV to encourage them to come to our meetings.
At the public meeting in April there were over 100 people in attendance. Where did the majority of people come from?	The majority of people came from Norgate and the rest came primarily from municipalities on the North Shore.

Public Engagement	
Would It be possible to put up a road sign on the entryways to the Norgate community?	We are considering this.
Does MV capture all the email addresses of those who have come to meetings in the past?	Yes, we do but it is kept private. If a meeting attendee provides their email address on the registration form and opts in for future communication, we add their email address to our contact database.
What are other stakeholders such as the local business community saying and what are you doing to respond to their questions and issues?	The local business community that is interested in the project seems to include only those located south of Third Street and their concerns are primarily about aesthetics and massing. MV is having focused meetings with the business community to respond to their need to have meetings during business hours.
Public Engagement	
Is there additional information on costs and funding including the level of commitment and information on the components that could be cut if funding is reduced?	The costs and the funding models will be discussed at the October public meeting.
Can you provide some definitive statements on the budget and commitment overall, including statements to guarantee that the odour control systems will be included even if there is a budget cut?	This is a result of where we are in the process and you will see more specifics at the next meeting.
Google Street View would be a good tool to show what First Street would look like in the future.	Comment noted.
Are our contributions influencing the elected officials who make the final decision?	MV has been going to the North Shore Councils and making presentations. The public is able to attend the Council meetings where these presentations are made. You can also make a delegation to the MV Utilities Committee so there are opportunities for you to advise elected officials directly of your concerns. All the information collected at the public meetings and the MV response will be summarized and brought forward to the MV Utilities Committee, which makes recommendation to the MV board of Directors.
When will the federal and provincial government receive information for funding?	Funding is an ongoing, high priority with the MV Utilities Committee and Board. There are regular meetings with provincial and federal government officials.

Reference Material Distributed to Workshop Participants

1. Agenda for Norgate Residents' Workshop – September 4, 2013 (Orbit No. 7759835)
2. Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant Feedback Form (Orbit No. 7788795)

Attendance

Norgate Residents Representatives: Bev Bowler, Ghyslaine Gray, Hans Gray, Derek Lunden, Art McGillivray, Brent Thomas, Sheri Thomas

CRF Members: Dan Bizzotto

LGPAC Members: John Hunter, David Knee, Diana Sollner, Jan Timmer

Metro Vancouver Resources: Jeff Cutler (Space2Place), Laurie Ford (MV), Marie Griggs (MV), Jaspal Marwah (MV), Joy William (MV), Andrea Winkler (MV), Matthew Woodruff (Matthew Woodruff Architecture), Marni Robinson (Context)

Recording Secretary: Carol Lee, Raincoast Ventures Ltd.