

**Combined Sewer Overflow Master Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting #2 Notes**

Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 4:15 PM – 6:30 PM
Anhang Room, Millennium Library, 251 Donald Street

In Attendance:

Henry David (Hank) Venema	International Institute of Sustainable Development
Ani Terton	Manitoba Eco-Network
Chris Lorenc	Manitoba Heavy Construction Association
Dale Karasiuk	Chalmers Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation
Julie Turenne-Maynard	Rivers West
Joy Kennedy	Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (Water Quality)
Yvonne Hawryliuk	Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (Environmental Compliance and Enforcement)
Andrew McMillan	City of Winnipeg – Water and Waste
Patrick Coote	City of Winnipeg – Water and Waste
Tiffany Skomro	City of Winnipeg – Water and Waste
Duane Griffin	City of Winnipeg – Water and Waste
Michelle Kuly Holland	Facilitator
Dennis Heinrichs	Consultant – Dillon
Brendan Salakoh	Consultant – Dillon

Regrets:

Ho Lau	City of Winnipeg – Water and Waste
David Marsh	Consultant – Dillon
Tracey Braun	Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (Environmental Approvals)
Carmine Militano	Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce
Colleen Mayer	Old St. Vital Biz
Colleen Sklar	Lake Friendly Manitoba; Partnership of the Manitoba Capital Region
Gloria Desorcy	Consumer Association of Canada
Dorothea Blandford	Winnipeg Rowing Club

Agenda:

1. Session opening & administrative items
2. Licence background and context from regulator
3. Committee perspectives on CSO planning:
 - a. What perspectives are around the table, and why are they important
 - b. Important considerations for planning (issues, opportunities, constraints)
 - c. What would help increase public understanding and interest about CSO Master Plan

4. Decision making on control limits: process and criteria
5. Session wrap up and next steps

1. Session opening & administrative items

Introductions were given. Administrative items were noted. The previous meeting's notes were adopted.

It was noted that the Millennium Library would serve as the primary venue for future meetings and events.

Binders were circulated and, along with the Basecamp website, will serve as a repository for SAC information (e.g. agendas, notes, presentations, background information, and terms of reference).

Meeting #2 Purpose:

- To learn more about the context, perspectives, and experiences of SAC members;
- To begin gathering input on important considerations and criteria for the CSO Master Plan, including issues, opportunities and constraints;
- To gather preliminary input into defining a guiding vision for the CSO Master Plan; and,
- To set the criteria for defining control limits.

SAC members were asked what their personal objectives were for the meeting.

Responses included:

- Understanding different perspectives;
- Understanding the process;
- To absorb and learn;
- To ensure that the proposed solutions are cost effective (value for money), efficient, sustainable, innovative (e.g. green infrastructure), and in the public interest;
- To make connections with different groups; and,
- To ensure that decisions are not made in silos, and that solutions are made in concert with related initiatives (e.g. other river or lake programs).

2. Licence background and context from regulator

Tracey Braun (Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship – Environmental Approvals) sent her regrets, and was not able to present on this agenda item. Tracey

offered to respond to any question or concerns regarding the licence and asked that be forwarded to the Province. Questions included:

- How do some of the new, larger developments in the City of Winnipeg comply with clause #8 of the licence?
- How were the Province's targets and metrics developed? How did they arrive at their measures?

Additional discussion regarding the licence:

- Clause #12 outlines the effluent quality standards, which are non-negotiable.
- Clause #11 prescribes the development of the CSO Master Plan; it's up to the City to determine how they will meet the Province's targets. #11 also outlines the minimum requirements.

3. Committee perspectives on CSO planning

Discussion on the hydraulic model:

The City noted that the consulting team is developing a hydraulic model. The water quality model, takes into account every CSO outfall in the City. It was noted that while bio-retention systems are not typically modeled in detail for these types of studies, flow can be taken out of the model (e.g. through area reduction) to simulate the effects that such green infrastructure might have on flows. It was also noted that 2D run-off was not simulated in the model. This type of run-off overland flow modelling is not necessary for this study and is more likely to be used in very detailed flood modeling (rather than in CSO and river quality modeling) and is very costly.

- How does the modeling fit in with river and waterfront development plans (Go To the Waterfront, Vision 2030)?
- How is climate change being considered in the model?

Discussion on CSO and licence context:

It was noted that both the modeling and licence discussions might be too technical for some of the SAC members, particularly without the licence's context being presented.

- It was added that the licence needs to be presented and understood, including its background and intent, before the SAC can provide meaningful feedback.

It was noted that CSOs' impacts (and why they are problematic) need to be understood before any solutions can be debated. It was not clear to some SAC

members whether CSOs were an aesthetic problem, a public health problem, a water quality problem, a problem for Lake Winnipeg, or some combination of those problems.

It was suggested that a video (or other form of graphic content) could be prepared to explain the CSO context. The City added that an animation explaining CSOs is currently being developed.

There was discussion about what the animation should include. It was reiterated that context, understanding, and the definition of the problem is needed first.

- A concise background brief (whether in video, presentation, or document format) would be helpful, as would an explanation as to what the group is trying to achieve.

There was some discussion as to whether CSOs have any discernible impact on Lake Winnipeg. It was noted that the nutrient load from all Winnipeg discharges (wastewater plants and CSOs) versus loading from the watershed as a whole was in the range of approximately 7% of Manitoba based sources or 3% of watershed sources. Rather, it is agricultural run-off from fertilizer (potassium and nitrogen) that is having a major impact on the lake, some argued. This is exacerbated by the fact that drainage works have sped up the flow to rivers, while wetlands (which naturally retain and filter water) have continued to be filled.

- Some asked whether this is being taken into account in the licence discussion, and whether the City is being unfairly targeted.
 - o It was noted that all municipalities must comply with effluent quality standards (clause #12 in the licence), not just the City of Winnipeg.

It was reiterated that the intent or objective of the licence is unclear. It was asked whether the purpose of the Master Plan is to:

- Protect Lake Winnipeg from nutrient loading?
- Protect the rivers' ecosystems?
- Ensure that the rivers are aesthetically pleasing?
- Meet a public policy objective?

It was noted that until there is a clear answer, it will be difficult to develop any meaningful stakeholder advisory process and input towards deciding on solutions to mitigate CSOs and comply with the licence.

Some felt that this was not a two-way dialogue – rather, they felt as though the terms of the licence were mandated by the Province with minimal consultation, and without consideration of the potential financial impacts on the City. The broader view of where CSO fits in environmental management needs to be understood by the SAC. These meetings need to address this need.

Discussion regarding public education / symposium:

It was noted that prior to going to the wider public, it is necessary that the SAC and project team have a better understanding of the context, impacts, and intent of the licence. There must also be answers to outstanding questions, or the project might not be well received by the community (particularly if the costs are going to be significant). People must be shown that there is value for money in mitigating CSOs. The Province must also understand that at a certain point, the costs of mitigation begin to outweigh its benefits (incremental benefits/ diminishing returns) – therefore, there needs to be some balance. It was noted that trade-offs would have been discussed, and that a discussion regarding the potential tax burden would have to take place with the larger community.

The symposium date has been tentatively set for January 28, 2015. There was some discussion as to whether the group was ready for the symposium, and whether an additional SAC meeting needed to be held prior. Some were hesitant to have their names associated with the SAC, in that a symposium with few answers and little background context might reflect poorly on the group.

Discussion on innovative solutions:

Some noted that the City must demonstrate leadership, seeking innovative solutions to mitigating CSOs. Some innovations discussed included:

- Green infrastructure
- A system of trading credits. For example, the City pays a farmer upstream to reduce the runoff their farm drains into the river; the amount investing has greater return than that of a City solution, but sees the equivalent or greater amount of nutrient reduction, making the “trade” more cost effective. An example in Ottawa was alluded to.

4. Decision making on control limits: process and criteria

The City made a brief Power Point presentation to give an overview of the decision process for selecting an acceptable control limit for CSOs and where stakeholders fit into the process.

Reference: The Control Limits SAC Presentation November 19, 2014 will be circulated and posted on the project website.

5. Session wrap up

Future meeting dates/times/locations are as follows:

- Thursday, March 12, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm
- Thursday, April 9, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm
- Thursday, May 28, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm

All meetings to be held at the Millennium Library (Buchwald or Anhang Room, 2nd Floor) at 251 Donald Street.

The symposium is tentatively set for Wednesday, January 28, 2015 (tentatively 5 - 8 PM) in the Carol Shields Room Auditorium (Millennium Library, 251 Donald Street).

Attendees were thanked for their participation, and the meeting was adjourned.

6. Summary of Action Items and Administrative Follow-ups

Complete:

- Where possible, CITY PROJECT TEAM: provided additional information in response to questions and comments raised at the meeting.
 - *Responses and additional information provided below.*
- How is runoff represented in the hydraulic model?
 - o Runoff is represented in the collections model based on the amount of permeable and impermeable area draining to the combined, land drainage and wastewater sewer networks being studied.
- How does the modeling fit in with river and waterfront development plans (Go to the Waterfront, Vision 2030)?
 - o For the first phase of the project we would look to identify a “Value” to include in our vision for the project such as master plan coordination. Following the first phase when we have selected a control limit we will be looking at the ways we can achieve and deliver it in the second phase. This is where we would look at coordination with other projects, which can provide significant cost savings, reduce disruption and achieve better results through development efficiencies.
- How is climate change being considered in the model?
 - o We are looking at our historic rainfall record and using statistical analysis. We are also looking at risk analysis. Looking at climate change is all about risk. E.g.: There is a risk of larger more intense

rainfall events - in terms of the existing combined system this would result in future larger CSO events but there may be less small events. E.g.: There is a risk of an extended dry period - in terms of the existing combined system this would result in less future CSO events.

- Some noted that the nutrient load from all Winnipeg discharges (wastewater plants and CSOs) versus loading from the watershed as a whole was in the range of approximately 7% of Manitoba based sources or 3% of watershed sources.
 - o This comment is referring to a November 2002 nutrient loading report undertaken by the Province (A Preliminary Estimate of TN and TP Loading to Streams in Manitoba). This report and another relevant earlier nutrient trend report can be found here.
http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/waterstewardship/water_quality/index.html
 - o The 2002 report is based on long term (1994 -2001) river monitoring data and estimates total nutrient contributions from the City of Winnipeg to Lake Winnipeg These estimates are TN (total nitrogen) is 5.7% and of TP (total phosphorus) 6.7%. As these percentages cover the three sewerage treatment plants, land drainage and CSO discharges, the report estimates CSO only make up 79 tons a year or 0.1% of TN and 16 tons a year or 0.3% of TP.
 - o Lake Winnipeg is estimated to receive 63,207 tons a year of TN and 5,838 tons a year of TP.

In progress:

- J. TURENNE-MAYNARD/H. VENEMA: Opportunity to follow up by email or phone to provide additional information on hydraulic modelling.
- FACILITATOR/CITY PROJECT TEAM: Provide feedback, questions, and clarifications on licence to Province for response.
- PROVINCE: Prepare a background brief of the licence context (video, presentation, or document format) and explanation as to what the group is trying to achieve as it relates to the licence.
- CITY PROJECT TEAM/FACILITATOR: Confirm and provide further details for symposium, 2015 meetings to SAC.
- FACILITATOR: Circulate meeting #2 notes to Committee members and alternates for feedback and comment prior to posting on project webpage.

- FACILITATOR: Post meeting #2 notes and PowerPoint presentation and reference materials on shared site for Committee members.
- CITY PROJECT TEAM: Produce hard copies of final meeting #2 notes and presentation for Committee members at next meeting.
- CITY PROJECT TEAM: Share meeting notes and presentation publicly on City of Winnipeg project website following Committee feedback.