Minutes of the Meeting of the Lakelse Lake/Jackpine Flats Septic System Management Working Group held Tuesday November 20, 2012, in the Regional District of Kitimat-Stikine Board Room, 300 - 4545 Lazelle Avenue, Terrace, BC, commencing at 9:00 am.

In Attendance - Working Group members
Terry Brown
Dave Materi
George Gillam
John Jensen

Members Absent
Ken Kolterman

Regional District Representatives in Attendance
Doug McLeod – Area ‘C’ representative
Ted Pellegrino, Planner
Margaret Kujat – Environmental Services Coordinator
Roger Tooms – Manager, Works and Services

Others in attendance
Linda Zurkirchen, Project Consultant
Ian Hayes, Cambria Gordon Ltd. (CGL)

Introduction
This is the 9th meeting of the Working Group (WG).

The meeting commenced at 11:05 a.m. as called by Chair Linda Zurkirchen.

Linda introduced Ian Hayes (Cambria Gordon Ltd). He has been responsible for the development of the reports to date and he will be doing follow-up on CGL aspects over the next few weeks. Linda indicated members of the working group had received these reports (Educational, Water Monitoring and Communications) as previous information.

Confirm/Accept Minutes from Meeting of October 24, 2012.
Minutes from the previous meeting were circulated to all WG members prior to this meeting and were accepted.

Agenda:
The future meeting dates were clarified and these will be shown on both the future agendas and subsequent meeting minutes. Next meeting: December 12th – 9 am - NOON
Action Items from previous meetings/ last meeting:

1) Cost Estimate of Septic System Management Program (attached)
Ian Hayes – Cambria Gordon Ltd - reviewed the itemized estimates and indicated that the Administration costs were taken from the LWMP.
Water Monitoring cost is based on 2 sets of sampling: 8 in Lakelse and 8 in Jackpine Flats. This will be reviewed and may be revised.

Contingency costs of the program are based on number of systems provide the cost per unit.

Dave Materi requested information on the sites selected at Lakelse for water monitoring and how they relate to current or past information. Mr. Gillam asked about the number 625 and how was that figure derived. This is the estimated number of lots per tax roll. Fees and charges may be on all lots whether developed or not as Mr. Gillam asked whether empty lots would be charged and felt they shouldn't. For example, he is part owner of a property that has an agreement for non-use. He pointed out that empty lots are totally undeveloped and may never be used by anyone. Roger indicated that the main concern is for empty lots on the lake’s edge that may impact the lake and water quality due to recreational use.

Roger indicated that under parcel tax systems, they would be charged so this may be a challenge for the group to decide. Some vacant lots are used heavily for recreational purposes. Mr Jensen countered that everyone should pay the same because the overall program serves “everyone” and all should pay. Dave Materi concurred with this.

Roger reminded the group that the Septic System Management program was a recommendation of the LWMP and the WG is bringing the exercise forward. The group will be challenged with recommendations to the Board.
John Jensen commented that even if land is not being used, the long term best interest is to ensure that the water quality of the area is maintained.

Dave Materi noted that monitoring annual cost, with a total of 16 sites seems high and asked if there were ways that could be reduced. He also noted that the proposed contingency funding also seems high so figure per parcel may be less. Dave reiterated that everyone should pay.
Roger – indicated figures may be very conservative. Margaret also added that the figures presented were based on values assigned to consultant's fees completing most works. In some cases, some aspects are already being undertaken by others who can share the data or information. It would also be reasonable to encourage collaboration and cooperation to achieve similar outcomes thereby saving costs.
Terry Brown felt costs related to the program should be reviewed with hind sight and any cost saving opportunities should be captured. The WG discussed the option of having the program reviewed and that programs such as water monitoring or education be re-evaluated and revised where and when appropriate. These ideas should be captured in a recommendation to the Board.
The WG concurred that the recommendation to the RDKS Board should indicate that Water Quality Monitoring (and all components of the program) will be reviewed every year for the first 5 years with WG and adapt as necessary.

Roger Tooms suggested that this will be a challenging program to implement and the WG members are and will continue to be highly valued in assisting with reviews and revamps of the program. The continuity offered in this would be beneficial.

Special comment was made to capture is the idea of prescribed review and adaptation should be written into the components. Once the programs are implemented, they should be reviewed in each of the three subsequent years and again after the sixth year. Suggestions were that it should be revised by taking the most positive aspects of each of the components.

The WG also discussed how this program would be funded related to taxes and how to acquire them and parcel tax vs. assessment. Mr. McLeod questioned whether to implement the program for 3 years and then terminate it, re-evaluated it and then, if warranted, be reinstated again. His reasons for this arose over concerns of adding incrementally to peoples taxes without sound reasons. Doug indicated to the group that he would like to see a way to save some money on these program.

Overall water quality issues need to be brought forward and seem mutually important to all. The public at large agrees that they want to have and maintain good and sustainable water. Dave Materi enquired about water quality at the Lake and how good it was considered to be. He also indicated that everyone he speaks to in his professional work as a real estate agent on Lake sales indicate they all want good water and seem to relate that sewer and water quality are linked together.

Roger reiterated that in the case of the Jackpine Flats area the primary goal of the program is to protect the quality of groundwater which is used for domestic supply. To address Doug’s comments, Roger explained that it the Regional District is always challenged with cost recovery in terms of assessment vs. parcel tax. Preference would be always to try not to heavily impact residents with program cost and that cost recovery will present a hard decision for the Board. The Septic system program will be implemented and subsequently reviewed. Area C has a number of higher valued properties in North Terrace, Old Remo, Lakelse, and Jackpine Flats so it is not just Lakelse residents who are potentially affected.

Ted Pellegrino added that land use and development is always a changing and constantly evolving process. The extreme view would be to take status quo which could mean no development, no full time development from seasonal only use, etc. and this would likely not acceptable. Planning needs to be done to meet the expectations of property owners for future development. At the moment and likely for future consideration will be a higher demand in Jackpine and Lakelse Lake – perhaps even commercial. Programs must change and adapt as these demands change.

Linda added that the draft report prepared for the Board will capture the working group’s desire for program review and looking for ways of cost reduction. When identified, these cost saving
collaborations or ideas should directly result in cost savings which will be reflected in the program reviews and adaptations. The WG was asked if they wanted to make a decision about this at this time. Roger indicated that this may be done as a by-law and there may be some ‘process’ to research which he will investigate further for the group. The WG had further discussion on program development, review, re-instatement or longevity. The WG had further discussion and John asked if this process would require a new service area? Roger explained that because the LWMP was as approved by the Board of the day, intended services can be implemented with the approval of 2/3’s Board Directors. A service can be provided through by-law but if there is no budget to support a program (approved by the Board), the program does not get implemented. Roger gave examples of situations where this has arisen in the past. Roger Tooms encouraged the WG make a recommendation that the program be reviewed at regular interval – perhaps once per year for the first 5 years with the concept of water quality being at the forefront of the program.

**ACTION ITEM:** Revise cost estimate. (CGL)

**Follow –up – RDKS Survey Monkey (Lakelse and Jackpine Flats program)**
Margaret reported to the group that RDKS had mailed out program update #3 which included a request to have property owners complete the Survey Monkey questionnaire either on-line or by a printed hard copy provided to them. Between the two areas (Lakelse and Jackpine Flats) over 600 were mailed out. To date a total of 41 surveys have been submitted. An incentive to complete the survey by November 15th was included in the mail out. (one of three eligible to win a $100 rebate towards water conservation devices or septic system servicing. Three random survey submissions were selected on a basis of 1 – 41. These were as follows:

#37 – Kwassin Lake Contracting Ltd  
   2472 First Avenue, Terrace V8G 0G2  

#8 - No Name included  
   3005 Soloman Way, Terrace V8G 0G5  

#41 – Brian and Marie Lenne-Pierce  
   324 Sockeye Creek, Terrace V8G 0G5

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Linda began a review of the three forms with the WG.

**Septic Description Form**
Scenario: This is the form used to acquire information on the system which is not anticipated to change much. Intended to go out to all system owners and they return it to RDKS (copy to self if desired) This information goes into a master data base.
Form has been tidied up since last discussion but more discussions and suggested revisions were made by the WG.
ACTION ITEM – Form to be revised and returned to the WG. (CGL)

Note – companies are currently not mandated to inspect.
Note – companies are very busy, little time for discussion and inspections at this time.
Suggestion: boxes to be “ticked” rather than things being circled…. Form changes to box checking
General discussion of inspection services and potential abilities inspectors took place with the WG.

Pumping and Inspection Form
Scenario: The Septic Management Program is up and running and prescribed intervals, the septic tank needs to be pumped. This form is intended to be used to evaluate the tank at that time. Could be given to the homeowner or trained vacuum truck companies OR parts to each. Discussions of questions and wording were reviewed by the WG.

Possible suggestion of inspection only (inventory) followed by a pump/inspection. Discussion also took place regarding who should fill in these forms with a general reminder that in the past, the WG thought it best to let the property owners do as much as they can themselves without local government intervention.

General discussions by the WG took place regarding cost effective ways to facilitate inspections and it was suggested that perhaps RDKS provide staff for a small flat fee to do this inspection. Dave Materi asked for clarification of whether the pumper truck would provide an inspection fee or similar from funding from within the program funds.
Conceptual process: Vac truck personnel trained, they do inspections and complete the forms which would be reflected in the cost of pumping. The WG debated the various aspects of who should do these inspections and who gets these forms for completion.
The WG spent considerable time reviewing this form and making suggestions for detailed revisions.

ACTION ITEM – Form to be revised and returned to the WG (CGL)

Doug McLeod wondered whether process could be expressed as simply as: “does the system work – yes or no?” e.g. Is there an easier way to determine this?

Qualification and Risk Assessment Form – Pending
Time did not permit this last form to be discussed. It will be deferred to next meeting.

Linda suggested a flow chart to for the WG to review. Roger suggested that he may require the Board to support approaching NH to fixing some serious issues in a common sense manner and convenient for property owners with respect to sewer and septic systems related to sustainable water quality for the area.
Where are we going?
Linda noted that paper and e-mailed copies of Education, Water Monitoring and Communication plans have been shared with the WG over the last month. Examples on the back of these packages are intended for possible ways to inform the public. The WG encouraged to take a more detailed look at the products and provide input and feedback to the process.
Linda requested that the WG concentrate on Education and Communications plan and to not spend time on the water quality monitoring – this will be reviewed and revised.
For the near future, the WG will review the inspection process and how to manage high risk properties, how to involve NH, and provide draft report on the program to date. It will be important for the WG to try to get through this information quickly to meet the WG’s preferred schedule and objectives.

Several members of the WG requested that future information delete the “draft” watermark on documents for ease of reading and review.

Revised future meeting dates:

December 12th (9 – NOON) Wednesday
January 9th (9-Noon)
January 16th (9 – NOON)

Enquiry – would the group be interested in hearing from John Colongard (an area ROWP)? The group generally thought that this may be useful at a later meeting date to facilitate working through some of these outstanding concepts.
A presentation of 15 – 20 minutes may be advantageous at a later date. Possible invitation to the January 9th WG meeting was considered.

Meeting adjourned 2:15 p.m.