

**Combined Sewer Overflow Master Plan  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Meeting #1 Notes**

Thursday, October 2, 2014, 4-6pm  
Fort Rouge Recreation Centre, 625 Osborne Street

**In Attendance:**

Ani Terton	Manitoba Eco-Network
Jim Robinson	Lake Friendly / PMCR
Carmine Militano	Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce
Chris Lorenc	Manitoba Heavy Construction Association
Joy Kennedy	Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (Water Quality)
Dale Karasiuk	Chalmers Neighbourhood Renewal
Colleen Mayer	Old St. Vital BIZ
Dorothea Blandford	Winnipeg Rowing Club
Tiffany Skomro	City of Winnipeg
Patrick Coote	City of Winnipeg
Andrew McMillan	City of Winnipeg
Ho Lau	City of Winnipeg
David Marsh	Dillon Consulting (guest)
Dennis Heinrichs	Dillon Consulting (guest)
Michelle Kuly Holland	First Person Strategies (facilitator)
Krista Stobart	First Person Strategies (recorder)

**Regrets:**

Colleen Sklar	Lake Friendly / PMCR
Megan Krohn	Manitoba Eco-Network
Julie Turenne-Maynard	Rivers West
Henry Borger	Manitoba Heavy Construction Association
Hank Venema	IISD
Gloria Desorcy	Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba)
Tracey Braun	Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship (Licensing)
Christine Hutlet	Rivers West / Red River Basin Commission

**Agenda:**

1. Session opening, welcome & introductions
2. Committee purpose & overview
3. City project team presentation on CSOs and CSO Master Plan
4. Q & A
5. Session wrap up

**1. Session opening, welcome & introductions**

Committee members thanked for participating and introductions made.

Meeting #1 Purpose:

To ensure participants understand why they are here, what the committee is being asked to do, and to share information about the City of Winnipeg's sewer system, combined sewer overflows (CSOs), and the CSO Licence and master plan process underway.

Deliverables / Outcomes:

1. Understanding, clarity on terms of reference.
2. Greater understanding of the City's sewer system, combined sewer overflows (CSOs).
3. Identification of questions, items for clarification.

Meeting Guidelines:

- Strive to meet the stated purpose and expected outcomes of meeting
- Respect the agenda
- Listen actively to others
- No one-on-one side conversations while other are speaking, no interrupting
- Manage your own input – focused responses, comments and questions, not long speeches
- Where consensus exists, or has been reached, support group decisions
- Phones on silent, urgent calls responded to outside meeting room

Committee adopted meeting guidelines.

Committee members asked to identify their expectations:

- Be able to ask questions throughout process

**2. Committee purpose & overview**

Terms of Reference reviewed and adopted.

Discussion / Questions:

- Why is this a 2-year project?
  - o There are 2 phases – 1) control limits and control options and 2) developing a Master Plan.
- Will the proposed CSO Master Plan go to Council?
  - o The Proposed CSO Master Plan will be reviewed by the City to an appropriate level at different stages which may include Committee signoff.
- How does this process relate to the previous study (2002)?
  - o This is a continuation of that work and is a more formalized process to develop a plan.

Committee members asked for feedback on methods of sharing materials:

- A collaborative site
- Meeting minutes should also be shared with alternates
- Hard copies also useful

Meeting notes and materials will also be shared publicly on City of Winnipeg project website.

### Phase 1 - CSO Control Limits SAC Timeline:



### 3. City project team presentation on CSOs and CSO Master Plan

*Reference:* PowerPoint presentation – will be circulated and posted on project website.

### 4. Q & A

Discussion / Questions:

- Can you define “clean” in terms of the water leaving the treatment plants? How do the pollution levels of discharge from a CSO compare to the discharge leaving a treatment plant?
  - o The Province has licensed discharge levels from treatment plants. Results are posted on City of Winnipeg website.
- Is there science that supports elimination of all combined sewers? Are outflows of CSOs monitored?
  - o The science is typically a risk based approach assessing environmental quality by identifying, evaluating, and managing existing and potential future risks to the environment and human health. Yes, 39 of the City’s combined outflows are monitored for occurrence of overflows; currently 2 are being monitored temporarily for water quality. There’s also an overflow risk from separate systems but this risk is much lower.
- How have you historically determined where to do infrastructure upgrades?
  - o Control centre continually monitors and flags problem areas; we also undertake condition assessments of pipes and use basement flooding statistics.
- What are other cities doing with their combined sewer systems? Are any jurisdictions going to zero combined sewers?
  - o There is an Experience Elsewhere Report available and the project team will put together a presentation to provide information on what other cities are doing.
- Can you provide examples of low impact development standards/practices?
- Presentation has talked about cost effectiveness, but nothing in presentation states that the main driver is (or should be) environmental improvement of waterways, and not just about meeting the CSO Licence. The presentation

- should clarify outcomes... e.g. what are the benefits, what environmental standards will improvements be designed to? When talking to stakeholders the context of cost/benefit should be shared.
- Is the objective to reduce the number of overflow events?
  - Will the Province handle some of the public consultation? Would like more details on what the public consultation process will involve.
    - o We're working with the Province. The City is planning to go to public in June.
  - The SAC needs to understand the social licence and the sustainability/environmental merits of this project. At the end of the day the public needs to be persuaded. This Committee should speak that language because we will be the ambassadors of the social benefit/rationale that underpins the project investments.
    - o A key role of the SAC is to help the project team frame the context for the public.
  - For a potential multimillion dollar project, consider dynamic modeling to ensure the right solutions/conclusions.
  - How was it determined that there needs to be a maximum of four overflows events per year? If 85% capture is desired, why does it matter how many overflows/year?
    - o Four tends to be the number that the EPA regulates to in the United States and was adopted here. Not sure exactly how EPA came up with four. Four overflows, 85% capture and the elimination or removal of no less than the mass of the CSO pollutants identified as causing water quality impairment are outlined in the US EPA CSO Control Policy as adequate levels of control to meet water quality based requirements. It's in the licence requirements that the Province has set and was also examined as part of the 2002 study.
    - o The City is looking beyond the CSO limits set in the licence and examining other control limits.
  - Is there a definition of the environmental standard objective to which we're developing the CSO Master Plan? What are the desired measurable outcomes? What exactly are we trying to do and how do we get there? Need information on how we define that standard.
    - o The input from this group will help define the objectives and standards. The desired outcome will be an improvement in water quality. We are assessing the impact CSO are having on water quality and potentially proposing upgrades to our sewer infrastructure to address them.
  - The context of the project should link to "Our Winnipeg".

## 5. Session wrap up

Next meeting – how do we talk about these concepts with stakeholders and the public

Meeting Logistics – please provide feedback on meeting time/location/day of week. Also looking for input on planning the larger symposium (Jan/Feb 2015)

Next meeting: Wednesday, November 19  
Anhang Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Millennium Library; 251 Donald St.

## 6. Follow-up Conference Call

A conference call was held for the committee members not in attendance at the October 2 meeting.

### Call Attendees:

Colleen Sklar	Lake Friendly / PMCR
Megan Krohn	Manitoba Eco-Network
Julie Turenne-Maynard	Rivers West
Gloria Desorcy	Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba)
Tracey Braun	Manitoba Conservation (Licensing)
Siobhan Burland Ross	Manitoba Conservation (Licensing)
Patrick Coote	City of Winnipeg
Andrew McMillan	City of Winnipeg
Tiffany Skomro	City of Winnipeg

### Agenda:

- Welcome
- Recap committee roles and responsibilities
- Recap City presentation from Oct. 2 meeting with Q & A

### Welcome, technical check and introductions

#### Recap committee roles and responsibilities:

- Reviewed committee purpose
- 2 year commitment, 2 phases of input
  - o Short term (Phase 1) focus: 2014 & Spring 2015 - control limits
  - o Longer term (Phase 2) focus: Master Plan for implementation of changes to achieve targets
- Influence: Collaborate level on International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum
- Communication:
  - o Primarily via facilitator by email
  - o Shared resources via shared site and hard copy materials
  - o Meeting notes and materials will be posted online
  - o Primary and alternates will receive meeting materials

#### Recap City presentation from Oct. 2 meeting with Q & A:

Presentation given via webinar (pdf version provided to those who called in)

#### Discussion / Questions:

- Has the province and the city been setting aside funding to construct improvements to CSOs, or are they waiting for the Master Plan to be finished before funding?
  - o (Province) Don't know the answer from the Province's point of view.
  - o (City) There have been yearly allocations in the budget, but much depends on outcome of the Master Plan.

- It was noted the SAC group will be involved in setting targets, but targets are set in the licence. Can you clarify?
  - o SAC will have a role in evaluating targets.
- As part of the options considered with the Master Plan will there be an opportunity to use infrastructure design to hold back storm water (e.g. pilot project at UofW)?
  - o Green infrastructure is being considered.

## 7. Summary of Action Items and Administrative Follow-ups

*As of November 10, 2014*

### Complete:

- COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Provide feedback on meeting time/location/day of week and input on planning the larger symposium (Jan/Feb 2015)
  - o *November meeting date set for:*
    - *Wednesday, November 19, 3:45 – 6:00p.m., Anhang Room, 2nd Floor, Millenium Library, 251 Donald St.*
- FACILITATOR: Circulate meeting notes to Committee members and alternates for feedback and comment prior to Meeting #2.
- FACILITATOR: Post meeting notes, PowerPoint presentation and reference materials on shared site for Committee members.
- Where possible, CITY PROJECT TEAM: Provide additional information in response to questions and comments raised at the meeting.
  - *Responses and additional information provided below:*
  - Can you provide examples of low impact development standards/practices?
    - o Low Impact Development (LID) is a storm water management strategy that seeks to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff and storm water pollution. Management practices promote the use of natural systems for infiltration, evapotranspiration, and reuse of rainwater. Green roofs, swales, retention basins are some examples of sustainable storm water management solutions to control runoff from new developments ensuring they have low impact with regards to runoff.
  - Presentation has talked about cost effectiveness, but nothing in presentation states that the main driver is (or should be) environmental improvement of waterways, and not just about meeting the CSO Licence. The presentation should clarify outcomes... e.g. what are the benefits, what environmental standards will improvements be designed to? When talking to stakeholders the context of cost/benefit should be shared.
    - o We are going to assess and report on the potential improvement in water quality for a range of control limits.
  - Is the objective to reduce the number of overflow events?
    - o Other City's CSO programs typically involve reducing the number of overflows and it's likely we will need to do the same. Once a need to address water quality is confirmed the main considerations are

typically what to limit them too, how to do it, sustainability, cost and time needed to achieve it.

- For a potential multi-million dollar project, consider dynamic modeling to ensure the right solutions/conclusions.
  - o Hydraulic models of the sewer system and a water quality river model are being developed as part of the project.
- The context of the project in public communications should link to “OurWinnipeg”
  - o This project aligns with the direction set out for the water and waste department in Our Winnipeg, its policies and initiatives. The CSO Master Plan project was one of the example projects outlined in Our Winnipeg.

**In progress:**

- COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Book the following tentative dates and times for upcoming meetings at the Buchwald Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 251 Donald St.
  - o Thursday, March 12, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm
  - o Thursday, April 9, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm
  - o Thursday, May 28, 2015, 3:45-6:00pm
- CITY PROJECT TEAM: Produce hard copies of meeting notes, PowerPoint presentation and reference materials for Committee members at next meeting.
- CITY PROJECT TEAM: Share meeting notes and PowerPoint presentation publicly on City of Winnipeg project website following Committee feedback.
- CITY PROJECT TEAM: Prepare a presentation on Experience Elsewhere.