

APPENDIX G

Stakeholder Feedback

The Administration held numerous open houses, surveys, communications and meetings with the wastewater hauling industry, the general public and industrial emitters known to emit high strength wastewater. Below is a summary of the dates of the Open Houses and the general topic of discussion.

September 16, 2014 – Notified wastewater hauling businesses of potential changes. This included the potential of the City not continuing to provide a hauled wastewater station, discussing where a new facility could be located and, the scope of a potential facility. Discussed the need for increased rates to support cost recovery business model.

January 20, 2015 – Discussed alternative locations for the new facility, site plan and Council’s December 2014 decision to build a facility.

June 2, 2015 – Discussed the Hauled Wastewater Business Model and wastewater quality parameters.

July 28, 2015 – Raised awareness that the City is increasing focus on source control and discussed facility operations.

August 25, 2015 – Raised awareness that the City is increasing focus on source control and discussed the surcharge formula and FOG.

September 24, 2015 – Initial information on prohibited, restricted and surchargeable substances sent to industrial emitters.

September 29, 2015 – Reviewed Bylaw Code of Practice, wastewater parameters.

September 30, 2015 – Open house with industrial emitters focused on prohibited, restricted and surchargeable substances.

November 3, 2015 – Reviewed recommended surcharge formula and accepted wastewater parameter.

December 8, 2015 – Meeting with CCRL to discuss proposed bylaw changes.

December 8, 2015 (General Public Open House) – Public Awareness regarding recommended rate increase and need to improve source control.

January 12, 2016 – (General Public Open House) – Public Awareness regarding recommended rate increase and need to improve source control.

January 26, 2016 – Discussed alternate locations to discharge material not accepted at Hauled Wastewater Station.

February 8, 2015 – Updated prohibited, restricted and surchargeable substances schedules sent to industrial emitters.

February 16, 2016 – Discussed facility and schedule of opening new facility. Discussed how to transition from old facility to new Hauled Wastewater Station.

February 29, 2015 – Met with Canadian Linen to discuss proposed bylaw changes.

*Note – Continuous communication was maintained with EVRAZ and CCRL at their request. One on one meetings were offered with all industrial emitters contacted.

Summary Table - Feedback Received from the Wastewater Hauling Industry

WHAT WE HEARD	CITY'S CONSIDERATIONS	RECOMMENDATION
Ensure fees for the facility are based on usage		
<p>Wastewater haulers were concerned that the rates would be set as a yearly rate for all users. This would cause the yearly rate to be very high for small users and low for large users. Haulers requested the rate to be set so that the rates are based on usage of the site.</p>	<p>The Administration explored options to collect the revenue required to achieve cost recovery for the facility. The Administration investigated one time yearly rates and volumetric rates. The Administration researched best management practice throughout western Canada to determine the recommendation for revenue generation.</p>	<p>The Administration is recommending that a monthly permit rate be maintained to cover basic administrative costs associated with issuing permits. The Administration is also recommending a discharge rate based on the volume of material that is discharged at the facility. This rate structure ensures that the users of the facility will pay based on the usage of the facility.</p>
Provide higher level of service even if costs need to increase		
<p>Wastewater haulers were concerned with the level of service at the existing facility. They are concerned that the facility is not cleaned regularly, all users are not following the bylaw and snow removal is not adequate.</p> <p>Wastewater haulers are also concerned that the new Hauled Wastewater Station is located on a gravel road. Haulers requested that the road be paved even if it resulted in an increase in the discharge rates.</p>	<p>The Administration researched discharge rate across Western Canada to determine if the City of Regina could build a facility and have competitive cost recover rates.</p> <p>The Administration designed a facility that will provide a higher level of service by ensuring site security, regular routine maintenance and the ability to regularly monitor wastewater parameters.</p> <p>The Administration is also completing design work on upgrading Condie Road from a gravel surface to a paved road.</p>	<p>The Administration received approval from Council in December 2014 to build a modern mechanical Hauled Wastewater Station.</p> <p>The Administration is recommending that \$1.5 million be transferred from the Utility Reserve into the Hauled Wastewater Station Capital account. This additional funding will be built into the cost recovery discharge rates.</p>
Ensure the rules of the facility are clear and enforced		
<p>Wastewater haulers wanted to ensure that they understood the expectation of the City when using the new facility. They were also concerned that the rules had to be enforced consistently, to ensure that all wastewater haulers were treated equally and no business was given an unfair advantage.</p>	<p>The Administration researched different alternatives to increase the monitoring and security of the facility to ensure only permitted hauler used the facility.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that the Bylaw and standard operating procedures of the new facility are clear to all users.</p>	<p>The Administration is developing a Code of Practice for the Hauled Wastewater Station. The Code of Practice will provide expected behaviours that will enable each business to update their standard operating procedures. These behaviours will include expected practice for entering the facility, using the facility, accepted wastewater parameters and exiting the facility. The Code of Practice will be provided to wastewater haulers when a permit is issued and on an as-needed basis.</p>
Concerns about high strength wastewater or prohibited substances		

<p>Wastewater haulers were concerned about what kind of wastewater would be received at the facility. Wastewater haulers acknowledged that current practice may not comply with the Bylaw, but had not determined where else this material could go. This material included hydrovac, FOG (Fats, Oils and Grease), carwash and garage pit slurry.</p>	<p>The Administration considered the risk to the upgraded Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) if certain wastewater parameters were accepted at the Hauled Wastewater Station. The Administration also reviewed the cost to treat certain wastewater parameters and the risk to premature infrastructure failure due to particular substances.</p> <p>The Administration completed research to determine if there was a disposal facility for the items of concern such as hydrovac, FOG and slurry from carwash and garage pits. It was determined that alternative facilities will accept this material and it does not have to be disposed of at the new Hauled Wastewater Station.</p>	<p>The Administration is recommending an updated list of parameters that will be prohibited from entering the Hauled Wastewater Station due to the risk caused to the WWTP.</p> <p>The Administration is also recommending a revised surcharge formula for particular parameters that are of concern, based on the effect on the collection system and the WWTP.</p>
---	--	--

Summary Table - Feedback Received From Industrial Emitters

WHAT WE HEARD	CITY'S CONSIDERATIONS	RECOMMENDATION
Concentrations are unrealistic		
<p>Some of the proposed allowable concentrations were lower than could be practically treated to.</p>	<p>The Administration was using CCME Model Sewer Bylaw and recommendations from the WWTP consultant as the framework for the parameters. The parameters were reviewed and compared to what was reasonable for treatment, acceptable for the WWTP, protective of the collection system and protective of worker health.</p>	<p>The Administration adjusted the values to address concerns of industry, while maintaining the protection needed.</p>
What if parameters can't be met or if there is an upset condition in pre-treatment?		
<p>Some industries are concerned that they will exceed allowable concentrations of some parameters, or will exceed parameters if their pre-treatment fails or has problems.</p>	<p>The City's sewage works and WWTP are designed to accept sewage, not industrial wastewater. The systems can accept industrial wastewater and can tolerate some upset conditions if they are closely managed. To allow exceedances of these parameters in everyday operations puts the collection system and WWTP at risk.</p>	<p>Allow emitters to enter into an agreement with the City where the effluent is closely monitored and controlled. The agreement should also require the emitter to provide pre-treatment within a pre-determined timeframe or provide mitigating measures.</p>
The new surcharge values will greatly increase costs		
<p>The cost of surcharges will negatively affect my business.</p>	<p>The sewage works and WWTP are designed to treat residential sewage. Elevated concentrations of certain parameters cost more to treat. An industry should be responsible for treatment of their own effluent if it is high strength. If they are unwilling to treat their own effluent, a surcharge should be applied to offset the cost to the City and to promote pre-treatment. Pre-treatment will also avoid using up WWTP capacity by industry rather than city growth.</p>	<p>The current surcharge is extremely low compared to actual costs and what other municipalities charge. The Administration recommends an extended implementation time, to allow industry time to budget for the changes and implement pre-treatment of their own.</p>