



MEETING SUMMARY

District of Highlands: South Highlands Local Area Plan

What: Task Force Meeting #6 (Phase 2), South Highlands LAP

When: 6:00-9:00pm, Tuesday, May 18, 2021

Where: Zoom Meeting

Please note: *This document is meant to provide a summary of key discussion topics, discussion points, and outcomes from the meeting. These are not meeting Minutes nor a Record of Decision.*

PARTICIPANTS

Task Force

Leslie Anderson (Council Rep)
 Marcie McLean (Council Alternate)
 Regine Klein
 Rick Lester
 Bob McMinn
 Scott Richardson
 Mel Sangha
 Kim Vincent
 Terri Wood
 Lexie Beigun (Absent)

Project Team

Laura Beckett
 Municipal Planner, Highlands

 Evan Peterson
 Barefoot Planning

 Jennifer Kay
 TownSquare Planning

Guests

Ingo Lambrecht (contaminated sites expert)

Observers

Ann Baird
 Gord Baird
 Karen Burns
 Libby McMinn
 Stephanie

District Staff

Loranne Hilton
 Chief Administrative Officer, Highlands



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



SUMMARY NOTES

Opening

1. Evan opened the meeting by facilitating roundtable introductions.
2. One member requested that the group discuss or consider:
 - a. Previous meeting summaries
 - b. Bob's request as communicated via email about leaving email communication open as part of the Task Force processes
 - c. Who would be able to fill out the Directions survey
 - d. Voting on next steps
3. Regarding who would be able to fill out the Directions survey:
 - a. Concern was expressed with artificial stacking of responses. It was explained that only one response was allowed on the Bang the Table platform per user and/or per IP address. That did not rule out the ability of someone to create additional responses with some effort; however, there was no evidence of this issue during the first survey.
 - b. A discussion was had about who should be able to complete the survey (e.g., "residents only", "taxpayers only"). It was explained that additional demographic questions could be answers and that response data could be sorted by demographic; however, it is best practice to incorporate many groups that might otherwise be missed by these limitations (e.g., renters, employees, commercial/industrial tenants).
 - c. It was agreed that additional questions would be added to identify participants that lived or worked in the South Highlands, as well as business owners, land owners, and employees in the South Highlands.

Q&A with Info Lambrecht – Contaminated Sites

4. Ingo Lambrecht, a contaminated sites specialist, provided an overview of contaminated sites in the context of the Gateway Area. Some of the additional commentary and Q&A included:
 - a. *What about landfills (e.g., GFL, which is the former Chew/Tervita site)?*

There is different legislation for landfills than for contaminated sites, and landfills are typically capped and left alone (unless land values become high enough to incentivize remediation).



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



- b. *What about the off-site migration of Millstream Meadows contamination?*
Off-site migration noted in 2020, and this will be dealt with through the current certificate of compliance process that is underway.
- c. *What area of the OKI site is contaminated?*
The contaminated soils were removed, while the water and wetlands were left. Remaining contaminants were left and dealt with via a risk management approach.
- d. *Who pays for management of landfill closure?*
Typically, the property owner. After 25 years, the property is usually considered “stable”.
- e. *What is the difference among the different “remediated land” categories, with respect to the Contaminated Sites Regulation?*
Please, see categories described in the above linked attachment.
Each is defined by who/what is the most likely receptors for the subject contamination (e.g., adult, child, animals, plant life), what the contaminants are, and what are the pathways by which the receptors could come into contact with the subject contamination (e.g., ingestion, skin contact, breathing). Groundwater is different because of unpredictability of movement and because it is used a drinking water source; therefore, groundwater is a particularly significant factor.
- f. *What is the difference between reclamation and remediation, with respect to Mines Act Permits and Contaminated Sites?*
When a mine is finished, “reclamation” of the land is the first step and is regulated through the Mines Act. “Remediation” may occur subject to the Contaminated Sites Regulation, depending on conditions at the time. Both are separate processes governed by different legislation and regulations.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575

Early Directions Survey

- 5. One member suggested that the Sustainable Gateway option needed more detail and specifics to clarify people’s preferences when they respond.
- 6. One member expressed concern about using a 4-choice Likert scale, as Likert scales often use 5 choices (with a “neutral”). Another member expressed a preference for 4 choices (meaning to not include a “neutral” option).



7. One member suggested to ensure that any competing topics or preferences were given their own Likert-scale “row” to respond to.
8. It was noted that the status of some of the properties in regards to the Contaminated Sites Regulation and the Mines Act will affect what future land uses are possible.
CLARIFICATION: Land use determines the endpoint for remediation or risk assessment for a given site. Individual site conditions will affect the viability and feasibility of certain land uses on certain sites.
9. It was suggested that the formatting of survey is reviewed to see if it could be presented wider on screen.
10. Some members suggested that the survey questions were mostly good as is.
11. One member thought that the Highlands’ values were not captured in the “directions”.
12. Some members thought that the “Greenbelt” option should be presented before the “Sustainable Gateway” option.
13. It was agreed that the option names should be changed and not given names that may be misunderstood by the public.
 - a. It was agreed that the land use option title “Greenbelt” was confusing.
14. One member felt that the description of the land uses were not neutral enough.
15. Concern was expressed about the definition and use of certain terms, such as “eco-industrial” and “low impact”.
16. A preference was expressed for survey respondents to select their preferred future land uses for each property from a range of possible land uses. Another preference was expressed for a continuum of land use choices instead of two alternatives.
17. Generally, it was agreed that the two Gateway options could work with [a] more clear land use descriptions and by [b] structuring the survey differently (e.g., having both options on 1 survey page and addressing both options in the initial Gateway context preamble).
18. One member thought that the land uses presented were too restrictive and represented too narrow of a focus (why not the rest of the Focus Area?).



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575



19. One member wondered why the current OCP direction is not an option.
20. One member expressed concern about Question #26, in that it suggests that tax revenue may be raised for/spent on enhanced remediation and restoration of contaminated lands.
 - a. Discussion ensued.
 - b. Another member wondered about a combination of private investment / amenities and tax income for remediation/ restoration, and not just a burden on tax-payer.
21. It was agreed that additional context information was needed for the Crown Lands in the survey, as well as additional map labelling to clarify their location.
22. One member asked why the Crown Lands included in the land use choices for Sustainable Gateway and Greenbelt? It was clarified that this was based on feedback to date about the future of this area and based on the Crown Lands being outside of the Highlands Servicing Area.
23. One member suggested that past choices are no longer relevant and that the direction should be to preserve the natural environment.
24. It was noted that the survey would not be finalized tonight and that progress toward finalizing the survey had been made. Highlands staff noted that next steps will include:
 - a. Revisions to the survey as discussed.
 - b. Staff and the lead consultant need to look at the status of the budget and timing for the project before any further Task Force Meetings can be scheduled.
 - c. Laura will circulate recent Task Force Meeting Summaries that have not yet been reviewed. They will then be finalized and posted as such on the web sites.
 - d. Laura agreed to a request to make public some previous emails that occurred among the Task Force.
UPDATE: This is not going to be possible due to personal email privacy.
 - e. It was noted that changes may occur to the linked document from Mr. Lambrecht for easier understanding.



Barefoot Planning + Design

barefootplanning.com

evan@barefootplanning.com

778.967.2575