MINUTES
LUND WATERWORKS DISTRICT
OPEN HOUSE
Saturday, April 18th, 2026 2:30pm To 4:30pm
The Lund Resort at Klah Ah Men

IN ATTENDANCE:

Lund Waterworks District (LWD):
Frances Ladret, Receiver; Courtney Robertson, Operator; Kelly Rankin, Administrator

qathet Regional District (qRD):
Jason Lennox, Director Area A; Al Radke, CAO; Michelle Jones, Corporate Officer and General Manager of Administrative Services; Linda Greenan, Chief Financial Officer and General Manager of Financial Administration; Mikael Drosdovech, Manager of Assets and Capital Projects; Patrick Devereaux, General Manager of Operational Services

Arielle Guetta, Director, Governances Services, Local Government Division, Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs
Jack Davidson, Environmental and Drinking Water Officer, Vancouver Coastal Health
Mike Seymour, Project Engineer, MSR Solutions Inc.

General Public:
Tom Kiddey, Greg Cran, Ben Bouchard, Cheryl Walden, Dean Bogert, Alan Burgess, Randy Whieldon, Joy Baird, Ron Bignell, Pam Kiddey, Al Wood, Gina Wood, Paul Mercs, Paula Rose, Joan Winegarden, Ted Winegarden, Jen Horsburgh, Andy Horsburgh, John Martlew, Lauritz Chambers, Wendy Larson, Bill McKee, Dave Clark, Karen Lawford, Mike Burge, Brian Johnston, Ruth Sutherland, Ed Levy, Jo Suche, Steve Suche, Jennifer White, Melise McKee, Doug MacLean, Pat Bradner, Evan Gray, Bruce Harrison, Roger Hilton, Rich Robb, Nancy Jeakins, Jan Lovewell, Al Braden, Katheryn Colby, Jim Elliott, Nevada McCarthy, Ryan Mathieson

The Presentation commenced at 3:10PM

Frances Ladret chaired the presentation. She introduced herself as the Receiver and representative of a board of trustees.

Acknowledgments
Frances acknowledged the meeting was being held on the traditional territory of Tla'amin Nation.
Other acknowledgements: qathet Regional District for printing the display information; Shelley Presseau qRD for preparing the displays and creating the LWD logo.
Lund Resort at Kla ah men for providing the venue and assisting with the setup.
LWD Project Advisory Committee for providing input during the project planning process.

Introductions
Frances introduced representatives from Provincial agencies, qRD and LWD and the Project Engineer.

Presentation Purpose and Format
Frances noted that the display boards illustrate the progression of the upgrade project to where we are today. She explained that the purpose of this presentation was to provide a brief overview of this information, leaving as much time as possible for questions. She asked people to save their questions to the end to avoid the presentation getting off-track.

Referencing the Timeline poster, she commented on the length of time (since 2008) that the qRD has been seeking funding to upgrade the Lund system with efforts being unsuccessful until the ICIP (Investing in Canadian Infrastructure) grant for up to $11 million awarded to the qRD [*officially announced in Spring, 2024*].

Conversion Process
Arielle Guetta explained the rationale for the Provincial policy to encourage improvement districts to convert to regional district services. She noted improvement districts were created to provide local service delivery prior to the formation of regional districts. Province now prefers the regional district model for service delivery for more efficient operations. The province does not force improvement districts into conversion. Will encourage conversion when improvement districts are having difficulties. This is a voluntary conversion with both parties, the LWD and qRD, having to agree. Her team assists with the conversion process.

Frances reviewed where LWD is in the conversion process, noting that the primary reasons for conversion are aging infrastructure and lack of resources for major repairs or upgrades since improvement districts are not eligible for grants. She outlined the advantages to a qRD service: better borrowing rates, better insurance rates, support from broader range of personnel. She also noted that IDs have complex administrative and operational responsibilities which are difficult to manage with only part-time contractors Courtney and Kelly.

Upgrade Plan Review
Frances stated that the Upgrade Plan considered what is wrong with system and how those deficiencies could be corrected.

System Deficiencies
Courtney Robertson, system operator, noted the following system deficiencies: LWD does not meet provincial requirements for water treatment; some storage reservoirs are past the end of their useful life; overall storage is insufficient for fire suppression and to support the community demand; the submarine line has corroded fittings resulting in frequent leaks and costly repairs; lack of isolation valves in system require shut downs for leak repairs; fire hydrants are aging; many water mains are undersized and some are not within legal rights of ways; no back up generator available for pumping and treating water during power outages. She also noted that the dams do not meet current seismic standards, but that issue is being addressed through another process.

Frances said that upgrades required for the entire water system have been identified with works categorized into three projects. Project 1 - Capital Upgrades 2026 addresses immediate requirements re treatment, storage, distribution system. Project 2 – Dam Improvements, for which qRD is seeking funding through the Disaster Resilience and Innovation Program (DRIF). Project 3 – Future Distribution System Upgrades for recommended but non-urgent upgrades to be carried out later as funds allow or as they break. She noted that this presentation focussed only on Project 1 – Capital Upgrades 2026 (based on qRD Scope and Cost Estimates Updated 2026).
.
Project 1 – Capital Upgrades 2026

Cost Assumptions and Considerations
Frances reviewed the basis for the Project 1 cost estimates cited on the “Cost Assumptions” display board. She noted current cost estimates are based on studies by McElhanney Ltd. (2022) and MSR Solutions Inc. (2023), adjusted for inflation in 2024 and again in 2026. She also reviewed possible ways to reduce costs as noted in the display.

Project 1 - Planned Works
Mike Seymour, Project Engineer, who has been working with LWD and the qRD for five years, explained the upgrades proposed in Project 1. He noted that dealing with the regulatory agencies, Vancouver Coastal Health, the qRD board and the residents to come up with a solution to meet Canadian Drinking Water Standards takes a lot of hard work. The system has a free supply, but there are costs associated with transporting and treating that supply so people have decent water and so that the environment is not impacted.

He reviewed how the proposed treatment process will work, noting that wastewater would be dealt with at source, not at the wastewater treatment plant. He also commented on the need to upgrade and replace storage reservoirs to

improve pressure and fire suppression capabilities. He referenced the possibility of using stainless steel tanks from the mill site which are good for 60-70 years and may offer substantial cost savings.

Costs & Cost Recovery
Frances reviewed the Project 1 costs summary showing total project costs of $15.3M. She explained the breakdown of costs eligible for ICIP funding totalling $14,594,921 with the grant to cover 73.33% and the remaining 26.67% of eligible costs plus 100% of ineligible costs to be paid by the local community through borrowing. She pointed out that the grant would cover only 73.33% to the maximum specified in the grant award. If less was spent, the grant would be reduced proportionately.

She attempted to explain that although the total estimated eligible project costs were slightly lower than the total approved in the grant award, the qRD intended to seek property owners' approval to borrow the full local share required to access 100% of the approved grant. This would provide some cushion if actual costs exceeded current estimates.

Taxation
Frances noted the qRD was reviewing two options for taxation to recover the debt payment expenses, a flat parcel tax where every property pays the same or a property value tax based on the assessed value of each property in the service area. The qRD board has not yet decided which option to apply.

Tax examples were presented for each option and for the two cost scenarios, one allowing access to 100% of the ICIP grant and one borrowing only enough to cover the local share of estimated project costs allowing use of only 97% of the ICIP grant.

Frances noted that the proposed qRD service area will include only properties that are or will be capable of connecting to the water system once construction is completed, and all those properties will be taxed, whether or not they are connected to the system.

She also pointed out that the qRD taxation authority does not apply to Tla'amin Nation treaty land but TN has agreed to pay an annual requisition that will be equivalent to what they would pay if taxed on the same basis as properties in the proposed service area. Frances identified the Treaty properties and property owned by TN on the display map. Arielle confirmed plans are to remove the properties in white from the service area.

Information was provided on how each property owner could calculate the property value tax that would apply to their property (i.e., tax rate/$100,000, cited as $328 or $337, times property assessed value divided by $100,000).

Estimated other annual costs were noted, i.e.,
- Capital Asset Replacement Reserve Contribution required to offset future costs. L. Greenan noted the qRD must show that it is planning for asset replacement. Approximately $900-1,150 per household.
- Annual user fee to cover system operation and maintenance. This fee will be based on metered consumption but how the qRD will structure the fee has not yet been finalized. Estimated fee $1,200+.

Project Approval
Frances explained that project approval is proposed to be obtained through the petition for service process which will give property owners in the proposed service area an opportunity to say yes or no to the conversion and the required borrowing. The petition content and process for circulating and evaluating were presented, based on the information provided in the display poster. Another public meeting prior to the petition being circulated is likely.

What happens if the petition is unsuccessful was considered. Inadequate treatment and other deficiencies still need to be addressed. No access to grants would mean 100% local borrowing at higher rates, higher insurance rates. Water

Quality Advisory would remain in place from VCH. Unpaid trustees must assume considerable responsibilities and associated liabilities. VCH may be more strict about regulatory compliance if the community turns down the grant.

Next Steps
Frances outlined work the qRD and LWD must complete before a petition can be circulated and conversion completed. Once there is community acceptance the Project 1 engineering, tendering and construction can begin. Completing Project 1 is expected to take approximately 3 years.

Information Sources
Kelly informed the audience LWD has a new website at https://lundwaterworksdistrict.ca/. This will be LWD's main source of information on the Upgrade Project. Copies of poster boards presently on display and a recording of this session will be posted to the site. Questions can be sent to lundwaterdistrict@gmail.com and answers will be provided on the website. qRD will also have information on their website.

Question and Answer Session began at 4:10 pm.
Attendees' questions and comments (Q/C) and responses (A) have been edited for brevity and clarity.

Questions asked during the presentation**:**

Q/C re treatment process. If you keep discharging treatment wastewater back to where you are getting the supply from, we will end up with a highly contaminated source. It is a 4 to 1 clean to four parts crap comes out, so if you put four parts crap back into your water supply where you are getting your supply from?
A: Mike Seymour: We are not putting wastewater back into the water supply. Water taken in has the Total Organic Carbon and particulate matter that is flowing into the stream right now; we filter out the organic carbon; waste is collected from filter and returned to creek meeting environment standards. Dilution and area of treatment need to be determined. Waste water treatment plant cannot handle it. A better solution is to put back in the stream concentrated and then diluted again so as not to impact creek. It will be balanced out.

Q/C re Project Financing. Why is there $400k off of the project cost? Why is the grant $10M rather than $11M?
A: The current total estimated project costs are lower than the costs on which the grant award was based. The grant would cover 73.33% of this lower cost.

The question of why was not clearly understood and no response was provided.

Q/C We pay Powell River a percentage of whatever money we spend in this project. What is that percent?
Question deferred to question session after the presentation.

Q/C Can we get clarification on what the qRD will be charging for the user fee?
A. Estimated fee is $1,200+. Consumption will be metered. How the qRD will structure the fee has not yet been finalized.

Q/C re Taxation and Affordability

- Property owner calculated their annual costs at $7,841. Questions ability of community members to pay for the system, noting that 63% of people in Lund are over 65.
- Who will want to buy a lot that has that level of taxation on it?

Q/C Will the qRD have decided what method of taxation they will charge before the petition is circulated.
A. Yes. The qRD will have decided whether to charge a flat parcel tax or a property value tax before the petition for service is circulated. The petition must state the cost recovery method.

Q/C That may sway the vote quite a bit as well?

Q/C Are other grants available?
A. Arielle advised no joint provincial-federal grants are available right now. If you walk away from this grant, it is very unlikely another provincial-federal grant would be awarded for Lund.

Q/C Have you also looked into Disaster Resilience and Innovation Funding program?
A. Yes. qRD has submitted two applications for DRIF funding that are being reviewed positively. This is for work on the dams, not for the work to be done in the Project 1 upgrades being considered here. qRD also applied to the Watershed Security Fund. Program was oversubscribed and qRD was turned down.

Questions following the presentation

Q/C Will parcels currently within the LWD that will be not be included in the proposed qRD service area, including the Tla'amin treaty land, be subject to a supreme court process to be excluded from the district?
A. Arielle: No, I do not believe you have to go to supreme court to dissolve an improvement district. There would have to be community agreement to do that; then the ministry would have to do an order in council to dissolve the letters patent of the improvement district. In this instance, assuming the conversion moves forward, the process we plan to follow to change the boundaries is to amend the boundaries of the improvement district before the conversion happens to exclude the properties that wouldn't be part of the new regional district service. Those owners have to sign a petition saying they want out of the boundaries of the improvement district and a minister's order to remove them is issued. Therefore, when the qRD prepares their service establishment bylaw, the service area boundary will be the finalized improvement district boundaries. Tla'amin properties are not part of this process. They will be automatically removed because they are not actually in the regional district boundaries.

Q/C What happens if a property is at a location where it can be serviced and it is not connected?
A. Arielle: Typically if a property could reasonably connect, e.g., a line goes in front of your property, but you choose not to connect then you can be charged the property tax (flat parcel tax or PVT) as there is a possibility at some point that the next owner might want it. That property would then need to contribute. For the user fees typically if you are not using the water, you are not charged a user fee. qRD confirmed this is their practice.

Q/C If the property owner is opting out of the petition are they also opting out of fire protection?
A. If 50%+ sign a petition in favour of the conversion and the loan, all properties in the proposed service area are included in the service, even those who did not submit a petition in favour. Fire protection from the Northside VFD remains in effect.

Q/C There 400 properties in NVFD responsible for fire protection costs but only 100+/- are being asked to pay for Lund water system upgrades related to fire protection. I think the project is too much money and people are going to vote no but then they are affecting fire protection requirements. They need water for fire protection but they are not going to pay. I think the petition should entitle everyone benefiting from the fire protection to a reduced price. Can you look into this before the petition?
A. Mike: You are providing water for fire protection to the qRD fire service area. FD pays for equipment but what if water is not available? There are LWD hydrants for the FD to connect to.

Q/C NVFD is getting new tanks and has its own water for fire protection. Can defend for two hours with water on hand at the highway.
A. Mike: suggested working with the qRD on this. qRD/NVFD is required to provide water for fire suppression. Need 750 gallons to 1,000 gallons per minute to fight a fire at the hotel. As its own government entity TN has agreed to contribute the same as everyone else.

Q/C Lund water was being used for fighting forest fire outside of LWD boundary. Your suggestion that the property tax apply to 400 properties for fire fighting is an interesting way of offsetting costs.
A. Mike: project allocates $1.5 million[+] for tanks that meet fire storage requirements. We are trying to keep costs down while meeting VCH requirements. Coordinating with NVFD may be worth investigating.

Q/C To Jason: Has qRD revisited the OCP for the Lund area and looked at the viability of subdivisions to increase the tax base? Also, putting the sewer pipe down Finn Bay Road to service parcels to the north with sewer which would allow subdivision to smaller parcels. It seems the OCP has 0 room for growth. What can we do so that we can start affording this? What can qRD do about 100 parcel owners paying for $20, $30, $40 million?
A. Jason: OCP-wise we are presently working on Savary's OCP. Our staff are trying to make the goals we have work within the regulations. Water is a benefit to more than just our users. qRD staff are taking notes about ideas being brought forward.

Q/C What is the benefit of asking to borrow the full amount versus the bare minimum. It is needs versus wants. Why should we ask for the max?
A. L. Greenan: We are looking at bare minimum cost for Project 1. If tender prices are higher than estimated, we will have limited ability to cover cost overruns. The project can be stuck without the ability to borrow more. Asking for the max will give us more money to work with and the ability to complete the project, with 73.33% covered by the ICIP grant rather than property owners having to pay 100% of the costs to cover overruns.

Q/C Is there going to be a discussion about groundwater or just capital upgrades?
A.

- Frances referred to the display board on groundwater noting LWD and qRD do not consider it a feasible option at this time for reasons noted, i.e., lack of information and funding. We do not have access to reports and have not been able to access funding to investigate, a process which typically takes two to three years. TN is in the process of negotiating its ground water rights under the treaty so is not presently in a position to share its information.
- Jack Davidson: Groundwater will likely require UV and chlorination.
- Jason: Directors have voted to take $30k from feasibility studies account to do a preliminary study.
- Mike: need 100 to 150 gallons per minute. Firehall well produced approximately 20-25 gallons per minute at time of drilling. It is an artesian well drawing water from below sea level. Potentially has salt water trapped which takes a long time to remove. If wells are interconnected with the lakes, then groundwater may be at risk to pathogens; filtration and UV and chlorine disinfection will be required by VCH. If three wells are needed, cost for drilling and servicing (access/power/etc) could amount to about $2M plus treatment cost to replace the $1.2M treatment plant cost. [*Actual budget estimate is $2.3M*]. It is likely more expensive than maintaining and treating the lake source and could be up to five years to have a groundwater source in place. The ICIP grant will expire before then.

Q/C Questioned the high cost for the treatment plant. A reverse osmosis plant can treat 250 gallons per minute for about $10k containerized for emergency use. Why so much money for just the water treatment?
A. Mike: Yes, I believe that is the cost for just the treatment plant [Mike S. cited *$1.2M. Budget is actually $2.3M*.] Plant needs a structure and concrete foundation to meet standards. A shipping container is not a housable structure. People will be working there so a minimum temperature of 60 degrees (Fahrenheit) is required. To meet a municipal standard, I believe $1.2 million is required to treat 600 cubic metres of water per day plus expandable.

Q/C Is a back up power supply/ generators included in the cost?
A. Mike: I do believe so as part of the project. This is an engineer's cost estimate based on conceptual plans. If the community decides to go ahead with this project various suppliers will be contacted to bid based on requirements established in preliminary and detailed design work.

Q/C What is the annual cost of running a $1.2 million system?
A. Mike: 3 to 4% - 2% for maintenance and 2 to 3% for capital cost recovery.

Q/C The maintenance fee isn't in these numbers, right? When I read the last email it was excluded.
A. Frances: It is in the numbers. The operating costs are covered in the user fee. I am unclear what maintenance fee is being referred to. The costs presented were the tax for the debt, the asset replacement reserve, and the user fee for standard annual operating and maintenance costs.

Q/C What average household usage was used to determine the user fee given that metering will be implemented.
A. Water tolls must generate enough revenue to cover the annual operations and maintenance costs. When metering is implemented, the qRD will likely establish a base fee for everyone allowing up to a specified amount of water and another fee for usage exceeding that amount. qRD has not yet finalized how its fee will be structured.

Q/C The questions was how much water is it based on a customer using?
A. Mike: We calculate water demand that includes every resident and commercial user, supplying water to boaters, and leaks of 600 cubic metres to determine maximum demand per day for busiest month.

Q/C BC design guidelines for drinking water systems were updated in 2024 and include things like membrane filtration, slow sand filtration, reverse osmosis. Has the system been assessed against the new recommendations?
A. Mike: I have provided an option that would meet VCH requirements. In preliminary design and detail design we'll be meeting with qRD, VCH, and the province to make sure we meet their standards. The Canadian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines will also be met.

Q/C Is the proposed system the one that was brought forward in 2018?
A. Mike: No. The system proposed in 2018 was around $4.2 million. This system that we are looking at is around [$2.3 million} The previous system assumed that reject water was going to the wastewater treatment plant. That water at about 30% volume would have overwhelmed the plant. We found a system with a lower percentage of water rejected that we are able to treat on site and dispose back into receiving environment.

Q/C When was that put together?
A. Mike: Four years ago.

Q/C 2022. So we haven't looked at any other options or any new technology or anything in the past six years?
A. Mike: We have not reached a point where we are going into detail design. We will certainly be looking at the latest and most advanced technology, but what we are looking at right now is technology to remove the total organic carbon that will meet the drinking water quality. I will certainly look into the system that's $10k.

Q/C It feels like we're kind of being pushed into something. And in my view, this is because of the grant. Can anyone tell me when the grant is actually up or will we actually lose it if we spend more time?
A.

- Mik Drosdovech: The grant project completion date is March 31, 2028.
- Frances: An extension may be possible but likely not for five years. The System Assessment board lists various reports and system assessments that have been done for the Lund water system. There is only so much preliminary money that can go into a project before the regional district has authority to retain the engineer to do detailed design.

Q/C I understand that. If the government came up and said they had new drinking water standards it's just something I would flag as being important.
A.

- Mike: Whatever we do we'll meet those standards and look at any new technology.

- Jack Davidson: There has been no change to the Drinking Water Protection Act in the last 10 year or more. The guidelines that just came out are just guidelines that direct people designing water systems with pretty standard technology and it is up to an engineer to find the best system for local source water. There are new guidelines but it is not the foundation of decision making. The legislation is outcome based.

Q/C On the question of affordability, what does tax deferment look like in our area and are seniors going to be able to access that deferment?
A. L. Greenan: Yes. The province collects the taxes for the qRD and they do offer financial deferment to people who are 55 or over.

Q/C What are the options for folks to help with the taxes?
A. Jason: Grants have been applied for by qRD staff. Another possible grant is up to $7M from the Strategic Priority Fund. Decisions are expected this summer. Fewer provincial grants are being offered due to BC's financial situation.

Q/C What impact would a Strategic Priorities Grant have on this project?
A. L. Greenan: Getting other grants would reduce the borrowing that is actually drawn down. We will only borrow what is necessary to complete the project.

Q/C I understand the Strategic Priorities grant is 100% not 73.33%. Explain what that would mean if that grant was received?
A. L. Greenan: We would rescope the project and then the borrowing would be reduced accordingly. M. Jones: 26% of $8 million would be the goal, i.e., $2,080,000. Mik: SPF application is for the entire distribution system. So, all of that infrastructure cost would come out of the ICIP project.
Frances: Tenders could come in higher than budget estimates so some of the SPF grant may be used to cover those overruns and not necessarily to reduce the borrowing on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Borrowing will be reduced if possible but the project needs to be completed.

Q/C Information presented on groundwater wells sounds like the worst-case scenario. If groundwater proved viable, what would happen to the dams and would there be cost savings in that area?
A. Mike: I prefer to repair the dam than to disassemble it which would create issues of downstream protection and environmental impacts. Dam Safety Officer has said these dams are at a high level of risk for failure. We have proposed to decommission the Lund Lake dam because it is already failing and it needs repairs. $250k to $400k to decommission, that will take pressure off the Thulin Lake dam. Put a new dam in front of existing Thulin Dam that is higher and longer to contain a surge for a 100-year storm event. If we use ground water, my job is to give you worst case scenarios. We have a guaranteed water source now. Groundwater is a risk; aside from risk there is a protracted government process which could mean losing the existing $11 million grant funding, while other levels of government regulate the process for groundwater: have to drill the wells, then prove them with 72-hour tests. Low chances of getting 110 gallons per minute from one well based on existing wells in area. Water in Fire Department well has salt in it. It may get better with flushing for 2 to 3 months; we don't know. The community may find other solutions but you're going to be paying the full cost to do it. Eventually VCH is going to take you to court after 10 years of waiting for you to upgrade.

Q/C Are you saying there are no possible grants we can get if we do not take this grant?
A.

- Mike: Province is in debt. At some point the funding tap stops. There are always grants. Other communities are not getting grants and are having to spend the money themselves. You have a chance here to get a water system at a lot less because you have a chance at a grant.
- Arielle: There are 5,240 water systems, 93% are small – around 4,500. You are the only water system in the province that has a capital grant. If you don't use the grant, that money does not go to another water system;

it gets absorbed into the province and federal budgets. Chances are very, very low that another grant would be awarded to Lund.

Q/C Is the qRD taking over an essential service in Lund a stepping stone to making us into a municipality?
A. Arielle: Regional districts provide a service to only those that want it. They need participating area approval which is why they have to do the petition. Only the people in the service area pay for the service. The chance of Lund incorporating is zero. My office is dealing with the first incorporation in 15 years, for a population of 8,000. The Province is not in the business of incorporating small areas.

Q/C If we get the used tanks, are we still eligible for the grant?
A. Arielle: Yes, I think so. Eligibility requirements for this (ICIP) grant and cost sharing agreement are you have to have a new water treatment plant, a new water storage reservoir, new intake and pumphouse, water reservoir repairs and associated piping and other works.

Q/C What water would we be storing in those tanks? Are they not for water collection?
A. Mike: Tanks would store treated water from Thulin Lake. It is good for individual homeowners to collect rain water but the area required for that to be used on a community-wide basis is massive.

Q/C I thought the community would decide the parcel tax vs property value tax to fund project?
A. Frances: This is a qRD decision, not a community vote. It would be useful for people to let the qRD know your preference.

- Jason: Regional board is going to decide. They will review options and consider community input.

Q/C Is Tla'amin going to build their own system and we will have two water systems or one water system for community?
A. Tla'amin has agreed to participate in the debt for the upgraded Lund system. They would be obligated to contribute to the debt payments for the term of the loan. qRD and TN will enter into a service agreement setting out conditions for supplying and paying for water from one system.

Q/C I hope we do better in considering groundwater then we have. If we find good water, we would a have a system with greater climate resilience. We would need to spend $100k to $200k to look into groundwater.

Q/C Comment about impact of cost on house value at the time of sale. Agreed groundwater should be explored.

Jason encouraged people to send him their comments on the upgrade plan.

The open house adjourned at 5:15PM.