Comox Strathcona Waste Management

Minutes

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes from the meeting held on September 19, 2023 via Zoom commencing at 12:34 pm

PRESENT:

D. Baar	Campbell River
M. Jeffs	Sayward
J. Best	Courtenay/Cortes Island
R. Rowe	CVRD Area B
K. Stubblefield	CVRD Area C
R. Telegus	Denman Island
K. Lukinuk	Hornby Island
K. Hamilton	Tavola Group
L. Eason, CSWM Community Educator	Consultant
D. Hadfield, Director of Operations	City of Campbell River
R. Armstrong, Manager of Asset Management Technical Services	City of Courtenay
C. Perry, Manager of Public Works	Town of Comox
R. Crisfield, Manager of Operations	Village of Cumberland
S. Fisher, Engineering Services Coordinator	Strathcona Regional District
A. Milwid, First Nations Liaison	Strathcona Regional District
M. Rutten, General Manager of Engineering Services	CVRD
V. Schau, Senior Manager of CSWM Services	CVRD
S. Willie, Manager of Solid Waste Planning & Policy Development	CVRD
M. Briggs, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD

ITEMS:

Review of Agenda and Minutes

M. Rutten acknowledged that the meeting is being hosted on the traditional unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, and the Comox Strathcona Waste Management (CSWM) service area is located in the Coast Salish, Kwakwaka'wakw, and Nuu-chah-nulth territories.

The committee reviewed the minutes of the May 11, 2023 Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (RSWAC) meeting and no errors or omissions were noted. The committee motioned to adopt the agenda for the meeting.

Welcome and Roundtable

S. Willie gave an overview of the topics to be discussed, including an update on Step 2 Consultation and multi-family diversion, and asked the group to share any stories, articles, or updates regarding solid waste management from the summer.

Advisory comments:

- Spoke to farmer on Denman using drip irrigation, but had to take PVC pipe to landfill. Should look into option for recycling PVC.
- Talked to farmer who covers hay with plastic (sileage wrap), which produces a lot of plastic that isn't recyclable. Noted that there is an initiative in Fraser Valley to recycle hay bale plastic and

other pilot programs looking at recycling options for hay bale plastic. Bioform Technologies is looking into producing biodegradable plastics for hay bales.

- Campbell River has fully implemented compost pickup and major difference in amount of garbage produced.
- Participated in four repair cafés and are seeing more participants and volunteers.
- Hornby Fall Fair had great presentation given by CSWM and display for residents to view.
- Hornby residents are complaining about road dust at depot, so would like to see timeline on efforts to mitigate dust, such as paving or putting down gravel. Horne Lake Stata also had to deal with dust recently, so might be worth checking on what they did.
- Cortes Island has an impressive level of service, but missing out on roll-out of automated bins in Courtenay.

Step 2 Consultation Update

K. Hamilton provided an overview of the Step 2 Public Consultation so far. Detailed provincial requirements for solid waste management plan (SWMP) consultation, and that the plan can only be submitted after sufficient public and stakeholder consultation. What We Heard consultation summary report is produced detailing what CSWM has done to raise awareness, how opportunities were provided for residents to participate, and to share the feedback received as a public record. Aim is to increase understanding of how solid waste is managed, to make solid waste management understandable and accessible to residents, to engage a diverse range of residents and stakeholders, and to meet and exceed provincial recommendations. Key topics include role of the solid waste management plan and importance of managing solid waste effectively, opportunities and challenges of existing system and future needs, and guiding principles and goals for the new SWMP.

CSWM held first landfill open house and tour at Cumberland landfill on July 8, with 142 attendees and 66 written responses with very positive feedback. Residents were guided on bus to various stops to see and learn about aspects of the site, including the active face, as well as provided information on composting, recycling, and extended producer responsibility (EPR). Tour attendees included a wide demographic, including families and children.

L. Eason, who has been leading community outreach for the SWMP, gave an overview of her interaction with the community. Set up a CSWM booth at over a dozen community events throughout the summer, with 1,820 in-person interactions and 164 written responses. Provided handouts, zero-waste gift baskets, and bean-bag toss game for kids. A lot of residents on islands and remote communities were already using zero-waste items included in gift baskets. Asked residents to read over guiding principles and provide potential action items for community to participate in draw, initiating conversation and providing opportunity to share their insight. Provided brochures and tried to answer as many questions as possible regarding zero waste and managing waste to encourage engagement. Also passed out cards directing residents to submit survey online if residents didn't have time to interact.

K. Hamilton noted strong blend of online and in-person engagement, so important to provide different opportunities to encourage interest. Online survey has been completed 420 times, with 2,276 web visitors, with the survey closing on Monday. Residents are actively directed to the website, and an increase in online traffic is seen when an event or topic is promoted through social media. CSWM held an online open house on September 12, with 25 registrants, with 30 per cent from Comox, 30 per cent from Courtenay, and 40 per cent from the CVRD electoral areas. An in-person open house will be held tonight in Campbell River. The high-level Step 2 consultation findings will be presented at the October meeting, and then presented to the CSWM Board in November.

Advisory comments:

- Next repair café is November 18 at Lake Trail from 11am-3pm. A link to the Facebook post was shared in the Zoom chat.
- What information do we get from those who visit the survey site but don't submit survey? Visitation lets us know if people are aware of opportunities, since they may submit questions or emails, or attend future meeting. Can tell how long people are visiting specific pages and what information they are accessing. Over 2,000 visitors is encouraging since there are already so many avenues to interact with project.

Multi-Family Diversion Opportunities and Challenges
S. Willie presented on multi-family waste management. Purpose is to learn about multi-family waste management, discuss common issues and best practices, and consider how to move forward. From CSWM perspective, looking to reduce waste per person as population grows in service area. City planning is focused on increasing density and construction of multi-family homes.

Multi-family waste is difficult to track at landfill scale, as it can come in as either "municipal collection by contract" or "ICI and household waste." Last year the City of Courtenay changed structure of waste collection, with the City no longer collecting multi-family waste and asking them to move to private collection. After this change, saw around 500 tonnage decrease in municipal waste and equivalent increase in ICI and household, giving a rough estimate of how much waste was multi-family. Staff can also guess the origin based on the type of vehicle dropping off the waste (rear-loader for single-family, front-loaders for multi-family, roll-off bin for larger businesses, etc.). Staff estimate that CSWM receives roughly 2,000 tonnes a year from multi-family dwellings (MFD), which includes apartments and some duplexes or row houses.

Multi-family differs from traditional curbside in several ways. Waste is collected in centralized bin that combines waste from multiple units, so some level of anonymity and hard to determine origin of waste. Collection is usually performed by private collection company, and frequency of pick-up and type of container is customized per location, providing options for level of service compared to municipal pick-up. Recycling may have a different list of accepted materials.

No multi-family services are provided by CSWM. City of Campbell River has funding from Recycle BC for multi-family collection, Comox and Cumberland are providing municipal pickup, and multi-family in Courtenay must utilize private collection. Collection companies often times won't provide collection for more isolated communities. Estimate that roughly 3,800 MFDs are not funded by Recycle BC and are considered served by the depots in Courtenay and Cumberland. Campbell River and Cortes have collection provided, and some west coast communities are serviced by SRD. Comox Valley mostly only covers single-family, with most multi-family and electoral area single-family not covered. Recycle BC only provides $18-22 per household per year to provide recycling service.

Recycle BC shared results of pilot study in City of Vancouver, where they provide service directly, to address contamination in MFDs. Multi-family experiences slightly higher contamination than single-family, with multi-stream seeing roughly 6.2 per cent contamination rate and single-stream seeing 9.7 per cent. 3 per cent contamination is prescribed target. Paper was the least contaminated stream.

Identified three types of challenges with MFD recycling: education, infrastructure, and management and culture.

<u>Education</u>
Higher frequency of turnover as people move in and out, more renters, and wider demographic of residents. More difficult to distribute education material, since may not be able to reach door or enter

building. Lack of signage and continuous communication, but could utilize signage in common areas and welcome packages with cooperation of property management. Need to use recognizable icons and symbols so residents can understand regardless of language they speak.

A study in Ontario showed that a bin in the lobby or commonly accessed area led to higher participation, signage promoted individual action, and a lobby event or display in lobby could help educate residents. Could also distribute resources to residents, including bags, posters, flyers, brochures, doorhangers, etc., but may prove expensive or inefficient depending on quantity or usage. Signage design study showed that images and icons need to be consistent to be effective. A pilot study in North Vancouver was conducted with 144 MFDs to determine effectiveness of education campaign, but found results were inconclusive. Study did notice that indoor performed better than outdoor, as well as locked performed better than unlocked, perhaps due to less illegal dumping from non-residents.

Infrastructure

Need to consider both existing buildings and future buildings. Diversion needs to be as accessible and convenient as garbage. Buildings may have limited storage space for separated recyclables, and areas ideally should be clean, well-lit, and safe. Unlocked bin may encounter illegal dumping. Also need to account for collection vehicle access and size of bins. For new developments, should look to develop buildings with indoor space sufficient for multi-stream recycling, consider access for collection vehicles, and consider accessibility for wheelchairs and seniors (can't expect seniors to use front-loading bin). Could implement design standards from other local governments or utilize referrals to ensure adequate spacing for garbage and recycling for new developments. Developers usually want to maximize individual units rather than common areas, since harder to make money off of shared area. Some local governments make distinction between smaller commercial mixed with residential compared to larger malls and businesses. Owner notification on resale would help educate the new owners on their building's facilities, although trickier with rentals. Could mandate number of bins required per resident, etc.

Management and Culture

Need to reinforce good recycling habits. Property managers are difficult to contact and interact with, so need clear procedures in place on interacting with MFDs. Multi-family also has more anonymity with less monitoring and enforcement, although a champion or ambassador in building can help. Lack of incentives for residents and private contractors for recycling. With introduction of bin service, may see bin cleaning companies becoming active. Could introduce incentives for participating in recycling, such as reduced tip fees. CSWM currently penalizes haulers bringing in contaminated loads, but hauler doesn't feel responsible for the load from MFDs. Would need to consider ways to direct penalty to waste generator or incentivize recycling to avoid contamination at source. Multi-family sometimes treated as commercial by Recycle BC due to being picked up by private hauler, limiting recycling options. Could look at options for contracting haulers to pick up waste and deliver to depot to keep it residential.

Advisory comments:

- Design standards for new buildings and developments could prove a huge benefit.
- Meeting design standards might ultimately be selling point to prospective seller or buyer, especially if well-known enough.
- SRD only has building permit process in Area D, so difficult to enforce design standards in other areas and islands. No regulations there. May see multi-family in Cortes or Quadra.
- Great time to establish local design standards for MFDs. Could it also be somehow incorporated into the builders' association accreditation?

- Denman does have a low-cost building project going on that requires building permit, but most projects generally don't require a permit.
- There are inconsistencies in how the building code is interpreted, so building departments of municipalities in Comox Valley are coming together to ensure similar interpretation.
- Bylaw challenge came up on Cortes. SRD bylaw requires garbage bins at end of road, but MFD is being constructed where bins would be at alternate location, so looking at how to handle that.

Break
The committee broke for recess at 2:10 pm and resumed its session at 2:20 pm.

R. Armstrong left the meeting.

Discussion of Multi-Family Diversion (Breakout Rooms)
The committee broke out into two groups to discuss multi-family diversion.

Breakout Group #1

1. *Share Experience*
   - Live on acreage on Hornby so have to drive and sort everything at central area.
   - In Kelowna (10-unit townhouse) moved from dumpsters to a private hauler to automated carts with the City, which was cheaper and had to manually roll to the curb and back in on collection day.
   - Comox will have three-yard front loader, toter carts, and each individual unit has recycling collected from end of driveway. Trying to transition as many MFDs onto curbside.
   - Had to have a centralized bin.
   - Hard to standardize across the board. Some were built 40 years ago when no recycling was available, so no room for these bins or extra dumpsters.
   - Only way to get change in MFDs is to mandate the change. Too many containers, so had extra bin and took away a paper recycling bin. Management wouldn't supply pick up, so needed to be forced into it. Education won't be enough.
   - Do people in Comox have a depot area? Options are Encorp on Puntledge and Comox Valley Waste Management Centre in Cumberland, but those facilities are very busy and not an attractive solution.
   - Can Comox create a recycle centre/Encorp centre? Comox did have a bottle and recycle depot through Encorp but it got closed down and hasn't re-opened. Owner is still working on it but not successful. Limited on light industrial land available.
   - In 90s in Victoria there was a mobile unit that would go around once a month in the neighborhoods that would take things like batteries and other recyclables that don't get picked up curbside.
   - Friend in Vancouver doesn't have any bins in her unit for recycling, just manually collect things and carry it down awkwardly.

2. *What do you think about the differences between single/multi-family and varying service levels?*
   - Why aren't multi-family covered under these contracts given the direction of housing? They are in Comox, but not Courtenay—Courtenay used to but stopped in 2022 and made them go private.
   - Even though Comox does provide the service, the types of buildings are very challenging since no place for bins. What happens in that case? It's been botched together over the years. Apartments have front-loaded bins typically, but with more focus on increasing diversion. A lot is based on grass roots desire to recycle more. Request of property owners, strata and landlords

to transition that over. Lack of space is biggest issue. Now with different sized trucks and more bins (potentially organics), need to reduce parking stalls to make room and that's an issue too.

- Newer properties are easy, as they know they need to make space. It's the older locations that only had garbage. The only ones that have access to organics collection are the ones that are currently operating curbside. Push for Town of Comox to not join Recycle BC, since there is not enough money to fund what it takes, and with limited staff and stringent requirements, it would be too challenging.
- Town of Comox doesn't deal with organics on multi-family despite the requests but need to have the ability to police it.
- Other issues to consider are who keeps it clean, how, what happens if animals get into it, safety issue, smells.
- Do multi-family residents deserve the same level of service as single family? Yes, but extremely difficult for it to be provided.
- Automated carts being added for Comox, so opportunity to add MFDs? There needs to be 1m between carts so a side loader won't be able to get into the area to do it.
- Patio homes/townhomes in Comox that are able to store carts and place carts out with enough space will receive organics collection, which will provide this service to a number of MFDs. Issue is with dense locations where each unit can't be provided with a cart due to storage issues.
- In multi-family there is not really any yard waste so just food waste. Maybe they could share or have smaller bins? Multi-family and duplexes in Comox are getting smaller carts that do qualify for this. Doing the best they can but no-win situation no matter what they do.
- Are the landlords being contacted for these changes? Have not been contacted for rental properties in Courtenay. Courtenay has taken all multi-family out of the program so that would be why not contacted.

3. *Cost of housing is rising for everyone. Do you think it is important to improve multi-family and organics even if the cost of development raises?*
    - Yes.
    - If we take away some of the development's cost (i.e. sq ft) for better recycling centres, it's still important.
    - If you take up space, it takes away space for the unit. Impacts overall costs.
    - Services are radically different but overall taxes aren't that different. Truck stopping at one place for 40 units. Depends on how full the truck is but maybe that could work.
    - The cost to the economy and environment is a factor for not picking that material up. Getting organics and recycling out of the waste stream extends the life of the landfill.

4. *How do we approach existing multi-family housing that doesn't have adequate space for supporting bins?*
    - How much laneway and city owned or community owned property is there?
    - Ideally no. Comox has some locations/properties in town where vertical MFDs picked up recycling on main road, and Emterra stops and picks up and blocks traffic to do this. Preference is to not have multi-family recycling/carts on the road, but must be picked up in the development itself.
    - If your space is constrained with only a few bins, could just increase frequency of pick up. Would need to tax differently just for that property or community would take it on.
    - Give people the opportunity to go to a facility nearby. Kids are being raised to divert as much as possible, so need to be able to do that. Some people though don't have the ability to drive to these depots.

- CVRD had facilities that have closed because of contamination and not recycling properly, so these facilities would have to be staffed. Very orderly affair once staffed, with helpful attendants, closed gates to block people from entering at night, and education for schools. There is a culture on Hornby though that can't be recreated at other depots.
- All multi-family in Comox is getting serviced by the Town, but the issue is organics. Desire is to transition to have more diversion and service. Staff are dealing with automated carts right now, but limited staff resources available. Will take time to implement.

5. *What are the benefits of delivery of a three-stream collection from private vs. local government?*
   - With private, doesn't become a monopoly. Concern that the solid waste provider doesn't do what they're supposed to do. Might be able to come in at lower cost. Benefits from municipality is that there is certainty that it will get done and is reliable. May get a building that wants to opt out.
   - CSWM has a role to play at the landfill. Don't need to accept loads that are full of recycling, but haven't really enforced any bans. If bans were enforced, the private sector would step up and do more to increase diversion. Hauler would have to dump and sort to be able to bring the garbage back. Pretty soon they'd make changes.
   - Residents in Nanaimo often get notices. They are strict with what is allowed, and it does result in behavior change.
   - The Town of Comox will be notified electronically with the new trucks who has contamination. If people want to change bins size, they will have to have an audit with the Town.
   - What if mini multi-family depot were allowed at buildings with adequate space and collection was contracted for material like film, plastics or batteries to be transported to waste management centre? Encorp businesses are money makers so there is opportunity to make money. People want a curbside collection service and don't want to go to the depot. How a person would get paid or what the business case would be would be the challenge. If they were collecting refundables and getting subsidized by Recycle BC as a residential collector maybe that could offset costs.

<u>Breakout Group #2</u>

1. *Recognizing everyone has different experience with the waste management services offered, share your experience or familiarity with waste collection in centralized or multi-unit properties. What have you observed that has worked well and what could be improved?*
   - Lived in MFD with green waste, recycling and garbage. There was low accountability. The recycling was multi-stream but when carts overflowed the recycling just went into the garbage. Generally good update of the programs by residents.
   - Pre-2000 experience. Single-stream garbage chute in the building and not much in the way of diversion opportunities.
   - Lanes are too narrow at the rear of the mixed-use buildings in Cumberland to serve the downtown area. Trucks can't fit down so waste is collected on Dunsmuir.
   - Like the design standard idea but unsure how to enforce that with private haulers and not a public collection system.
   - Laneways can also make collection a challenge with snow removal.

2. *What do you think about the differences between waste collection programs for single-family homes and multi-family? How do you feel about the varying service levels?*
   - Deeply annoyed by depot service level, and frustrated it can't be improved or can't have access to curbside service.

- What about boat access homes? They have no services at all. Could they get even intermittent services for EPR products?
- Is infrequent curbside pick-up of EPR products possible?
- If we leave it to people to take their recycling somewhere, some will go out of their way and some won't.
- If the cost is visible, it will raise the level of acceptance.
- What if MFDs were required to use carts with RFID so that contamination could be monitored?
- What about an app where people could indicate when they have things ready to pick up? Could that app include sharing services, for people looking for bubble wrap for example?

3. *The cost of housing is rising for everyone in the CSWM area, small towns and rural areas included. Do you think it is important to improve multi-family recycling and organics diversion opportunities even if it raises the cost of development?*
   - My experience says that developers are willing to accept policies for building, so long as there are clear guidelines and no delays. Most important for them is the timeline for construction and not waffling on what is allowed or not.
   - Work with the private sector to collaborate on creative solutions for high volume materials like cardboard. Bike shops, for example, get an influx all at once and it clutters the streets.
   - Large MFDs can't be served effectively with a municipal service in the Village of Cumberland. Should be serviced by private sector.

4. *How do we approach existing multi-family housing that doesn't have adequate space for supporting more bins?*
   - Increase the frequency of pick-up, use smaller bins, and support compaction on site. Reliable sorting needed for compaction, and compaction equipment can take up quite a bit of space so you would need to be generating a lot of materials to make that worthwhile.
   - What about storage of materials on the roof and only bringing down the bins when it was time for pick-up?
   - Reduce the amount of recycling that is created in the first place.
   - Have a designated day for pick up for multi-family, instead of a permanent bin/bins.
   - There is space for bins; it is called parking spaces. Older buildings need to accept that they have to convert some parking spaces into recycling areas. Could work as less people own cars and less parking is needed.
   - The number of parking stalls needed is an outdated figure. Buildings just need to make more efficient use of the existing space.
   - Need out-of-the-box thinking. Perhaps looking to utilize top of buildings where the space is likely under-utilized. Recognizing these approaches will need to be a coordinated approach with building departments to ensure compliance and safety.
   - Need to enforce in strata bylaws and mandate requirement to accommodate three-stream collection for improved diversion.

5. *What are the benefits of delivery of a three-stream multi-family collection service that is provided directly by a private hauler to each building, versus a service that is consolidated and provided by a private hauler but overseen by a local government, like CSWM?*
   - In Area B there is a truck going down the road every day of the week because of private subscription. Supportive of consolidated service.
   - There is a GHG savings for fewer trucks.

- Disappointed with Courtenay backing out of the multi-family service. Regional district could provide that service. There is value in looking at recycling and organics differently than garbage; let that stay private.
- Keep a free market for garbage service.
- Area C always has garbage trucks driving around Tuesdays and Thursdays, for maybe one house at the end of a street.
- Wouldn't it be the same number of companies, whether the service is public vs private? Isn't it just a more efficient service with harmonized administration? Standardized can be efficient. Can multi-family be standardized?
- Can still adjust the frequency of the service and the types of bins, and provide a public service.
- There is benefit to a harmonized service across the region that would create efficiency, provide scale of economy and, therefore, better rates. Perhaps looking at standardizing the service but providing options to meet the needs of different sectors.
- Government doesn't need to get involved in all sectors, but they should fill the gap where the free market is not addressing the need, which is the case here.

Discussion of Multi-Family Diversion (Full Group)
The committee returned from their breakout groups and resumed session as a full group.

D. Hadfield left the meeting at 2:56 pm.

K. Hamilton shared a Zoom whiteboard with the committee. Posed the question "Understanding each requires resources, what strategies do you think are most important to take on, whether that be education, material bans, mandatory source separation, collection service, space requirements for new developments, and other ideas?" Directed the members to share post-its of ideas considered a must, should, could, or won't.

Advisory comments:

- Add to the list of ideas/items
    - Education material mailed
    - Webinars for property managers
    - In-person lobby events
    - Design standards for new developments
    - Create a new CSWM collection service
    - Mandate source separation
    - Increase garbage tip fees for buildings without recycling
- Must
    - Design standards
    - Ban recycling and organics from the landfills
    - Increase tipping fees for MFDs – policies and cost incentives effective for change
    - Depot in Comox
    - Require new developments to make room for recycling centres
    - Make available in rural areas as well
    - Expanding education to create awareness
    - Champion within each building to promote, create awareness and accountability
- Should
    - Provide services to MFDs where possible
    - App for weekly signup for specific material pickup. Can minimize GHGs and optimize pickup route while having special item pickup.

  - Require participation and ensure service options are available
  - Transparency of costs
  - Hornby curbside
  - Require large business to take more responsibility for garbage and recycling, especially big grocery stores
  - Figure out how to compost pet waste
  - More education on what can be recycled
  - Ensure that all residents have ready access to recycling
- Could
  - Pop up depot in the remote areas
  - Create a system of public/volunteer options
  - Mandatory source separation
  - Work with residents of MFDs to find solutions
  - AI technology to provide innovation and compliance
  - Create a system where all recyclables have a refundable values. Charities and other businesses would be eager to pickup.
  - Rooftop bin that drop down for weekly collection in space constrained lanes
  - Mobile depots like what is offered with Recycle BC First Nation initiative
  - Per building compaction in every area in both RDs
- Won't
  - Offer glass pickup for MFDs since contaminated too easily
  - Hornby curbside
  - No more unstaffed depots (just results in garbage being dumped illegally)

R. Crisfield left the meeting at 3:20 pm.

Next Steps
S. Willie advised the committee that the What We Heard consultation report will be shared with the committee in October, compiling feedback from public engagement and events. Invited advisory members to attend Coast Waste Management Association virtual conference on October 25-27 in Victoria, with multiple sessions held on those dates and three additional meetings available before conference, with link to more information included in agenda. Gap in conference schedule for in-person tours on October 25, so looking to hold next committee meeting that afternoon to review What We Heard report. Recommended for advisory members since they can learn about what is happening in other communities and solutions for small communities. CVRD can assist with registering advisory members.

Wrap-Up
S. Willie asked the advisory committee for any outstanding comments and questions. Shared a picture of the first load dumped into Cell #2, which included food waste, waxed cardboard, and packaging that came from a grocery store. Photo received some of the most significant engagement on a CSWM post, with people disgruntled about the type of waste going into the landfill.

Advisory comments:
None.

M. Rutten adjourned the meeting.

GENERAL:
The next Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee is scheduled for October 26, 2023 at 11:30 am.

TERMINATION:
The meeting terminated at 3:29 pm.

Recorded by:

M. Briggs

Michael Briggs
Branch Assistant – Engineering Services

Certified correct:

V. Schau

Vivian Schau
Senior Manager of CSWM Services