

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO
REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2014
BOARD CHAMBERS**

Present:

Joe Stanhope	Chair, RDN Director	Michael Recalma	Qualicum First Nation
Frank Van Eynde	Member at Large	Al Cameron	Town of Qualicum Beach
Jan Hastings	Non Profit Representative	Charlotte Davis	City of Nanaimo
Jim McTaggart-Cowan	Member at Large	Glenn Gibson	Island Heath
Kevin Arnold	Waste Management Industry	Rod Mayo	Institutional Waste Generator
John Finnie	Member at Large	Brian Dietrich	Member at Large
Craig Evans	Member at Large	Gerald Johnson	Member at Large
Ellen Ross	Member at Large	Michele Green	Member at Large
		Amanda Ticknor	Member at Large

Also in Attendance:

Larry Gardner	Manager of Solid Waste, RDN
Sharon Horsburgh	Senior Solid Waste Planner, RDN
Daniel Pearce	A/GM Transportation & Solid Waste Services, RDN
Rebecca Graves	Recording Secretary, RDN
Paul Thorkelsson	CAO, RDN

Regrets:

Chief & Council	Nanoose First Nation
Chief & Council	Snuneymuxw First Nation
Jeremy Jones	Business Representative
Wally Wells	Business Representative
Ed Walsh	Waste Management Industry
Fred Spears	District of Lantzville
Al Leuschen	Ministry of Environment
Karen Muttersbach	Environment Canada
Al Metcalf	City of Parksville

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 5:25 pm.

INTRODUCTIONS

L. Gardner welcomed the committee members and round table introductions were done by individual committee members.

MINUTES

MOVED F. Van Eyde, SECONDED J. McTaggart-Cowan, that the minutes from the meeting of the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee regular meeting held October 8, 2014, be adopted.

CARRIED

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SWMP) PROCESS & EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (L. Gardner)

L. Gardner gave a brief presentation which included an overview of the process and evaluation of options.

SWMP CONSULTATION PLAN (M. Walker & Associates)

M. Walker gave a presentation on the consultation process for Solid Waste Management Plans and its three stages. Stage 1 includes an assessment of the existing system, Stage 2 develops and evaluates options and strategies for the future and Stage 3 to obtain community feedback on preferred options and then finalize plan.

The consultation plan components include a public and technical advisory committee(s), public and stakeholder consultation, First Nations consultation and Municipal consultation.

G. Johnson asked what the committee members should do if they are approached by residents and Rate Payers Associations that may request a presentation? Who should they ask?

L. Gardner commented that we do encourage committee members to talk to the community and inform them on the discussions that take place at these meetings but any press enquiries should be directed to RDN staff and if any presentations are requested to inform RDN staff.

F. Van Enyde questioned if the Residents Association's want a presentation can we make them aware of what we are doing? Would we consider doing that or at least could the directors receive copies of the meeting minutes so they are aware of what is discussed?

L. Gardner commented that we would be willing to provide presentations to community groups that are interested. The RDN will be but conducting extensive consultation as this is a regulatory requirement of the Plan review process.

J. Hastings enquired on the process of developing the plan for our consultation and communications plan if that would happen tonight or if at least a better understanding on how we would approach the plan?

M. Walker commented that we would at least come up with a consultation framework.

J. McTaggart-Cowan questioned how do we control the online survey so there isn't a particular group flooding the comments?

M. Walker clarified that the on line survey is only meant to test the waters and is a piece of information to help inform the process.

C. Evans commented that at this stage he recommends having more preliminary meetings with associations or community groups and reach out and engage the public as soon as possible.

J. Hastings remarked that people are really interested and should be educated first before making decisions. Does not believe we should have our first collaboration before we are selecting options.

A. Ticknor questioned in regards to Stage 1 is the survey available to view on line?

M. Walker replied that the survey is available for comments and that the draft newsletter will be sent out to homes and will be available on-line.

C. Evans reiterated that in Stage 2 he feels it would be beneficial to have the information displays and public service announcements to the public and have the dialogue start rather than in Stage 3.

J. McTaggart-Cowan mentioned that he believes it is the role of the committee members to bring that communication to various groups and present the information back to the group.

J. Finnie agreed that public meetings tend to bring people in and have them be heard. By the time you get to Stage 3, a lot of people in the public will be saying you've already made the decisions.

M. Walker commented that there is room for all ideas and the general public does want to be educated. Part of the committee's role is to represent the voice of the community and we need to bring that out.

PRIORITIZING THE ISSUES (S. Horsburgh)

S. Horsburgh gave an overview of the presentation which included putting the SWMP review in context, today's reality and underlying challenge, strategic planning approach to decision making, prioritizing the issues exercise and the next steps involved. Stage 2 of the plan review will involve five key elements which include issue identification, public interests, internal and external stakeholders, key messaging, media and evaluation.

J. McTaggart-Cowan questioned the waste success over the years of 2004 – 2012, what is the gross total in all the categories?

S. Horsburgh answered that the total waste diversion was broken down into categories based on WSMML reporting and landfill data. The data is included as an appendix in the Stage 1 report. The 2012 Waste Composition Study helps us to understand where the greatest diversion has been achieved.

L. Gardner replied that what was provided was a composition study of what was and is in the waste stream, but what wasn't presented is the waste generation prediction for the future. Future predictions and any information needed can be compiled together and presented at next meeting.

S. Horsburgh invited the committee to do a table top exercise to prioritize the issues that are marked on the posters and a review would follow.

A. Ticknor questioned if the table top exercise would be available online to further comment?

S. Horsburgh replied we can look at that it could be made available.

J. Hastings questioned when this plan was developed, and the landfill bans were implemented was it anticipated that increased diversion would result in shrinking landfill revenue? If so, what is the thinking that can guide future budget planning?

L. Gardner referred to some of the earlier discussion and work that has seen waste being exported off island because of increasing tipping fees in the region.

J. Finnie commented that when he was involved with Solid Waste, there was some discussion about what might happen if and when waste diversion programs started impacting tipping fees, i.e. the implication being that a reduction in the quantity of waste going to landfill may require an increase in tip fees to maintain the infrastructure. This could drive even more waste away from the landfill to illegal dumping and/or other facilities (like out of province) and further exacerbate the problem. Without additional revenue, this arrangement becomes unsustainable.

OTHER

L. Gardner noted that M. Walker will provide a recommended consultation framework and it will be available electronically. The plan is to have that framework available to adopt at our next meeting.

L. Gardner also mentioned that the RDN will provide a report to the Board early in the New Year regarding potential to reduce tipping fees to stabilize our revenue. This will be done while the management plan is being worked on.

G. Gibson questioned if the capacity at the Regional Landfill is able to accept an increased in percent of waste?

L. Gardner replied that we are not trying to attract garbage flow into the landfill but rather trying to adjust the fee to help to stabilize the industry.

J. Hastings asked what is the time frame attached to this recommendation?

L. Gardner commented that it would be up to the Board.

C. Evans enquired why not leave the tipping fee the same and ask the haulers to haul it away and pocket the difference rather than landfill the waste?

L. Gardner replied if we can stabilize it then we can make rational decisions for the future because it has implications to affect what we've achieved to date and also the loss of tonnage has an economic impact on local jobs vs jobs elsewhere. One concern is that there is such a disparity in fees, if we wait a year to figure things out there maybe no opportunity to change things back.

J. McTaggart-Cowan commented on lower the fees for industry but not for the public. If you reduce in one category you need to reduce for others.

A. Cameron questioned in regards to the commercial haulers, would you take other haulers from other areas if the tipping fee is reduced?

L. Gardner replied that our bylaw doesn't allow us accept material from out of district. But in terms of reduction, for commercial waste haulers, we are contemplating a reduced tipping fee for large generators.

D. Pearce commented that it's important to state that we don't encourage more garbage to the landfill but determining where we are going with zero waste.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40pm.

Alec McPherson

CHAIRPERSON