

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO
REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015
BOARD CHAMBERS**

Present:

Alec McPherson	Chair, RDN Director
Craig Evans	Member at Large
John Finnie	Member at Large
Jim Kipp	RDN Director, Deputy Chair
Frank Van Eynde	Member at Large
Ellen Ross	Member at Large
Amanda Ticknor	Member at Large
Larissa Coser	Community Representative
Derek Haarsma	Business Representative
Jan Hastings	Non Profit Representative
Michael Tripp	Business Representative
Wally Wells	Business Representative
Stewart Young Jr.	Business Representative
Charlotte Davis	City of Nanaimo
Ed Walsh	Waste Management Industry
John Marsh	Town of Qualicum Beach

Also in Attendance:

Larry Gardner	Manager of Solid Waste, RDN
Rebecca Graves	Recording Secretary, RDN
Sharon Horsburgh	Senior Solid Waste Planner, RDN
Meghan Larson	Special Projects Coordinator, RDN

Regrets:

Dennis Trudeau	GM, Transportation & Solid Waste Services, RDN
Chief & Council	Nanoose First Nation
Chief & Council	Snuneymuxw First Nation
Glenn Gibson	Island Heath
Al Leuschen	Ministry of Environment
Karen Muttersbach	Environment Canada
Michael Recalma	Qualicum First Nation
Fred Spears	District of Lantzville
Gerald Johnson	Member at Large
Jim McTaggart-Cowan	Member at Large
Michele Green	Member at Large

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 5:07 PM.

DELEGATES

MINUTES

MOVED F. Van Eynde, SECONDED J. Kipp, that the minutes from the meeting of the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee regular meeting held July 7, 2015, be adopted. CARRIED

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE****UNFINISHED BUSINESS****REPORTS****Update on Communications and SWMP Review Survey. (S. Horsburgh)**

S. Horsburgh provided a presentation on the status of the Stage 2 Communications and Consultation Plan. A report outlining the Stage 2 Communications is currently being developed and will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment. The report will outline the communication activities and will demonstrate the RDN's commitment to actively engaging the public in debate with respect to the SWMP. In 2015, there will be 6 mail outs done discussing the SWMP Plan Review and Update, 2 online surveys and attendance at multiple summer and public events.

L. Coser commented on the alternatives given in the survey that financially the costs hadn't been mapped out.

L. Gardner replied that the next time the RDN goes out to the community it will be at another level of detail so that informed decisions can be made based on real numbers.

J. Hastings asked what some of the comments were from the community survey when they answered that they would pay more to maintain or increase services.

L. Gardner commented that it was more to engage with the public and the general sense indicated that they were willing to pay a bit more to have services increased.

Regulatory Authorities to Increase Diversion. (L. Gardner)

L. Gardner gave a presentation on regulatory tools to promote increased waste diversion which included providing an explanation of authorities that may be granted through a SWMP, explaining additional powers that Regional Districts may obtain and provided examples of how these additional powers may influence diversion.

C. Davies questioned why we would get haulers to work as agents but rather mandate anyone that generates waste to sort at the point of generation?

L. Gardner commented that to regulate at the source it would take an additional authority and staffing needs to do the enforcement towards people that don't behave.

J. Marsh questioned if the provisions are not in the SWMP you can't regulate or deal with it, how often does the SWMP change and how difficult is it to amend?

L. Gardner replied that about once every decade and then it takes a couple of years to complete.

M. Tripp remarked on why not put all the provisions in the SWMP and have the debate later.

J. Hastings asked what problems will all this solve?

L. Gardner commented that if the committee believes we can encourage people to do the right thing with diversion because we ask them to, then we don't need any of these provisions. If we believe there is a line and we want to cross that line to compel people to do the desired behavior, then regulatory tools are necessary. If we want diversion to increase over the next 15 years then how do we anticipate increasing diversion? Without these regulatory tools will we achieve the desired behaviour? If we do, then we don't need any of these tools.

S. Young questioned what is the RDN's opinion on the cost of diversion?

L. Gardner commented that if you were to look at mandatory waste collection, either by a single contracted hauler or municipal staff, there wouldn't be a place for you unless you had a contract to provide the service.

D. Haarsma commented that the only provision that makes sense is waste source regulation. The private sector has invested way too much to have the RDN take over collection and in regards to working with the hauler to get source separation essentially the hauler currently has to regulate the customer base.

W. Wells stated that one of the options is to include all provisions and one option is to include none of the provisions. He would like to see future discussion focusing on regulatory authority to address the systematic issues that are holding back diversion and other options that would not necessarily require new regulations.

GROUP EXERCISE

L. Gardner introduced the group exercise and the Committee broke off into groups to discuss the topic "Which regulatory authorities should be considered for inclusion in the SWMP?" and "How might additional authorities improve diversion?"

ADDENDUM

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

NEW BUSINESS

L. Gardner updated committee that there would be future reports sent to them over the next few weeks to help on future discussion.

J. Hastings commented that there were many exercise options that stated further research required.

L. Gardner replied that those required research requested will be addressed in the future reports.

Next RSWAC meeting will be held October 15, 2015.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED J. Kipp, SECONDED F. Van Eynde, that this meeting be adjourned.



CHAIRPERSON

Regulatory Option	PRO	CON
<p>1. Mandatory Waste Collection System (MWC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Source separation is mandatory ➤ Potential to use a co-op for collection like 'recology' in San Francisco ➤ Ship to MRF for processing ➤ Potential to increase diversion % through mandatory collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shuts down competitive business ➤ Destroys Capital investment ➤ Administrative burden on business and RD ➤ Jurisdiction – City of Nanaimo is a provider ➤ Jurisdiction – City of Parksville eliminate competition & free market ➤ Jurisdiction –Town of QB a service provider ➤ Eliminates price competition ➤ Business already collecting from ICI ➤ Limits private enterprise ➤ Too authoritative ➤ Not competitive - does not allow free enterprise
<p>2. Waste Hauler Franchise (WHF)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Table 2 removed it as an option ➤ Slightly better than above as more than 1 hauler used ➤ Ship materials to MRF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Table 2 removed it as an option ➤ As above
<p>3. Waste Haulers as Agents (WHA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Operational efficiencies & reduction of emissions ➤ Ship to MRF ➤ Retains opportunity for innovation and private investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ More expensive collection ➤ Will not want to implement remittance to local govt ➤ Surcharges attached to business ➤ Lot of administration

<p>4. Flow Management (FM)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ship to MRF ➤ Controls material so high grading is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Discourages cross regional coordination ➤ Too restrictive for residuals and does not aid diversion
<p>5. Waste Source Regulation (WSR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Promotes separation at source ➤ Enforcement by private sector is expensive but if works especially if it is done in conjunction with Flow Management. ➤ Higher diversion % from ICI ➤ Promotes high grade products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Public sector responsible for enforcement & administrative costs. ➤ Moderate administrative burden ➤ High compliance through enforcement
<p>6. Other: Recycling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Could provide stable recycling program to back up plan <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What is our goal? Diversion? Increase use of resources. Do we need to define 3R's? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Subsidize last 30% of low value material ➤ Storage of hard to recycle material ➤ Socialize recycling cost