



Making a difference...together

**Notes of a Special Meeting of the Environmental Service Committee  
Held June 24, 2014 in the Board Room, 625 Fisgard St., Victoria, BC**

---

- PRESENT:** **Directors:** N. Jensen (Chair), J. Mendum (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, J. Brownoff, V. Derman, B. Desjardins, J. Cullington (for C. Hamilton), B. Isitt, A. Bryson (Board Chair, ex officio)  
**Guests:** Capital Regional District Board: S. Brice, C. Coleman, B. Garminga, M. Hicks, G. Hill, D. Howe, L. Seaton, L. Wergeland, W. Milne, G. Young, Maura Walker and Associates: Maura Walker, Morrison Hershfield: Konrad Fichtner  
**Staff:** B. Lapham, CAO, Capital Regional District; L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services; R. Smith, Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management (ERM); T. Watkins, Manager, Policy & Planning, ERM; A. Bergner, Planner, ERM; W. Dunn, Program Coordinator, ERM; D. Dionne (Recorder)
- ABSENT:** **Director:** W. McIntyre

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved on consensus.

**2. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Jensen welcomed everyone and made introductory remarks. The goal of the workshop is to inform the Committee on the status of the solid waste management planning process, present key assumptions which summarize findings in waste management areas and obtain confirmation of direction for the development of strategies for the Integrated Solid Waste and Resource Management Plan (ISWRMP).

**3. Presentations/Delegations:** There were none.

**4. Solid Waste Management Plan Workshop**

Chair Jensen introduced the workshop facilitators, Maura Walker from Maura Walker and Associates and Konrad Fichtner from Morrison Hershfield. Ms Walker outlined the workshop objectives, provided background on the planning process to date and advised that they would present each topic and its assumptions for discussion and confirmation.

Reduce, Reuse and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

*Assumption: There is general support for education and EPR programs.*

Discussion:

- Existing Capital Regional District (CRD) programs don't go far enough
- A weakness with EPR programs is that they are not market-driven
- PPP program lacks ability to reduce packaging. How much influence does a regional district have to reduce packaging?
- The province has limited tools to ensure compliance with recovery goals

- How will we measure success and environmental progress and the benefit to the public in the new plan?
- There needs to be reference to climate change
- Polluters should pay
- How will we tackle contaminated soft plastics?
- Education is often perceived as education for everyone else but me
- Strategies need to clearly define the CRD's role: direct, indirect, advocacy
- Consumer behavior is influenced by education, incentives, convenience, regulations

The Committee supported the assumption.

### The 3<sup>rd</sup> R: Recycling – Collection and End Uses

#### *Assumptions:*

- *The CRD will not get involved in garbage collection in the region*
- *There is a general shift of recycling programs to EPR*
- *A long-term kitchen scraps processing strategy will be in place by 2015*

#### Discussion:

- What is the rationale for blue box service in some areas and not others (like Port Renfrew)?
- There should be no cross-subsidization of blue box costs by multi-family residents

The Committee supported the assumptions.

### Construction and Demolition (C&D)

*Assumption: The private sector will continue to play a major role in construction and demolition waste diversion.*

- *CRD and municipal role focuses on developing policies and regulations*

#### Discussion:

- Include a full economic analysis of public service options
- C&D waste has been a driver for industry in our region and should continue to be managed by the private sector as it is working well right now
- C&D waste is regulated by the province and should not become a local government responsibility
- C&D waste is not a lesser level of diversion
- Add education and incentives to the assumption for the CRD and municipal role
- CRD offered incentives in the 1990's through the Diversion Council but they were not enough
- Illegally dumped C&D waste is an issue in Juan de Fuca EA. Could CRD sponsor one day to pick up C&D waste?
- Victoria is seeing garbage from other municipalities in their public bins
- There will always be some illegal dumping

The Committee supported the assumptions.

### Residual Management

#### *Assumptions:*

- *The goal is to never have another landfill in the region*
- *There is support in principle to expand Hartland landfill as required*

#### *Discussion:*

- Assumption is supportable by adding “within the context of diversion goals” after “expanding”
- 50 to 60 years of landfill life are ok – we could start mining it in 50 years to extract valuables like metals.
- Do we need to expand?
- A better description may be “greatest use” or “change in design” of Hartland landfill
- There are other possible sites for a landfill (for example, in Juan de Fuca area)
- What is in the remaining 30% - how do we plan for zero waste?

The Committee supported the assumptions, with the inclusion of the suggested above wording revisions.

### Resource Recovery

#### *Assumptions:*

- *Prerequisite for waste-to-energy (WTE) is 70% diversion, which is a proposed CRD goal by 2020*
- *WTE will only be considered conceptually in this ISWRMP*

#### *Discussion:*

- Wait to see how other technologies are introduced and function
- The first bullet is not an assumption, but rather a regulation
- The assumption should provide an opportunity to consider viable emerging technologies
- Keep an open mind by not precluding other technologies
- Technologies should be leading edge, not bleeding edge – we need proven technology
- Could the plan differentiate between a business case for reducing waste versus a business case for capturing resources?
- We are missing an assumption to optimize landfill gas recovery to 100%
- What is the problem with incineration? (Consultant answer: Banana – Build absolutely nothing anywhere near anyone)
- CBC is running a program on emotion versus rational?
- We need to use consistent life expectancy numbers for various scenarios.

The Committee supported the assumptions.

**Regulatory and Community Issues - (Post Meeting Note: Appendix B, Page 6 of the Workshop Agenda package, under “Topics” should read “Regulation of Waste Flow” not “Regulation of Haulers”.)**

*Assumption: Waste Flow Management will be considered as part of the ISWRMP planning process.*

- *Allows for potential future implementation*

Discussion:

- Waste flow management will create unrest and raises red flags among industry
- Extensive consultation would be required
- Create incentives to keep waste in-region (like Put or Pay system in Winnipeg)
- Control over waste flow is a way of funding the waste management system – you cannot tax material that leaves the region
- Waste flow management does not allow industry to show innovation
- Assumption is consistent with Regional Sustainability Plan
- Waste flow management would provide needed data for true diversion rate calculation
- It is difficult to implement kitchen scraps processing in the region without committed tonnages
- By having the assumption in the SWMP it allows the discussion to begin
- Halifax is considering removing waste flow management because of its impact on small business and their concern about proprietary information
- We need more information – ask staff to put forward more detailed pros and cons
- There is room for more conversation

The Committee did not fully support the assumption for this revision of the SWMP.

Financial Management

*Assumption: New sustainable financial model for the solid waste function is required*

- *Need to find new funding mechanisms (revenues/expenses)*

The Committee supported the assumption.

**5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

---

CHAIR

---

COMMITTEE CLERK