

Notice of Meeting and Meeting Agenda Environmental Services Committee

Wednesday, January 20, 2021

1:30 PM

6th Floor Boardroom
625 Fisgard St.
Victoria, BC V8W 1R7

B. Desjardins (Chair), N. Taylor (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, L. Helps, M. Hicks, G. Holman, G. Orr, J. Ranns, K. Williams, R. Windsor, C. Plant (Board Chair, ex-officio)

The Capital Regional District strives to be a place where inclusion is paramount and all people are treated with dignity. We pledge to make our meetings a place where all feel welcome and respected.

1. Territorial Acknowledgement

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Adoption of Minutes

3.1. [21-086](#) Minutes of the October 21, 2020 Environmental Services Committee Meeting

Recommendation: That the minutes of the Environmental Services Committee meeting of October 21, 2020 be adopted as circulated.

Attachments: [Minutes - October 21, 2020](#)

4. Chair's Remarks

5. Presentations/Delegations

In keeping with directives from the Province of BC, this meeting will be held by Live Webcast without the public present.

To participate electronically, complete the online application for "Addressing the Board" on our website. Alternatively, you may email the CRD Board at crdboard@crd.bc.ca.

6. Committee Business

6.1. [21-044](#) 2021 Environmental Services Committee Terms of Reference

Recommendation: That the Environmental Services Committee receive the 2021 Terms of Reference, attached as Appendix A.

Attachments: [Staff Report: 2021 Environmental Services Committee Terms of Reference](#)
[Appendix A: 2021 Environmental Services Committee Terms of Reference](#)

6.2. [21-080](#) 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

Recommendation: That the Environmental Services Committee approve the 2021 Terms of Reference for the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, attached as Appendix A.

Attachments: [Staff Report: 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference](#)
[Appendix A: 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference](#)

6.3. [21-058](#) Results from Solid Waste Advisory Committee Self-Evaluation Surveys

Recommendation: The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:
That this report be received for information and that no changes be made to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference.

Attachments: [Staff Report: Results from SWAC Self-Evaluation Surveys](#)
[Appendix A: Summary of Self-Evaluation Feedback](#)
[Appendix B: Terms of Reference - Solid Waste Advisory Committee](#)

6.4. [21-053](#) Solid Waste Advisory Committee Motion of November 6, 2020

Recommendation: The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:
That staff be directed to continue to follow the October 14, 2020 Board recommendation that staff report back on the first annual report on the Solid Waste Management Plan on measures that can be taken to achieve more aggressive waste reduction targets.

Attachments: [Staff Report: Solid Waste Advisory Committee Motion of November 6, 2020](#)
[Appendix A: Sept. 16, 2020 Environmental Services Committee Staff Report](#)

6.5. [21-081](#) Solid Waste Management Plan Consultation - Phase 2 - Verbal Update

7. Notice(s) of Motion

8. New Business

9. Adjournment

The next meeting is February 17, 2021.

To ensure quorum, please advise Sherri Closson (sclosson@crd.bc.ca) if you or your alternate cannot attend.

Meeting Minutes

Environmental Services Committee

Wednesday, October 21, 2020

1:30 PM

6th Floor Boardroom
625 Fisgard St.
Victoria, BC V8W 1R7

PRESENT:

Directors: D. Blackwell (Chair), N. Taylor (Vice Chair), B. Desjardins, L. Helps, M. Hicks, G. Holman (EP), J. Loveday, J. Ranns, D. Screech, R. Windsor

Staff: L. Hutcheson, General Manager, Parks and Environmental Services; G. Harris, Senior Manager, Environmental Protection; R. Smith, Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management; M. Lagoa, Acting Deputy Corporate Officer; S. Closson, Committee Clerk (Recorder)

Regrets: Directors C. McNeil-Smith, C. Plant

EP - Electronic Participation

The meeting was called to order at 1:41 pm.

1. Territorial Acknowledgement

J. Loveday provided a Territorial Acknowledgement.

2. Approval of Agenda

MOVED by Director Taylor, **SECONDED** by Director Loveday,
That the agenda be amended to add new business by Director Helps in Section 8.
That the agenda for the October 21, 2020 Environmental Services Committee meeting be approved as amended.
CARRIED

3. Adoption of Minutes

3.1. [20-665](#) Minutes of the September 16, 2020 Environmental Services Committee Meeting

MOVED by Director Taylor, **SECONDED** by Director Screech,
That the minutes of the Environmental Services Committee meeting of September 16, 2020 be adopted as circulated.
CARRIED

4. Chair's Remarks

There were no Chair's remarks.

5. Presentations/Delegations

There were no presentations or delegations.

6. Committee Business

6.1. [20-631](#) 2019-2022 Climate Action & Environmental Stewardship Service Planning

L. Hutcheson introduced the 2019 - 2022 Climate Action & Environmental Stewardship Service Planning.

Discussion ensued on the following:

- building energy retrofit grants
- climate action service delivery establishment date
- climate service maximum funding
- climate emergency progression

**MOVED by Director Helps, SECONDED by Director Windsor,
The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:**

- 1. That Appendix A, Community Needs Summary - Climate Action & Adaptation, be approved as presented and advanced to the October 28, 2020 provisional budget review process;**
- 2. That staff pursue the completion of an updated Climate Action Strategy;**
- 3. That staff pursue completion of a detailed business case for a Regional Energy Retrofit Program; and**
- 4. That staff report back in 2021 with 2022 budget implications (as proposed in the May 13, 2020 CRD Board staff report).**

CARRIED

6.2. [20-618](#) 2019-2022 Landfill & Recycling Service Planning

L. Hutcheson introduced the 2019-2022 Landfill & Recycling Service Planning.

Discussion ensued on the operational hours of the Hartland Landfill.

**MOVED by Director Helps, SECONDED by Director Loveday,
The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:**

That Appendix A, Community Need Summary - Landfill & Recycling, be approved as presented and advanced to the October 28, 2020 provisional budget review process.

CARRIED

6.3. [20-630](#) Enerkem Facility Update

R. Smith presented the Enerkem Facility Update.

Discussion ensued on the following:

- Enerkem non-disclosure requirements
- Enerkem gasification residual ratio
- Enerkem current operating capacity as a commercial demonstration facility
- additional Canadian gasification facilities
- previous/past RFP participants
- gasification as a possible long-term solution

**MOVED by Director Windsor, SECONDED by Director Taylor,
The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional
District Board:**

That this report be received for information.

CARRIED

**MOVED by Director Windsor, SECONDED by Director Hicks,
That we enter into a non-disclosure agreement with Enerkem to gather
information.**

**MOVED by Director Windsor, SECONDED by Director Taylor,
The question was called on the arising motion.**

CARRIED

**MOVED by Director Windsor, SECONDED by Director Hicks,
That we enter into a non-disclosure agreement with Enerkem to gather
information.**

CARRIED

6.4. [20-608](#) Provincial Plastics Action Plan Update and Next Steps

Discussion ensued on the following:

- styrofoam inclusion in definition
- styrofoam options for gasification
- single-use items in the federal government program
- return options for deposit items eligible for gasification
- Jason Adams styrofoam recycling

**MOVED by Director Taylor, SECONDED by Director Helps,
The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional
District Board:**

That the Plastics Action Plan and Next Steps report be received for information.

CARRIED

**6.5. [20-650](#) Motion from Solid Waste Advisory Committee (meeting of October 2,
2020)**

Director Taylor spoke to the motion from the Solid Waste Advisory Committee
and an opportunity to do a self assessment of that committee.

Discussion ensued on the following:

- results of the self-assessment
- template for self-assessment
- a commitment by the committee to ensure continuing contributions by its
members

**MOVED by Director Taylor, SECONDED by Director Loveday,
That the Solid Waste Advisory Committee request support and direction from the
Environmental Services Committee for the opportunity for the Solid Waste
Advisory Committee to do a self-assessment survey.**

CARRIED

7. Notice(s) of Motion

There were no Notice(s) of Motion.

8. New Business

Director Helps spoke to the upcoming Resilience Summit being held by Zoom on November 6th and encouraged participation from directors and staff. She requested the report handed out to the directors at the meeting be forwarded to all CRD Board members.

Discussion ensued on the data from the University of Victoria regarding rural emissions.

Director Windsor left the meeting at 2:25 pm.

9. Adjournment

**MOVED by Director Helps, SECONDED by Director Screech,
That the October 21, 2020 Environmental Services Committee meeting be
adjourned at 2:29 pm.
CARRIED**

Chair

Recorder

**REPORT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021**

SUBJECT 2021 Environmental Services Committee Terms of Reference

ISSUE SUMMARY

This report is to provide the 2021 Terms of Reference for the Committee's review.

BACKGROUND

Under the *Local Government Act* and the Capital Regional District (CRD) Board Procedures Bylaw, the CRD Board Chair has the authority to establish Standing Committees and to appoint members to provide advice and recommendations to the Board.

On December 9, 2020, the Regional Board approved the 2021 Standing Committee Terms of Reference. Terms of Reference (TOR) serve to clarify the mandate, responsibilities and procedures of standing committees and provide a point of reference and guidance for the committees and members.

This year, there were no changes to the defined purpose of the Committee's TOR. Minor housekeeping changes were made to the pro-forma provisions of the TOR, including updates to the language under committee composition to clarify that all Board Members can attend all committees, but not vote unless a member; and clarification to the provision regarding creation of the committee agenda, to reinforce that Board Members may raise items for the agenda through the notice of motion process.

The TOR are being provided for review by the committee. Any proposed revisions to the TOR will require ratification by the Board.

CONCLUSION

Terms of Reference serve to clarify the mandate, responsibilities and procedures of committees and provide a point of reference and guidance for the committees and their members.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Environmental Services Committee receive the 2021 Terms of Reference, attached as Appendix A.

Submitted by:	Larisa Hutcheson, P.Eng., General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services
Concurrence:	Kristen Morley, J.D., General Manager, Corporate Services & Corporate Officer
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT

Appendix A: 2021 Terms of Reference – Environmental Services Committee



ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

PREAMBLE

The Capital Regional District (CRD) Environmental Services Committee is a standing committee established by the CRD Board and will oversee and make recommendations to the Board regarding waste management, resource recovery, climate change and other environmental matters.

The Committee's official name is to be:

Environmental Services Committee

1.0 PURPOSE

- a) The mandate of the Committee includes overseeing and making recommendations to the Board regarding the following functions:
 - i. Regional solid waste function
 - ii. Environmental protection, monitoring and compliance
 - iii. Community climate action
 - iv. Resource recovery opportunities
- b) The Committee will also:
 - i. Serve as the Plan Monitoring Advisory Committee for the current Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP)
 - ii. Stand as the steering committee for the revised SWMP
- c) The following committees will report through the Environmental Services Committee:
 - i. Climate Action Inter-Municipal Task Force
 - ii. Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)

2.0 ESTABLISHMENT AND AUTHORITY

- a) The Committee will make recommendations to the Board for consideration; and
- b) The Board Chair will appoint the Committee Chair, Vice Chair and Committee members annually.

3.0 COMPOSITION

- a) Committee members will be appointed CRD Board Members;
- b) All Board members are permitted to participate in standing committee meetings, but not vote, in accordance with the CRD Board Procedures Bylaw; and
- c) First Nation members are permitted to participate in standing committee meetings at their pleasure, in accordance with the CRD Procedures Bylaw, where the Nation has an interest in matters being considered by the committee.

4.0 PROCEDURES

- a) The Committee shall meet on a monthly basis, except August and December, and have special meetings, as required
- b) The agenda will be finalized in consultation between staff and the Committee Chair and any Committee member may make a request to the Chair to place a matter on the agenda through the Notice of Motion process;
- c) With the approval of the Committee Chair and the Board Chair, Committee matters of an urgent or time sensitive nature may be forwarded directly to the Board for consideration; and
- d) A quorum is a majority of the Committee membership and is required to conduct Committee business.

5.0 RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

- a) The General Manager of Parks & Environmental Services will act as liaison to the Committee; and
- b) Minutes and agendas are prepared and distributed by the Corporate Services Department.

Approved by CRD Board January 13, 2021



**REPORT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021**

SUBJECT 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

ISSUE SUMMARY

This report is to provide the 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference for the Committee's approval.

BACKGROUND

Under the *Local Government Act* and the CRD Board Procedures Bylaw, the CRD Board Chair has the authority to establish Standing Committees and appoint members to provide advice and recommendations to the Board.

On December 9, 2020, the Regional Board approved the 2021 Standing Committee Terms of Reference for the Environmental Services Committee. Terms of Reference (TOR) serve to clarify the mandate, responsibilities and procedures of standing committees and provide a point of reference and guidance for the committees and members.

This year, there was a change made to the composition of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee: The Chair of the Environmental Services Committee shall be Chair of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. There were no changes to the defined purpose of the Committee's TOR.

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee's TOR will require approval by the Environmental Services Committee. Any proposed revisions to the TOR also require ratification by the Environmental Services Committee.

CONCLUSION

Terms of Reference serve to clarify the mandate, responsibilities and procedures of committees and provide a point of reference and guidance for the committees and their members.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Environmental Services Committee approve the 2021 Terms of Reference for the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, attached as Appendix A.

Submitted by:	Stephen May, P.Eng., Acting General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services
Concurrence:	Kristen Morley, J.D., General Manager, Corporate Services & Corporate Officer
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT

Appendix A: 2021 Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference



SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PREAMBLE

The Capital Regional District (CRD) Solid Waste Advisory Committee is an Advisory Committee established by the CRD Environmental Services Committee to provide input on solid waste management matters and meet the requirements of the Ministry of Environment's *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning* for an advisory committee on the development and implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP).

The Committee's official name is to be:

Solid Waste Advisory Committee

1.0 PURPOSE

The mandate of the Committee includes advising the Environmental Services Committee regarding the following:

- a) providing input on major solid waste management matters
- b) serving as the advisory committee to the Steering Committee (Environmental Services Committee) on the development of Revision 3 of the SWMP
- c) acting as plan monitoring advisory committee for the new SWMP, once approved

2.0 ESTABLISHMENT AND AUTHORITY

- a) The Environmental Services Committee will:
 - appoint the committee members for up to a three-year term
 - act as the Steering Committee for Revision 3 of the SWMP
 - appoint a member as the liaison between the advisory committee and the Environmental Services/Steering Committee
- b) The Committee will report its input to the Environmental Services Committee for consideration. The CRD Board is the final decision-making authority.

3.0 COMPOSITION

The Committee shall consist of members representing a diversity of background, interests and geographical location, representing a balance between technical and non-technical members and industry and public members, as follows:

Representation	Number of Members
Regional District Director (The Chair of the Environmental Services Committee)	1
Municipal engineering staff who are involved in solid waste collection	2
Electoral Area representative	1
First Nations	2
Environmental organizations	1
Business groups	1
Non-profit group with an interest in solid waste (e.g. reuse organization)	1
Large waste generators (industrial, commercial, institutional)	2
Owners/operators of private waste management facilities	2
Private sector industry collection service providers	2
Composting industry representative	1
Product stewardship agency	1
Community representative (representing Prospect Lake/Hartland area)	1
Public representatives, at large	3
Willis Point representative	1
District of Highlands representative	1

4.0 PROCEDURES

- a) The CRD Board Procedures Bylaw will apply.
- b) The Chair of the Environmental Services Committee shall be Chair of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee
- c) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair and have special meetings, as required.
- d) The agenda will be finalized in consultation between staff and the Chair.
- e) A quorum is a majority of the committee membership and is required to conduct committee business.

5.0 RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

- a) The Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management, will lead the coordination and allocation of resources to the Committee.
- b) Minutes and agendas are prepared and distributed by the Environmental Resource Management division.

Approved by Environmental Services Committee on _____

**REPORT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021**

SUBJECT **Results from Solid Waste Advisory Committee Self-Evaluation Surveys**

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) was interested in completing a self-evaluation survey to improve the effectiveness of the committee.

BACKGROUND

At its October 2, 2020 meeting, SWAC requested support and direction from the Environmental Services Committee (ESC) for the opportunity for SWAC to do a self-assessment survey. The ESC endorsed this request at its October 21 meeting. As a result, SWAC finalized the survey questions at its November meeting and the survey was distributed to SWAC members on November 23, with responses due back by December 18. Completed surveys were received from 11 of the 22 committee members (with 1 that hasn't arrived due to Canada Post delays). A summary of the feedback received is attached as Appendix A.

The survey responses are generally positive regarding the effectiveness of the Committee, with a minority expressing concerns around two main issues:

- the Environmental Services Committee/CRD Board decision not to be more aggressive with the Solid Waste Management Plan waste reduction targets; and
- SWAC Terms of Reference not allowing more direct input into Hartland Landfill/ Environmental Resource Management operational details.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

That this report be received for information and that no changes be made to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference.

Alternative 2

That the Environmental Services Committee make changes to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the survey, staff recommend maintaining the committee's Terms of Reference (attached as Appendix B) and continuing to focus committee work based on the Terms of Reference.

RECOMMENDATION

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

That this report be received for information and that no changes be made to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee Terms of Reference.

Submitted by:	Russ Smith, Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management
Concurrence:	Steve May, P.Eng., Acting General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Summary of Self-Evaluation Feedback

Appendix B: Terms of Reference – Solid Waste Advisory Committee

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

		Yes	Somewhat	No
1.	<p>Do you think the Advisory Committee membership, as defined in the Terms of Reference, has an appropriate balance of skills, experiences and backgrounds?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Advisory Committee membership is well balanced in terms of skills, experiences, and backgrounds. It would be good to encourage all members to articulate the perspectives of their stakeholder group more clearly. • I think we would benefit from more First Nations voices. 	10	1	0
2.	<p>Do you think Advisory Committee meetings are properly focused on items identified by the SWAC Terms of Reference?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We appear to be suffering from mission drift at this point with repeated attempts to move the agenda back to items outside of scope. • I have attended only one meeting but most of the conversation dealt with the wording of this survey. Self-assessment is not listed in the Terms of Reference. • I can't really answer this accurately as I joined the committee recently and only attended one meeting • We spend a lot of time on housekeeping issues. • I think we can get off topic slightly from the big picture and end up arguing/becoming a little bit pedantic (sometimes), but overall the meetings have good focus, and we touch on the relevant points. • The Terms of Reference state that the Advisory Committee “includes advising the Environmental Services Committee regarding the following (a) providing input on major solid waste management matters, (b) serving as the advisory committee to the Steering Committee (Environmental Services Committee) on the development of Revision 3 of the SWMP, (c) acting as plan monitoring advisory committee for the new SWMP, once approved.” As outlined below, the focus of the Advisory Committee has been mainly on (b), with relatively little work having been requested or initiated on (a). Activity (c) will only become relevant once the SWMP is approved. 	5	4	2

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

		Yes	Somewhat	No
3.	<p>Do you believe Advisory Committee meetings allow sufficient time to discuss the business at hand?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We appear to be suffering from mission drift at this point with repeated attempts to move the agenda back to items outside of scope. • yes if the agenda is specific and the group do not get off topic • It seemed at times that the presentations of the policy by the consultants lacked an implicit invitation to get involved in discussion. They were tedious and long and did not really invite comment in their content. I may have had this reaction as a person used to vigorous discussion about ideas with input in advance of policy. And I also have little experience with this sort of presentation. It seemed mind numbing though, I expect, it was well done. • Sometimes feel like it is a large committee and not enough time to discuss issues in an in-depth manner. It is such a large group and hard to keep the thread of the discussion going. • If the Advisory Committee would meet monthly, each time with a well-defined agenda, there would be enough time to do more comprehensive work. Unfortunately, monthly meetings were frequently not convened. Specifically, there were no meetings in late 2019 and early 2020, Sep 2020 and Dec 2020. In my view, there was inadequate discussion of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the draft SWMP achieving its main objectives, in particular, reaching the annual landfill target of 250 kg per capital. While the actions proposed in the draft SWMP will undoubtedly result in reductions in the waste destined for landfilling, the extent is largely unknown. The reductions expected from each action (a total of 69), strategy (a total of 15), and strategy area (a total of 3) should be quantified more thoroughly. ii. the solid wastes (in terms of composition and total quantity) that will have to be managed in future years, as the CRD population grows and its economic activities change. The projections should extend to the year 2100, even though the specific end date of the draft SWMP is the year 2030. The reason for having projections beyond 2030 is that the draft SWMP must align with the overarching strategy of balancing waste generation and waste management in the long term and within the capabilities of the Hartland Landfill and other CRD entities. iii. the future of the Hartland Landfill site. This is a key issue not only for residents and businesses in the area near the Landfill, but the entire CRD. The draft SWMP does not set out options, 	6	4	1

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<p>recommendations, and implications pertaining to the Hartland Landfill. The SWMP should do so.</p> <p>iv. the fate of diverted wastes, notably plastics, metals, and construction wastes, most of which are expected to be ultimately processed outside the CRD. It is presently unclear what options the CRD has if some of the external entities are unwilling or unable to take CRD wastes, even if they have been properly preprocessed or separated in the CRD.</p> <p>v. the disposition of composted wastes. Specifically, does the CRD have the potential to use the composted wastes within the CRD or do they have to be exported on a major scale, thereby creating challenges like those stated in (iv) above?</p> <p>vi. innovative options, especially options of a technical nature, to address the solid waste challenges in the CRD so that the annual landfill target of 250 kg per capita can be reached with some certainty by the year 2030 and make further reductions possible beyond 2030.</p> <p>vii. the options regarding landfill gas utilization. As a result, the strategic implications of the options do not appear to be adequately understood from an overall environmental perspective. It is therefore unclear whether the correct decision is being made.</p> <p>Items (i) to (vi) pertain to the draft SWMP. I view the draft SWMP as a work in progress and open to significant enhancement.</p>			
4.	<p>Do you think Advisory Committee meetings allow for candid, constructive discussion and critical questioning?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be a division of opinion that has developed, again around specific items that are outside of scope but clearly of concern to parties with an interest in local issues around the Landfill. I understand both the frustration and the concern but it is currently blocking the process of developing a constructive plan for the wider CRD community to enable the region to move forward and start actioning items. Individual municipalities are now filling the gaps where a regional plan is not in place that is sufficiently up-to-date and relevant to recent changes. • But you have to be patient if you want to raise a topic for discussion, i.e. submit a Notice of Motion in meeting and obtain approval in the next. • only based on one meeting • As the group matured and there was more comfort in participating in the discussion I think candid, constructive discussion occurred. Initially the presentations were not provocative enough to 'incite' such discussion. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>7</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>4</p>	<p>No</p> <p>0</p>

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think CRD staff are amazing and listen and do not get defensive, even when actions are being critiqued. The chair does a good job and sets a respectful tone. • The Advisory Committee has a good, collaborative, and respectful working style. This is attributable to the leadership and fairness of its Chairs as well as the collaboration and shared common purpose of its members. There are no adversarial factions or strident members. <p>Advisory Committee deliberations are largely in the nature of information exchange; this is valuable. However, focused discussions aimed at bringing forward innovative solutions to waste management problems are largely missing. Standard solutions are presented (principally by consultants and staff), reflecting early workings of the Advisory Committee, but it is unclear that these solutions will achieve the desired level of success (see item 3 i above). The lack of discussion on future implications for the Hartland Landfill and its landfill gas (see items 3 iii to vii above) is noteworthy.</p> <p>Advisory Committee members regularly question and provide suggestions to staff and consultants but, in my view, with limited results. As an example, I point to the information material that was provided for the first set of public consultations in late 2019. Several important suggestions were made by members of the Advisory Committee, but not implemented. While the staff and consultants were under no obligation to act on the suggestions made, it appears from the public feedback received that adoption of the suggestions would have reduced, at a minimum, important uncertainties expressed by some respondents. No specific advice was sought from the Advisory Committee on consultation materials to be used for the second set of public consultations that are currently underway.</p> <p>The current draft of the SWMP was discussed by the Advisory Committee on several occasions, using a section-by-section approach. This was essential and important. However, no discussion has occurred on the overall feasibility and practicality of the draft SWMP, thereby gaining some certainty that the desired goals and targets can be achieved.</p> <p>In a memorandum (dated Nov 5, 2020) to the SWAC Chair and Senior Manager (Environmental Resource Management, Parks & Environmental Services Department), I raised several points regarding the draft SWMP and the second set of public consultations. No response has been received to date and the regular meeting of the Advisory</p>			
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	Committee scheduled for Dec 4, 2020, where these points could have been discussed, was cancelled.			
5.	<p>Do you find that pre-meeting materials clearly identify the significant issues, trends or developments for Advisory Committee discussion?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes the pre-materials are sent without much notice, but for the most part I really appreciate these materials and think they aid discussion and developments for the committee. • The materials provided to the Advisory Committee tend to be voluminous, often without identifying specific issues to be addressed. Where appropriate, alternatives to issues should be presented in advance of meetings so that they can be considered by Advisory Committee members and then discussed in meetings. Agendas would benefit from being more specific, posing issues and/or questions to be discussed. SWAC members should be encouraged to share, in particular, the perspectives of their stakeholders. For example, very little has been learnt thus far about the ability of recyclers in the CRD to increase their capacity and the conditions under which these increases can be achieved. Similarly, little has been learnt about what the regional universities, colleges, and other organizations with research, development, and innovation capabilities can contribute to addressing issues identified in the draft SWMP. The pre-meeting materials and meeting agendas should be created so that they challenge the Advisory Committee members to contribute to the solution of solid waste management problems, especially those problems for which good solutions presently do not exist. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>9</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>2</p>	<p>No</p> <p>0</p>
6.	<p>Using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=poor, 5=excellent), how would you rate overall Advisory Committee performance to date? Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel a bit new to the process to be able to rate performance. • 4 – I think we push the Environmental Board and CRD Board to “do better” and challenge them/keep them on their toes, and also we learn things in the process of our discussions which is valuable. • 4 – Initial stages progressed quickly with good understanding of the issues and sufficient momentum. Recent changes due to COVID delays and membership turnover has begun to erode that progress. • 4 – The Committee successfully identified “what” needs to be done. More work is needed in establishing “how” it needs to be done, by “whom” and by “when”. • 4 - I rate it as a 4 (couldn't figure out how to mark this otherwise). There are representatives present who have the expertise to comment so that they illuminate what is being asked of the committee, thus inviting others to join the discussion. 			

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 - Only based on one meeting • 2.5 - As stated already, the Advisory Committee works harmoniously and collaboratively. This is very positive. In collaboration with CRD staff and its consultants, the Advisory Committee can assist with the development of a SWMP that will lead to major reductions in wastes directed to the Hartland Landfill, while also reflecting the principles of sustainability and the circular economy more generally. However, these objectives cannot be achieved without major innovations. The application of current best practices, as used elsewhere in Canada and abroad, are likely insufficient. New approaches need to be developed. The CRD can do this and example possibilities should be identified in the SWMP. In my view, the Advisory Committee is working below its potential, but this can change. I give its performance to date a rating of 2.5. • 2 - The Advisory committee has performed well in my experience, however the meetings of the last several months have been mostly focussed on procedure. Perhaps there is misunderstanding by some committee members as to an “advisory” v a “decision” role.
7.	<p>Do you have suggestions for improving the way in which the Advisory Committee functions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members may need more background to bring them up to speed with the process and progress to date before coming in to the meetings. Some expectations need to be set in advance to avoid moving out of the terms of reference. • Let me attend a few more meetings and I will have something for you next time. • There needs to be a time limit for each person, and very specific discussion items directly related to the draft document so that the meeting does not get hijacked by discussion of other items. • Give some thought to gathering input around agenda and minutes in advance of the meeting and summarize at the meeting so that this review can go quicker • I think it is helpful if we have a team who sticks around, as a lot of the discussions are cumulative – it would be nice to get new people up to speed/have a way to have all the information in one place perhaps an understanding of where each member is coming from and how that informs our recommendations. • Less presentation and more discussion. Small group discussions are good but the opportunity to share the results is sometimes cut off. Good discussion sparks more discussion and the small group ideas might not get enough time for reaction and further digestion. Presentations such as those by the consultants tend to stifle my ability to make coherent comments. I am never quite sure what is being asked of us as reaction until others make their comments. I expect this is as a result of not being in such large, bureaucratic venues. • Not sure what changes are possible given the structures / parameters of CRD. • I think staff/chair are doing an excellent job. • The Advisory Committee would benefit, in my view, by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving its agendas, with issues and questions clearly identified in advance of meetings and supported by accompanying documentation with potential options stated. - consulting Advisory Committee members on agenda items in advance of future meetings. - requesting consultants and staff to provide their presentation materials in advance and in more concise forms, with key questions / issues highlighted. Important suggestions from Advisory Committee members should be minuted. It is understood that not all suggestions will be followed. However, when there are significant deviations, the rationale should be provided.

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - holding regular meetings and dealing with issues more expeditiously. For example, it took well over half a year and several meetings to come to a decision on undertaking this self-evaluation. - ensuring coordination and cross-fertilization of ideas with the work of other entities in the CRD. For example, the City of Victoria has recently released an important document called 'Zero Waste Victoria'. This document contains valuable information and ideas, many of which parallel the work of CRD consultants and staff as well as of SWAC. The connections between the work of the City of Victoria and the CRD are unclear. 'Zero Waste Victoria' is a well-constructed document that will be of considerable value as the SWMP is finalized. <p>Another opportunity for collaboration with the City of Victoria is the development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).</p>
8.	<p>Since joining the Advisory Committee, please state the important advice that the Advisory Committee has provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe we have developed a reasonable plan with targets that have the option to be updated as things change in the region and the wider community. • I liked the recommendation to the Environmental Services Committee to set an aggressive target of cutting per capita waste production, despite it being rejected. • I think the Advisory Committee has worked well with CRD staff. I think a sound Solid Waste Plan has been created. I think the process was well thought out and informed me enough to make good decisions and recommendations • none so far but this is only based on one meeting • Recommendation to strengthen the landfill reduction target, which I think will encourage stronger waste reduction practices. • This question is somewhat ambiguous. Are you referring to information given by the CRD to the members or other information and reactions put forward by other members of the committee? And are you interested in the presentation materials from the consultants or the summation of the reactions of the committee? The policy presentations have been overwhelming, but, I suspect, when boiled down are really much more to the point. Other than those two reactions, I would say that we are to give our ideas of waste reduction but that many of these ideas are not able to be implemented because of policy or legislative restraints. That the goals that many of us would like to achieve are out of reach because of this and the conservative expectations of a government bureaucracy. But that our thoughts are welcome. • We challenge the Boards to be more ambitious with their targets and also to word things more clearly to encourage transparency with the document before it goes out to the public. I think a lot of us are still learning – so getting feedback/information from the CRD members that are on the Board is very helpful. • I have learned a great deal about the CRD solid waste planning and initiatives and have a better understanding of the role of the extended producer responsibility programs in the bigger picture. • To have CRD be a leader in waste reduction, and to be more ambitious with the plan. • Short list of potential strategy options for the SWMP update. • I have served on the Advisory Committee since April 2018. Since then, the following 'advice' has been provided to the Environmental Services Committee:

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the target for annual landfill waste to 125 kg per capita in the CRD by 2030. This advice was not accepted by the Environmental Services Committee and the CRD Board. However, the notion of exceeding the current annual target of 250 kg per capita is generally viewed favourably. - A draft SWMP has been created, with input from SWAC members, and commented on by SWAC. The draft SWMP describes a large number of strategies and associated actions (see 3 i). The draft plan was accepted for public consultations, the second round of which is currently occurring. The draft SWMP is subject to public input as well as further consideration by the Advisory Committee. <p>The Advisory Committee has discussed two options for landfill gas utilization, i.e., ‘Green Electricity’ and ‘Green Gas – Renewable Natural Gas (RNG)’. However, to my knowledge, SWAC has not given explicit advice to the Environmental Services Committee, expressed in the form a motion or otherwise regarding the preferred option. It is unclear that the ‘Green Gas’ option, which is currently being pursued by the CRD, is the superior option since it rests heavily on certain assumptions.</p>
9.	<p>Do you think that the suggestions provided to CRD staff and consultants are being used effectively?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member’s recommendations were appropriately considered when developing the draft report for consultation. Regarding the consultation process I do think there were some suggestions made that were not appropriately considered that could have made the process more inclusive and robust. Overall I believe the consultants have been valuable and have developed a reasonable plan to move the region forward. • Yes, even if they are not acted upon, the advice does provide influence. • I think that the broad base of representation provides alternative points of view to CRD staff and consultants, and that these points of view are given consideration. • That remains to be seen. The policy that has been proposed as a result of the committee input take the suggestions to a certain level but cannot take them as far as the aspirations of many of the public who actually consider these matters. There is a middle road which, I suspect, a governing body feels it has to take. However, there comes a time when there has to be a push to overcome the legislated barriers to achieving waste reduction (e.g. ensuring that ICI comes under the PPP legislation and that C and D be worked into building code bylaws so that materials can be reused.). There comes a time when actions need to be very bold. • I think this is complicated because a lot of the suggestions have financial and time frame changes associated – so I think while they consider our suggestions they aren’t always able to make the changes right away. I hope as time goes on we see them being incorporated in a creative way that doesn’t cause major delays on the actions/major financial setbacks. • Yes, staff and consultants have been both good presenters and “good listeners” • I question a bit about use of the consultants. I came to the process late, but I think it should be more iterative. It seems like there is little room to be engaged in a meaningful manner with consultants’ reports, which I find stick within narrow and acceptable standards, and are not very inspired. Everything certainly seems efficient, the next step is underway before the first one has

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<p>had feedback but I don't think that is necessarily a good thing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It appears to me that the CRD staff and consultants are under significant time and resource constraints to follow-up suggestions by members of the Advisory Committee.• The encouragement of Advisory Committee members for staff and consultants to think more creatively about solving problems and public consultations has had limited success. I recognize that many solid waste management problems do not have standard solutions that require only adaptation to meet CRD conditions. Finding such solutions (or, at a minimum, potential pathways leading to solutions) would be a valuable undertaking for the Advisory Committee, CRD staff, and consultants. The opportunities to do so continue to exist since the SWMP is presently in draft form and remains to be finalized. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes• Yes
--	---



SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PREAMBLE

The Capital Regional District (CRD) Solid Waste Advisory Committee is an Advisory Committee established by the CRD Environmental Services Committee to provide input on solid waste management matters and meet the requirements of the Ministry of Environment's *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning* for an advisory committee on the development and implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP).

The Committee's official name is to be:

Solid Waste Advisory Committee

1.0 PURPOSE

The mandate of the Committee includes advising the Environmental Services Committee regarding the following:

- a) providing input on major solid waste management matters
- b) serving as the advisory committee to the Steering Committee (Environmental Services Committee) on the development of Revision 3 of the SWMP
- c) acting as plan monitoring advisory committee for the new SWMP, once approved

2.0 ESTABLISHMENT AND AUTHORITY

- a) The Environmental Services Committee will:
 - appoint the committee members for up to a three-year term
 - act as the Steering Committee for Revision 3 of the SWMP
 - appoint a member as the liaison between the advisory committee and the Environmental Services/Steering Committee
- b) The Committee will report its input to the Environmental Services Committee for consideration. The CRD Board is the final decision-making authority.

3.0 COMPOSITION

The Committee shall consist of members representing a diversity of background, interests and geographical location, representing a balance between technical and non-technical members and industry and public members, as follows:

Representation	Number of Members
Regional district director (member of Environmental Services Committee)	1
Municipal engineering staff who are involved in solid waste collection	2
Electoral Area representative	1
First Nations	2
Environmental organizations	1
Business groups	1
Non-profit group with an interest in solid waste (e.g. reuse organization)	1
Large waste generators (industrial, commercial, institutional)	2
Owners/operators of private waste management facilities	2
Private sector industry collection service providers	2
Composting industry representative	1
Product stewardship agency	1
Community representative (representing Prospect Lake/Hartland area)	1
Public representatives, at large	3
Willis Point representative	1
District of Highlands representative	1

4.0 PROCEDURES

- a) The CRD Board Procedures Bylaw will apply.
- b) Member from Environmental Services Committee shall be Chair of Solid Waste Advisory Committee
- c) The committee shall meet at the call of the Chair and have special meetings, as required.
- d) The agenda will be finalized in consultation between staff and the Chair.
- e) A quorum is a majority of the committee membership and is required to conduct committee business.

5.0 RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

- a) The Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management, will lead the coordination and allocation of resources to the Committee.
- b) Minutes and agendas are prepared and distributed by the Environmental Resource Management division.

Approved by CRD Board on April 8, 2020

**REPORT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021**

SUBJECT Solid Waste Advisory Committee Motion of November 6, 2020

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) passed a motion at its November meeting that was contrary to recent Board direction.

BACKGROUND

At the November 6, 2020 SWAC meeting, the following motion was passed:

That the Solid Waste Advisory Committee recommends that the Environmental Services Committee direct staff to report back on options and recommendations on ways the potential actions, as outlined in Table 2 of the September 16, 2020 Environmental Services Committee staff report, can be incorporated after consultation and before the final draft Solid Waste Management Plan goes back to the Environmental Services Committee for approval.

The additional actions highlighted in Table 2 of the September 16, 2020 Environmental Services Committee staff report (attached as Appendix A) were only intended to be incorporated into the draft Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) if the Board approved the more aggressive waste reduction targets recommended by SWAC. However, at the October 14, 2020 Capital Regional District (CRD) Board meeting, the Board did not approve a more aggressive waste reduction target. Instead, the following direction was given to staff regarding the CRD's draft Solid Waste Management Plan:

- That the waste reduction target remain at 250 kg/capita/year by 2030 but goal 1 be changed to read "To surpass the provincial per capita waste disposal target and achieve 125 kg/capita/year";
- That the Solid Waste Advisory Committee's recommended additions be added to the draft Solid Waste Management Plan;
- That staff proceed with community and local government consultation on the draft Solid Waste Management Plan, including targeted stakeholder consultation with residents in the areas of Hartland Landfill, Prospect Lake, Willis Point and Highlands; and
- That staff report back on the first annual report on the Solid Waste Management Plan on measures that can be taken to achieve more aggressive waste reduction targets.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

That staff be directed to continue to follow the October 14, 2020 Board recommendation that staff report back on the first annual report on the Solid Waste Management Plan on measures that can be taken to achieve more aggressive waste reduction targets.

Alternative 2

That the Environmental Services Committee provide alternative direction.

IMPLICATIONS

The SWAC motion is contrary to Board direction.

CONCLUSION

The November 6, 2020 SWAC motion effectively asks the Environmental Services Committee to reverse the October 14, 2020 Board direction not to include a more aggressive waste disposal target, by requesting that Environmental Services Committee direct staff to do further work on enhanced waste reduction options to exceed the Board's directed solid waste reduction target and report back prior to finalizing the CRD's Solid Waste Management Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

That staff be directed to continue to follow the October 14, 2020 Board recommendation that staff report back on the first annual report on the Solid Waste Management Plan on measures that can be taken to achieve more aggressive waste reduction targets.

Submitted by:	Russ Smith, Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management
Concurrence:	Larisa Hutcheson, P. Eng., General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT

Appendix A: Sept 16, 2020 Environmental Services Committee Staff Report

**REPORT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020**

SUBJECT Solid Waste Management Plan – Next Steps

ISSUE SUMMARY

To seek direction on next steps for the Solid Waste Management Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Capital Regional District’s (CRD) current solid waste management plan was last revised in 1995. Per the Province of BC’s *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning*, Regional Districts should complete a full plan renewal every 10-year plan cycle. There have been many changes to the solid waste system since 2005, and the current plan is out of date.

In February 2011, the CRD substantially initiated planning on Revision 3 of the Solid Waste Management Plan, and completed Steps 1 and 2 of the *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning* (Table 1). At the direction of the Environmental Services Committee (ESC) and CRD Board, work was put on hold between 2014 and 2018 to investigate opportunities for integrated resource management. Between 2018 and present, work has proceeded and the CRD is now in Step 4 of preparing the draft Solid Waste Management Plan. A detailed chronology of work completed on solid waste management planning between 2011 and 2020 is included in Appendix A.

Table 1: Status of Solid Waste Management Planning (2018 to present)

Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning Steps (Province of BC)	Status
Step 1: Initiate the Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate the update • Establish planning teams and committees • Design the consultation process • Develop the budget 	complete
Step 2: Set the Plan Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify principles, goals and targets • Prepare background Information • Assess the current solid waste management system • Consider trends affecting solid waste management • Consult the public 	complete
Step 3: Evaluate Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop potential strategies • Assess the financial and administrative implications • Consult the public and interested parties on the options 	complete
Step 4: Prepare and Adopt the Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare draft plan* • Consult the public on the draft plan • Prepare final draft for submission • Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy review and approval • Final adoption 	*we are here

The Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) was established by the ESC to provide input on solid waste management matters and meet the requirements of the *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning* for an advisory committee on the development and implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan.

In 2018, through SWAC recommendation, the ESC and CRD Board endorsed proposed guiding principles, objectives, goals and a consultation plan for Revision 3 of the Solid Waste Management Plan (Step 2). Between November 2018 and May 2019, SWAC worked with a consultant, Tetra Tech, to develop options, strategies, actions and targets to meet these guiding principles, objectives and goals, and refer these for inclusion in the draft plan. In September 2019, based on this work, the ESC and CRD Board endorsed 15 strategies and actions and a waste reduction target of 250 kg/capita/year by 2030, and directed staff to proceed to public consultation (Step 3).

Public consultation was undertaken, and results were reviewed through SWAC and presented to the ESC and CRD Board in August 2020. The consultation included 21 open houses and meetings, a social media reach of over 19,000, and received more than 1,000 feedback forms. Participants were asked to indicate their level of support and provide feedback on three plan elements: target and timelines; guiding principles, goals and objectives; and strategies and actions. Respondents were also able to provide general feedback. Overall, there was a high level of support for all plan elements, and 82% of respondents either strongly agreed (60%) or agreed (22%) with the proposed waste reduction target of 250 kg/capita/year by 2030 (a 1/3 reduction from present levels), 4% disagreed, and 3% strongly disagreed. Specific stakeholder topics were identified as potentially requiring further consideration during the draft plan stage of consultation. These include:

- impacts on mountain bike trails within the landfill property
- rerouting traffic to the north end of the Hartland site (Willis Point Road entrance), including potential environmental and recreational impacts of landfill footprint expansion to extend the life of Hartland to 2100
- cruise ship waste
- human/wildlife conflicts

The guiding principles, objectives, goals, targets, strategies and consultation results (Steps 1-3 of the planning process) have been compiled into a draft Solid Waste Management Plan (Appendix B) (Step 4). At its July and August meetings, SWAC considered the draft plan and, through a round table process, identified proposed additions to the draft plan. A summary of the feedback received through the roundtable process can be found in Appendix C, and the presentation in Appendix D. SWAC passed the following motion:

That the additions to the draft plan under the four headings Municipal Waste Management, Illegal Dumping, Household Hazardous Waste, Finance, be incorporated into the draft plan including the background information on how the targets were developed.

SWAC also identified a desire to strengthen the target that was set by SWAC and endorsed by the ESC and Board in 2019. This would require going back to Step 2 in the planning framework and invalidate the current draft plan and above motion. The following motion was passed:

That a new target of 2/3 waste reduction by 2030 (relative to 2019/2020) be approved to guide the development of the new Solid Waste Management Plan, and that staff undertake work, with feedback from the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, to update the draft plan which includes strategies as required to meet the new target.

The CRD is currently in Step 4 of the four-step *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning* framework. Per the framework, next steps include additional consultation on the draft plan, preparing a final draft for submission, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (ENV) review and approval, and final adoption. This report identifies next steps for solid waste management planning following the provincial planning framework, as well as preliminary implications associated with setting a new target at Step 4 in the planning process, as proposed by SWAC.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

1. That the waste reduction target remain at 250 kg/capita/year by 2030 but goal 1 be changed to read “To surpass the provincial per capita waste disposal target and achieve 125 kg/capita/year”;
2. That the Solid Waste Advisory Committee’s recommended additions be added to the draft Solid Waste Management Plan; and
3. That staff proceed with community and local government consultation on the draft Solid Waste Management Plan, including targeted stakeholder consultation with residents in the areas of Hartland Landfill, Prospect Lake, Willis Point and Highlands.

Alternative 2

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

That staff proceed with analysis to understand strategies, including waste flow management, waste stream bans, and costs and funding sources, to meet an enhanced target of 2/3 waste reduction from current levels (125 kg/capita/year) by 2030, and review these strategies through the Solid Waste Advisory Committee before returning to the Environmental Services Committee for direction.

Alternative 3

That this report be referred back to staff for additional information.

IMPLICATIONS

Technical

Between 1989 and 2019, the CRD’s per capita waste disposal went down from approximately 671 kg/capita to 382 kg/capita/year (43%). This reduction was the result of a variety of CRD initiatives, including the blue box program, recycling depots, as well as the introduction of Extended Producer Responsibility programs regulated by the provincial government, and landfill bans on materials when viable alternatives exist (processing systems and end markets).

The draft Solid Waste Management Plan has been developed following the process included within the *Guide to Solid Waste Management Planning*. This plan includes a waste reduction target of 250 kg/capita/year by 2030, approximately a 1/3 reduction from current levels. This ambitious target significantly exceeds the provincial target of 350 kg/capita/year, and was set based on a comprehensive technical analysis of what could be achieved, given the role of the Regional District under the current regulatory and policy framework, and considering the 15 strategies developed by SWAC, and endorsed by the ESC and CRD Board.

Increasing the target to a 2/3 reduction by 2030 (Alternative 2) would seek to bring the per capita disposal rate down to 125 kg/capita. Table 2 identifies potential strategies that could achieve further reductions. Additional technical analysis would be necessary to determine how much waste reduction each strategy could achieve and if the target is achievable. Many of the 'low hanging fruit' actions the CRD has authority over have already been completed and achieving further reductions will be incrementally more difficult. It is likely the CRD would need to implement a waste flow management policy, as provided for in the *Environmental Management Act*, along with bans on flows of material types to the landfill and consider new funding sources for waste management, such as tax requisition. The term "flow control" refers to the CRD's authority to control the movement and disposal of solid waste within the region. It is an important regulatory tool to support the implementation of solid waste management plans and to help ensure the long-term financial sustainability of the waste system by stopping waste and associated tipping fees from leaving the region. In June 2014, the issue of waste flow management was discussed by the ESC and CRD Board members at a workshop on the Solid Waste Management Plan. Workshop participants did not endorse the assumption that waste flow management should be considered as part of the new Solid Waste Management Plan. The policy option was reviewed for a second time by the Integrated Resource Management Advisory Committee and CRD Board in 2017.

Table 2

	Short-term (3 years)	Medium-term (5 years)	Long-term (10+ years)
Endorsed Disposal Target (kg/capita/year)	340 ¹	285	250 ²
Targeted Sectors/ Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction, renovation and demolition materials • Organics material from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Single-family - Multi-family - Industrial, Commercial and Institutional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recyclables and organic waste from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Single-family - Multi-family - Industrial, Commercial and Institutional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended Producer Responsibility for textiles and Industrial, Commercial and Institutional generated paper and packaging • Refine programs to increase performance for all sectors
SWAC Proposed New Disposal Target (kg/capita/year)	125 kg/capita/year (2030)		

<p>Potential additional actions required to achieve 2/3 waste reduction by 2030</p>	<p>Ministry/Private Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended Producer Responsibility for large plastics, furniture, mattresses and building materials (e.g., wood, carpet, composite products) • Improvements in processing technology and end markets for multi-family and Industrial, Commercial and Institutional recyclables • Innovative technologies for managing plastics • Ban on distribution and sale of single use items (cups, diapers, etc.) <p>CRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste flow management • Implementing landfill ban enforcement at source • Local processing facility and increasing subsidy for food waste processing regional materials sorting facility • Region-wide residential organics collection <p>Municipal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of collection facilities (e.g., eco depots) • Streetscape collection of recyclables and compostables • Mandate recycling and organics collection programs at multi-family and Industrial, Commercial and Institutional properties
--	--

Note: 1. Assumes that disposal bans for construction, renovation and demolition materials would be implemented.
 2. Assumes new Extended Producer Responsibility program will be implemented by Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy.

Goal 1 of the draft Solid Waste Management Plan currently reads “To surpass the provincial per capita waste disposal targets.” Under the *Guide for Solid Waste Management Planning*, it is possible to set aspirational goals. One approach to capture the intent of the SWAC recommendation regarding a much lower target without necessitating years of new planning work is to modify Goal 1 to read “To surpass the provincial per capita waste disposal target and achieve 125 kg/capita/year.” By modifying this overarching goal to include an aspirational target while keeping the 2030 target intact at 250 kg/capita/year, the strategies and technical work supporting the draft Solid Waste Management Plan as written do not need to be redone. Furthermore, the CRD Board could submit a plan amendment to update and strengthen the strategies and targets in the Plan at a future date, once the Plan is implemented and performance is measured.

Through the public consultation process, the rerouting of traffic to the north end of the Hartland site (Willis Point Road entrance), and potential environmental and recreational impacts of landfill footprint expansion to extend the life of Hartland to 2100 were identified as specific topic areas of interest. In its round table review of the draft plan and recommended draft plan amendments, SWAC did not identify or recommend any changes to the draft plan relating to these topic areas; however, at other SWAC meetings, these were topics discussed as requiring further consultation.

Service Delivery Implications

Per the *Guide for Solid Waste Management Planning* framework, next steps include additional consultation on the draft plan (Alternative 1), preparing a final draft for submission, ENV review and approval, and final adoption.

Establishing new targets (Alternative 2) would require the CRD to go back to Step 2 of the Solid Waste Management Planning Process. This will require further technical evaluation, assessment of financial and administrative implications, consultation with the public and interested parties on

options and target, and obtaining necessary referral, endorsement and decisions by SWAC, ESC and CRD Board. This work is expected to take 2-3 years.

Financial Implications

The CRD has spent approximately \$170,000 plus staff time on completing technical analysis and consultation associated with the current targets to date. Establishing new targets (Alternative 2) would require the CRD to go back to Step 2 of the Solid Waste Management Process and redo this work at an equivalent cost. Further analysis is required to understand the full cost implications and funding strategies for achieving the waste reduction target in Alternative 2; however, it is anticipated that a new tax requisition would likely be required.

CONCLUSION

The CRD is currently in Step 4 of the four-step *Guide for Solid Waste Management Planning* framework to develop a new Solid Waste Management Plan. Public consultation found overall a high level of support for all plan elements, and 82% of respondents either strongly agreed (60%) or agreed (22%) with the proposed waste reduction target of 250 kg/capita/year by 2030 (equivalent to a 1/3 reduction from present levels). SWAC recommends strengthening plan targets to 2/3 reduction by 2030. This change in target is anticipated to delay plan approval by 2-3 years, cost \$170,000 plus staff time, and require the CRD to reconsider its stance on implementing a waste flow management policy and would likely require funding through tax requisition.

RECOMMENDATION

The Environmental Services Committee recommends to the Capital Regional District Board:

1. That the waste reduction target remain at 250 kg/capita/year by 2030 but goal 1 be changed to read “To surpass the provincial per capita waste disposal target and achieve 125 kg/capita/year”;
2. That the Solid Waste Advisory Committee’s recommended additions be added to the draft Solid Waste Management Plan; and
3. That staff proceed with community and local government consultation on the draft Solid Waste Management Plan, including targeted stakeholder consultation with residents in the areas of Hartland Landfill, Prospect Lake, Willis Point and Highlands.

Submitted by:	Russ Smith, Senior Manager, Environmental Resource Management
Concurrence:	Larisa Hutcheson, P. Eng., General Manager, Parks & Environmental Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS

- Appendix A: Chronology – Solid Waste Management Planning – 2011-2020
- Appendix B: Draft Solid Waste Management Plan – June 2020
- Appendix C: Solid Waste Advisory Committee Roundtable Feedback – July 2020
- Appendix D: Solid Waste Advisory Committee – Presentation – August 7, 2020