

**PRESENT**

**Voting Members**

Arlene Ridge	Area C
Jim Kennelly	City of Cbk
Hal Anderson	Ind. Advisor – SE Dis.
Darcy Edison	Ind. Advisor – Waste Mngmt
Gaetane Carignan	City of Fernie, Vice-Chair
Karen Bergman	Area B Baynes Lake
Daryl Calder	City of Cbk/Community Grp
Kate Bennett	Area G Brisco

**Non-Voting Members**

Nikolaas Morissette	City of Kimberley
Heather Rennebohm	Akisk'nuq First Nation
Mark Read	Village of Radium
Zabrina Pendon	City of Fernie

**Directors**

Mike Sosnowski	Director, Electoral Area A
Gerry Wilkie	Director, Electoral Area G
Stan Doehle	Director, Electoral Area B
Ange Qualizza	Alternate Director, City of Fernie, Chair

**STAFF**

Shawn Tomlin	Chief Administrative Officer
Kevin Paterson	Environmental Services Manager
Jim Penson	Solid Waste Superintendent
Loree Duczek	Communications Manager
Lynne Newhouse	Environmental Services Secretary

Kevin opened the meeting at 11:06 am and introduced the consultants leading the project Mairi Dalgleish and Dr. Tony Sperling.

**Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Kevin ran the election portion of the meeting. Nominations were taken and the following people were appointed:

- Ange Qualizza – Chair
- Gaetan Carnignan – Vice Chair

**Sperling Hansen presented the Key Drivers** (refer to RDEK AC Mtg2\_13 PowerPoint provided in DropBox)

**Roundtable on Key Drivers:**

What issues, opportunities or subjects do you think are critical to consider during this planning process?

Group Observations:

- Look at having a transfer bin at each of the RV sites in the Koocanusa area at a cost to the RV sites and not to the taxpayer.
- Need to define curbside pick up and the areas that this would be feasible.
- Would like to see more thought about wood waste burning
- Need to keep our eye on taxation, as we need to keep the costs down.

- Potential partnerships with higher levels of Government – Ministry of Environment is developing a program to partner with them for Love Food Hate Waste.
- Tracking the usage – tying in with the Waste Characterization, which would be helpful in managing the waste.
- Discussion in: history of the landfills, what actually causes reduction of waste, different alternatives of things that may work – an easier way to find out where to recycle things.
- Looking for synergies within our three subregions and more efficiencies.
- Funding opportunity for subregional organics diversion through Organics Infrastructure Program.
- Need to manage the waste - focus on education and reduction, recycling is done well, but we need to further reduce the waste.

### **Guiding Principles**

#### **Discussion on points 1 – 4:**

- A question was asked about how do you achieve zero waste? Dr. Tony Sperling advised that it is an aspiration goal that is a philosophy, we can move towards it, 350 kg/person per year is the goal, we are at 50% of what it used to be.

#### **Group Observations:**

- Zero waste is more about using a material repeatedly
- It was suggested that when tipping fees are imposed, the public tend to dispose of their garbage in the backcountry.

### **Waste Composition Study**

#### **Questions:**

- The numbers provided for the various categories – are they similar to other regional studies? Sperling Hansen advised yes, it is quite similar; organics makes up most of the pie elsewhere. What about the textiles? Sperling Hansen thought the textiles in this study were low.
- Staff advised historically we did not have a diversion program for textiles but recently have had a partnership with the Diabetes Association.

### **Introductions**

Those present introduced themselves.

### **Diversion Opportunities**

#### **Increase Service and Rural Transfer Stations**

#### **Increase Opportunities for diversion**

#### **Group Observations:**

- People other than those that live in the rural areas are using the rural transfer stations.
- Donations at a manned transfer station were better because of the relationships developed with the attendants.

### **Increase Supervision (Attendant)**

1. **Offer Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Collection at the Regional District owned Transfer Stations**
2. **Rely on existing depots for EPR collection**

**Staff provided the following Information on EPR:**

- The RDEK funds its waste through taxation, historically the EPR was left to the stewards. Residents have driven the demands for opportunities; they have paid for the program at the front end. More opportunities are being introduced – we are in discussions with Recycle BC to have recycling opportunities at our manned sites.
- We have built a Household Hazardous Waste station at the Cranbrook Transfer Station with a used oil capability and are being paid for the collection of oil.

**Tipping Fees (Consider Implementing User-Pay)**

We will have a discussion at a future meeting on tipping fees policy and bylaws, Sperling Hansen.

**Changes to the Transfer Station System:**

Is there a case study done on whether the garbage ended up in the woods. Sperling Hansen will provide a report from the Thompson Nicola Regional District on this.

January meeting topic: will be Transfer Station System Optimization – will review adding an additional transfer station in Invermere, Sperling Hansen

February meeting topic: will be Policy, Bylaws and Finances, Sperling Hansen

**Conversion from Rural to Attended Sites**

Staff advised the RDEK has several small unattended sites – could be exploring some consolidation of sites and varying levels of service – ie: areas of offering the eco depot sites. Attended sites are definitely a cost that would require discussion of ways to manage the costs.

**Group Observations:**

- Discussion was held around how far people are willing to drive to dispose of garbage. Sperling Hansen advised a comparison was done with other Regional District; the RDEK has more sites per square km. Recycle BC had a goal for their facilities to be at least every 45 km from a service area. Having something 10 to 15 km distance from populated areas would be reasonable. Could use the distances from where people go for their shopping.

- Would like to see a justification for what we already have and why we have to change to attended sites and a comparison for attended sites and their location – will people drive, what's the carbon footprint.

Sperling Hansen advised the landfill at Kaslo is manned 4 days a week to help with waste diversion.

- A suggestion was made in order to assist with diversion of waste a site may have to be manned for a couple of days/week. Also manned sites can be used to educate the public, generate more information on what people bring and where it is from, the time they come in, then collect the data and make an informed decision on hours of operation at the site.

Sperling Hansen provided that Cariboo RD had many unmanned sites, through discussion with the contractor they saw a lot of contamination of piles, ie: treated wood in the wood waste pile, you get a better quality of waste separation by having a manned site.

- The question was asked how all three sites in the EV are attended sites. Staff answered, they were all municipal landfills and were converted under the RDEK into transfer stations.

- An observation was made that in the Fernie area there were couches, fridges, stoves in the backcountry, manned or unmanned sites, as long as there isn't a tipping fee there isn't as much dumping in the backcountry.
- Concerned that when the Fernie transfer station was temporarily closed there was an outcry from the public to have to travel to Sparwood.
- Are there studies on commercial wood waste vs residential wood waste? No Sperling Hansen doesn't have that information.

### **Encouraging Recycling and Diversion**

#### **Variable Tipping Fees**

#### **Waste Audit Kits for ICI Sector**

#### **Disposal Bans**

#### **Education**

### **Discussion on Education:**

#### **Group Observations:**

- It was suggested to have someone at the RDEK for answering the phone for recycling. Answered by that the number is published on every ad and that we do have someone answering recycling calls.
- Other First Nations have a guardian of the land. These are internship positions that are for 4 years at a time. These individuals are out walking the lands and could help with stopping illegal dumping.
- Questions on the current recycling program – 19% of recycling is going to the landfill – tissues or waxed or dirty paper/cardboard. Is this typical?

Sperling Hansen answered, six different studies indicate that it is. The capture rate is in line with what other Regional Districts are seeing.

- How are we capturing the details of this meeting, looking to have continuity with the group. Minutes are being taken and will be distributed to the group.
- Question was asked when is the discussion going to take place on recycling? The taxation on recycling is so high for things we cannot sell.

Staff answered, the current recycling landscape in Canada is a major challenge with the collapse in the market and the change in China. This is going to drive the development of mills in North America to recycle products here. We really have to look at this program, as there is a huge cost to it.

Staff spoke to Recycle BC is mandated for only the residential program. The commercial program has to find their own market. Fluctuation of markets for cardboard, which had been a positive revenue generator, is now a very depressed market.

- Contractor advised we recycle cardboard, paper, tin, plastics through our plant. We also divert compostable material - yard and garden and white wood waste. Most is dealt with locally. The problem is paper, plastic, still some value in cardboard, tin and milk jugs. All

the others are extremely costly, look at carbon footprint incurred while shipping the recyclables.

- Contractor advised with the state of the recycling market, there is a glut of product; the end product is not being used. If it is source separated and is clean, you can find markets for it.

- High temperature gasification system - has there been a pilot on this?

Sperling Hansen answered, yes there has been a study on this and it has been difficult to implement because of the level of contamination. It is large scale over \$100,000/year - the costs would be prohibitive.

Staff advised RecycleBC is exploring other markets. Their program is funded from point of sale. We recycle 6,000 MT/year in our area; we have to balance with the other side of what our economic impact is. Do we entertain putting the recycling in the garbage; are we recycling for the sake of recycling? Perhaps we have to focus more on reduce rather than recycle.

Staff advised the costs of recycling vs just landfilling, recycling is \$1.2 m. Have to develop a plan to either ship or landfill the recycling.

- The presentation from October 30, 2018 meeting, RDEK SWMP slide #34, is in the DropBox - unit cost summary data - disposal of garbage in the Columbia Valley - \$76/T and recycling is \$189/T.

## **Organic Waste Diversion**

### **RDEK current strategies**

- Small pilot project to see if we could do low tech windrow compost at our sites. We can do it in a low tech localized way collection and transportation was a large part of the cost.
- Compositing (Short term)
- Continue to promote back yard composting
- Sale of composters and education program
- Continue to collect yard and garden waste at transfer stations
- Consider additional yard & garden waste drop offs

## **Wood Waste**

### **Consider Feasibility of Centralized composition (Long term)**

#### **Technologies**

- RDEK currently reviewing opportunities for region.
- Turned windrow exclude wheat products – this could be used
- Backyard composting is a great idea very problematic because of being a bear attractant.

## **Education opportunities**

### **Group Observation:**

- A person can backyard compost in the spring, summer and fall although the process produces methane. Discussion took place around factors that pose an issue, not having the space and a method to keep bears away.

## **Diversion Potential**

### **Next meeting**

January 23, 2019 (11 am to 2 pm)

### **Residual Waste and Transfer Station System Optimization**

- Do we have too many sites, should we consolidate these
- Look at the CV and achieve some attended sites
- Economy of scale to transfer that waste to the Central Subregion landfill

The meeting adjourned. 2:04 pm

### **Action Items**

	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Completed</b>
Look into the application for partnership with the Ministry of Environment – Love Food Hate Waste	Kevin/Communications	
TNRD report on garbage ending up in the woods	Sperling Hansen	
Organics Infrastructure Grant		
Unit cost analysis from the October meeting	Mentioned in these minutes with reference where to find them in the DropBox	Yes