

In Attendance:

Voting Members

Arlene Ridge	Area C
Diane Tammen	City of Cbk
Joe Tress	Dist of Sparwood
Hal Anderson	Ind. Advisor – SE Dis.
Karen DiLullo and Darron Towle	Ind. Advisor – Waste Mngmt
Gaetane Carignan	Community Energy Assoc., Vice-Chair
Karen Bergman	Baynes Lake, Area B
Nadine Rake	City of Cbk/Community Grp
Vassa Stein	Dist of Invermere

Non-Voting Members

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

Directors

Mike Sosnowski	Director, Electoral Area A
Stan Doehle	Director, Electoral Area B
Clara Reinhardt	Director, Village of Radium Hot Springs

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

Regrets:

Bob Cutts	Area B
Jim Kennelly	City of Cbk
Cailey Chase	City of Kimberley
Bill Swan	Area F
Kate Bennett	Area G
Ange Qualizza	Alternate Director, City of Fernie, Chair

Welcome and Introductions

The Vice-Chair brought the meeting to order at 11:05 am. Kevin introduced the consultants leading the project Mairi Dalgleish and Dr. Tony Sperling, President of Sperling Hansen.

Minutes from April 2, 2019 Meeting

The minutes from the April 2, 2019 meeting were discussed.

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Regional District of East Kootenay Solid Waste Management Plan Advisory Committee meeting dated April 2, 2019 be adopted as circulated

Director Doehle Moved

Duane Allen Seconded

RDEK Presentation:

RDEK gave a presentation on the Waste and Recycling Costs Survey results being released to the general public

Draft Solid Waste Management Plan

Presentation from the Consultant:

Sperling Hansen presented the goals of the meeting to include:
(RDEK_AC_Mtg5-Jun5 powerpoint presentation)

Key Drivers

Guiding Principles from the Ministry of Environment

Planning Process

Increase Waste Reduction and Recycling

Increase Organic Material Diversion

Enhancing Residual Waste Management

Policies and Bylaws

Promotion and Education

Plan Monitoring and Measurement

Staffing Implications

Implementation Schedule

Plan Monitoring Advisory Committee – Terms of Reference

Dispute Resolution Procedure

Next Steps

Community Engagement and Consultation

Planning Process:

Sperling Hansen reviewed where the committee is in the Solid Waste Management Plan Update planning process:

- At the end of Phase 2 in the Draft SWMP
- Doing a presentation June 6 to the Regional District of East Kootenay Board for their input
- Phase 3 Community and Stakeholder Consultation

Organics Infrastructure Program - Update

Meetings were held with a proposal submitted on May 22, 2019, and at this time, it is unknown if the proposal is accepted. The Columbia Valley, Central and Elk Valley Subregion would have a composting facility, with curbside collection starting in the District of Invermere, City of Kimberley, and City of Fernie. 66% is funded from the Provincial and Federal Governments, the rest from the Regional District.

Questions from the Powerpoint presentation Topics:

SWMP Draft Plan - Question on Number 4 Guiding Principles – the wording was discussed.

Answer: As this is a background piece to support the process of the SWMP review, it is a provincial document so it will be left as is.

With respect to the SWMP and the BC Guiding Principles – when the Ministry of Environment reviews our submission do they reflect back to the guiding principles and if we avoid one of these principles is it viewed negatively?

Answer: The Provincial Government is looking at whether the Regional District is doing its fair share towards adopting the principles, made rationale decisions based on them and maximize to reach the goals. The plans that are successful are the ones that have solid action items to strive towards goals.

Every 10 years we do a SWMP review. How easy is it to amend the plan once it's drafted.

Answer: The government refers to the SWMP as a living document so it can be amended so any waste that impacts people differently can be addressed. The Ministry is willing to work with modifications to the plan.

The Provincial Government has asked the municipalities to reduce their waste, are they offering any incentives for doing this, or any fines for not doing this?

Answer: It is the entire province as a whole that is to reach this provincial average. They are evaluating each plan to see that they are adequate to do their fair share to get to the average. There isn't funding to assist with this nor is there any punishment for not doing this. They could reject the SWMP if there weren't enough initiatives in place to achieve the provincial average for waste.

The question about how much people are willing to pay with the result that the Elk Valley is willing to pay double, is this in a user pay system or for having their facility open more.

Answer: The question in the survey was referencing for more additional services rather than user fees.

Question about 2 Encourage municipalities to develop policies and bylaws that promote waste reduction, who is the authority to say who does this. Citing an example of reducing the number of plastic bags.

Answer: If we identify areas where there is significant volumes of waste, it would be up to the City, the Regional District would assist by lobbying for this. An example is to ban plastic bags, the mechanisms are in place for the member municipalities to do this. The Regional District would have to go through more steps to make this happen. For example to ban fireworks during a fire ban, a service area had to be established in order to do this. Further to this process, when developing policies and bylaws there are costs involved due to staff time.

Have we explored the opportunity for a private business, work with the forest industry or a business plan for organics to support a private business in organics. Also wondered if the compost facilities are dependent on the funding that has been applied for, or is there a plan B if it funding is not received.

Answer: The RDEK will continue to look for further opportunities for organic diversions. We could look to explore other opportunities, as long organics are a high priority in our SWMP. The Regional District Board will still have the authority to make a decision on this.

Could there be more details about what is recommended specifically with respect to the development of transfer station sites.

Answer: Sperling Hansen discussed this proponent with the RDEK and refers to the Conceptual Scenarios for Budget Purposes. CV System costs \$2,640,000 and Central \$1,000,000.

In terms of the Central Subregion scenario, are there specifics to explain the cost of \$1,000,000.

Answer: Those scenarios have all been considered, we think it is presumptuous to put one specific scenario into the plan but want to have a place holder so that the plan can move forward. Once you have these costs in your plan, you wouldn't have to go to a referendum to obtain the funding.

Discussion took place about the sites for the Columbia Valley and that there is only one transfer station site being proposed in the SWMP. The SWMP has been set up to do a thorough study of the requirements for transfer stations in the Columbia valley and the process involved in doing this.

Question was raised whether the financials are in today's dollars?

Answer: Yes, they are. It was suggested to have the SWMP reflect that the costs used are based in 2019 dollars. Suggestion was made to note that no allowance has been made for inflation, and to clarify the projections.

Who could potentially be a party involved in a dispute [about a SWMP]? A member of the public?

Answer: It would mostly be businesses. An example was if banning of waste was developed, there would be an avenue for resolution.

If there is a change in government, do the guiding principles change as a result of that?

Answer: The Ministry name may change but in terms of policy it has remained consistent through government changes.

For the Plan Monitoring Advisory Committee, Term of Membership – the Board may at any time and at its discretion, revoke the membership of any member – suggestion made to make it as a written explanation.

Answer: Given that there is no term of membership on the committee, my recommendation [Shawn Tomlin, CAO] would be to not add that because there are times where the Board may want to change a member to bring in a different perspective.

Plan Dispute Resolution procedure – while dispute resolution does not appear in PMAC terms of reference. (if appropriate) is too loose. It needs an explanation of what makes it appropriate.

PMAC is currently in existence, comment regarding “if appropriate” can be removed.

Implementation schedule – I hope there is a reason for the schedule and that we are going to work from it and not bounce around with the initiatives.

The implementation schedule does get tied to the budget process of the Regional District.

In the consultation process are there any plans to present to municipal council or is that meant to happen through their representation on the Board.

Answer: Presenting to municipal councils is not designed into the consultation process. We would be open to do a presentation at the request of a council.

General Observations:

- Organics in the SWMP is really focused on the residential sector there needs to be consideration for the commercial sector.
- With the illegal dumping component of the SWMP a suggestion was made to add the provincial government as a partner in the development of region-wide illegal dumping prevention strategy. Other Regional Districts were also mentioned as a way to develop processes from those that have been working.

Success from this plan

The Advisory Committee was asked what success from the SWMP would look like for you.

Summary of the answers:

- If we achieved greater diversion and met the goal for waste per capita rate.
- Need to be able to keep an open mind and work with new opportunities that come along.
- Would like to see more municipalities do curbside collection of recycling, a lot of things we are doing with solid waste are good and we should look to items that are funded.

- We have a good plan, if we can successfully engage the public and get their support for the plan that's an important piece.
- The ecological advancement with the reduction of our waste, we've talked about the economic and fiscal impact of creating jobs at transfer stations, there are a number of impacts that we could look at.
- Timeline for the organics could move a little quicker as it would help to achieve the targets.
- Having composting facilities, strong reduction in plastic and sustainability for future generations.
- Wide spread support for the plan, and achieve what we say we're going to achieve within the costs.
- Education and awareness piece of why we're trying to achieve that target.
- As a commercial hauler we do need to carefully consider bans, hospitals, hotels and restaurants probably have to mandate the diversion to happen.
- Really care about illegal dumping.
- Necessity of the need to be flexible in the process.
- This plan has specifics that are high scale and flexible that will allow for innovations and opportunities as they arise and help us to move forward as an organization.

Next Steps:

The draft plan is going the Regional District Board then there will be a consultation process with the public, we will then meet again with the review committee, the plan will then go to the Board for consideration and then be submitted to the ministry.

Final meeting with the committee may be in September or October depending on the public input portion.

Next meeting

The meeting adjourned. 2:08 pm

Action Items

Action Items	Person Responsible	Completed
Provide costs for Columbia Valley Transfer station addition based on the Subregion rather than the entire RDEK.	Sperling Hansen	