Comox Strathcona Waste Management

Minutes

REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes from the meeting held on May 2, 2024 in the CVRD Civic Room and virtually via Zoom at 770 Harmston Ave, Courtenay commencing at 1:00pm

PRESENT:

W. Cole-Hamilton	Co-Chair, RSWAC
D. Baar	Campbell River
D. Birtch	Campbell River
J. Ellis	Courtenay
J. Best	Comox/Courtenay/Cortes Island
K. Lovely	Cumberland
R. Rowe	CVRD Area B
K. Stubblefield	CVRD Area C
R. Telegus	Denman Island
M. Jeffs	Sayward
C. Thompson, Manager of Solid Waste Services	City of Courtenay
C. Perry, Engineering Manager	Town of Comox
R. Crisfield, Manager of Operations	Village of Cumberland
S. Fisher, Engineering Services Coordinator	SRD
A. Milwid, First Nations Liaison	SRD
R. Savey, Housing Manager	Mowachaht/Muchalaht First Nation
L. Bryan, Executive Director	WMABC
L. Gardner, Environmental Consultant	Consultant
L. Eason, CSWM Community Educator	Consultant
J. Marten, General Manager of Corporate Services	CVRD
M. Rutten, General Manager of Engineering Services	CVRD
V. Schau, Senior Manager of CSWM Services	CVRD
S. Willie, Manager of Solid Waste Planning & Policy Development	CVRD
K. Douville, Manager of Financial Planning	CVRD
B. Meagher, Branch Assistant – Engineering Services	CVRD

ITEMS:

Review of Agenda and Minutes

Co-Chair W. Cole-Hamilton acknowledged that the meeting is being hosted on the traditional unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, and the Comox Strathcona

Waste Management (CSWM) service area is located in the Coast Salish, Kwakwaka'wakw, and Nuu-chah-nulth territories.

The committee reviewed the minutes of the April 4, 2024 Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (RSWAC) meeting and no errors or omissions were noted. The advisory committee adopted the May 2, 2024 meeting agenda.

Introduction of CSWM Landscape

S. Willie presented an overview of the CSWM service established by Bylaw No. 1822. Revenue comes from tax requisition, tipping fees, Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) programs, and recycling. Estimated tipping fees by waste sector are Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) and household at 43 percent; curbside municipal waste at 27 percent; construction waste at 15 per cent; and other waste at 15 percent. Residents are producing approximately 551kg waste per person, aiming for 350 kg per person. Each region is unique with geography, population, economic drivers, and density influencing service costs and efficiency. Looking to other regions like the Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) and Capital Regional District (CRD) to learn from each other.

Our region benefits from working done outside of CSWM services by private sector partners such as waste haulers, wood waste processing, yard waste composting, and recycling sorting. We're taking steps towards zero waste goals with the easiest steps already taken e.g. population understands 3 R's of recycling, organics composting in place. Lots of changes in technology for greater accountability in ICI and multi-family (MF) sectors.

Key terms discussed:

Source separation – When the waste generator is required to sort waste where it originates

Post-collection sorting – When mixed waste (recyclables, organics, garbage) is picked up from waste generator and taken to an off-site location for sorting.

Material Recovery Facility (MRF) – The facility sources recycling to be separated into commodities (can come in as mixed recycling or single stream)

ICI – Industrial, Commercial, Institutional

Multi-Family (MF) – Apartments, condos, townhomes

Waste Generator – Entity creating waste

Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) – Not just waste from a municipality. MSW is the regulated term for waste that isn't hazardous, from heavy industry, or controlled. Includes construction, residential and ICI waste.

Regulatory Tools to Enhance Diversion

L. Gardner, Environmental Consultant, presented on Waste Facility Licensing, Waste Generator Source Separation, and Waste Hauler Licensing. Introduced his presentation with his key perspectives: Diversion costs more than disposal. Society will continue to rely on disposable products. Increasing diversion is good for the economy. Industry delivered services contribute more to the economy than government delivered services. The role of government is to facilitate systems that get end of lift products into the raw material stream.

Waste Facility Licensing (WFL)

The primary function is to deal with environmental nuisances, rather than increase diversion. Key example is waste dumped on farmland at Cultus Lake last year where Agricultural Land Commission stepped in. Other nuisances like odours, rodents, occur among waste operators. Waste facility licensing gives local government tools to address problems.

Three regions with WFL are Metro Vancouver, the Cowichan Valley Regional District (Cowichan Valley), and the Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN). Reporting obligations under licensing provide better understanding of waste stream. Resources and staffing required vary across regional districts depending on amount of inspections and oversight. Regulate only as much as needed to achieve responsible behaviour among operators. Facilities requiring waste stream licenses are: disposal facility, transfer station, material recovery facility, mixed waste facility, refuse-derived fuel facility, storage facility, brokering facility, composting facility. Some examples of exempted facilities are: thrift stores, facilities licensed by federal government, facilities operating under EPR plan, composting facility operated by farm, drop-off depot operated by charity. WFL is the only feasible option for mitigating nuisance and offers the benefit of reliable reporting.

Waste Facility Licensing Options/Strategies:

2a. License all facilities: captures data from all facilities, estimated $80,000 set-up costs and $200,000 annual costs.

2b. License only primary waste facilities: estimated $80,000 set-up costs and $20,000 to $100,000 annual costs depending on level of oversight.

2c. License and set diversion targets: costly to make diversion targets a licensing requirement, risk of making local businesses uncompetitive, estimated $200,000 set-up costs and $400,000 annual costs.

Advisory Comments

S. Willie – Checked in with group to see if anyone would like clarification regarding options presented.

L. Bryan – WMABC worked collaboratively with Metro Vancouver on WFL. System has mostly worked well. Recently a facility had its license suspended and Metro Vancouver has been unable to compel the facility to cease operating. Something to think about when creating the licensing and regulatory framework.

L. Gardner– Enforcement is always challenging. RDN has ticketing authority. The idea isn't to close a business but to change behaviour. Unscrupulous businesses may choose to operate in another jurisdiction. The benefit to responsible businesses is not being undercut by unscrupulous operators.

M. Rutten – Do the regional districts identify who requires licensing or do they ask operators to indicate whether they require licensing?

L. Gardner – Anything public-facing is excluded (bottle depot, thrift store). A scrap metal dealer requires licensing. There are strict requirements about who requires a license. Regional districts don't need to seek operators out. Other licensed operators will usually notify the regional district.

S. Willie – What about operators on lands such as the air base and First Nations?

L. Gardner – Those facilities wouldn't need to be licensed by the regional district. Waste hauler licensing would impact facilities on these lands. The governing bodies of these lands may want to adopt the same standards as the regional district.

S. Fisher – Option 2c seems appealing. Can we quantify existing diversion efforts and the savings we might have by materials not coming to the landfill?

L. Gardner – This question may be better addressed at the end of the presentation. The next two regulatory tools are more economical ways to provide higher levels of diversion. The goal is to incentivize rather than enforce.

Waste Generator Source Separation

Two options to get recyclables out of waste stream: separate into different containers by generator or remove recyclables from mixed waste. The more you mix garbage, the harder it is to sort and the more contamination you get. Lower costs and contamination when separated at source with better quality recyclables to go into a raw materials stream.

We often encourage people to divert but don't provide the physical means to do so. Source separation containers increase convenience and recycling but have associated

costs. Diversion costs more than disposal, but good for economy when major industry is involved in diversion.

How do you develop a system for improved source separation? Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) requires recyclables and organics to be taken to a recycling facility, which is challenging to enforce. RDN requires everyone to have source separation bins, but don't compel their use for easier enforcement. Another option is compulsory residential curbside service where everyone pays, which can be expanded to businesses and multi-family residences. May need a different system for more remote areas. Hiring inspectors to ensure people use containers correctly increases costs and may alienate the community.

Waste Generator Source Separation Options/Strategies:
1a: Require recyclables to be taken to facility as an education tool. Startup cost is minimal. Annual cost is low, estimated at $5,000. Diversion impact is low.
1b: Require recyclables to be taken to a facility with enforcement. Startup cost is minimal with considerable annual costs estimated at $170,000. Approximately 4 per cent increase in diversion.

2a: Require source separation bins. Startup costs are moderate, estimated at $40,000. Annual cost is relatively low, estimated at $30,000. Approximately 4 per cent increase in diversion.

3a: Compulsory service with separation bins provided. Significant startup costs. Significant annual costs estimated at $26 million or more. Approximately 4 per cent increase in diversion.
3b: Compulsory service with enforcement. Significant startup costs. Significant annual costs estimated at $26 million or more. Private services can be more cost-effective than local government.

Advisory Comments
S. Willie – Can private services provide more cost-effective services than local government?

S. Fisher – It seems pretty clear that mandatory bins get more diversion. It might be difficult to regulate and enforce in more remote communities.

L. Gardner – Keep in mind a bylaw for containers may require people to have three bins but may not require people to bring them to a recycling facility.

S. Willie – It's a mixed bag in terms of whether private sector or local government can provide more cost-effective services based on the comments.

L. Gardner – In the RDN, residents pay low fees. In concept, there's overhead associated with government not associated with private industry. Could you get the same results by requiring everyone to have a private hauler? Potentially government could put rules in place to get the same impact as providing the service themselves.

L. Bryan – Some service providers may have access to markets that local government doesn't and this can reduce costs.

R. Telegus – Is source separation a tool for providing transparencies for recycling outside of Recycle BC?

L. Gardner – This is more about getting higher value divertible items out of waste stream.

R. Telegus – It would be helpful to have waste haulers licensed.

L. Gardner – Lots of divertible items such as electronics may end up going all over the world. These processes tend to attract responsible operators.

S. Willie – We could reassure people recyclables are being sorted responsibly.

L. Gardner – Nanaimo requires every business to have three bins. In practice, businesses hire someone to pick up the waste. Someone might take recyclables home if it's a small amount. This is about building a system to get people to get used to participating in diversion.

L. Bryan – Generally private industry agrees with source separation. It's not perfect but it's a good starting point. Innovation and investment should be encouraged to keep recycling on Island.

L. Gardner – In the RDN, the industry supported the concept of requiring multiple bins for generators. They liked the idea of government regulating it.

S. Fisher – We could distribute bins to remote communities but access to disposal options is the biggest barrier. We want people to think about that.

S. Willie – What are the expectations with remote communities and cost-of-living considerations? There may be alternative options for source separating at an acceptable cost.

Waste Hauler Licensing (WHL)

The RDN has adopted WHL with a goal to grow the waste industry. A significant proportion of waste goes directly to landfill from small industry. Encourage waste to flow to industry by reducing tipping fees on disposal of non-recyclable materials. Provide incentives to industry to divert by making disposal of recyclables more expensive. Put in place a levy for disposing of materials regardless of disposal location to eliminate the search for low-cost disposal. In the case of RDN, haulers pay a lower tipping fee and a disposal levy. They save $20 per tonne. Industry is incentivized to divert. The way to reduce the levy is to recycle more. The levy only applies to material going to landfill.

The CRD adopted an alternative strategy with a Waste Collector Incentive program (WCI). Waste collectors receive $25 per tonne tipping fee rebate with voluntary self-reporting of waste collection data. Should encourage waste to flow through industry and encourage diversion. More effective if standards for diversion are set and checked. Doesn't discourage low cost disposal.

Waste Hauler Licensing and Waste Collector Incentive Options/Strategies:
WHL licensing had estimated startup expenses of $80,000 and annual costs of approximately $50,000 with a high estimated diversion impact of 15 per cent.

A WCI program has minimal startup costs and high estimated annual costs of approximately $120,000 with an estimated diversion impact of 4 to 9 per cent depending on how the program is organized and whether there are inspections and/or data auditing.

In conclusion, we want industry to participate in waste diversion. We get participation if we make diversion more profitable. Strategies that motivate haulers and don't require a large regulatory burden are preferrable. The SWMP can provide access to these additional tools.

Advisory comments:
D. Baar – Consider waste haulers travelling from CVRD to Lower Mainland. Which location has jurisdiction over the hauler? Site of origin?

L. Gardner – It may depend on how waste is sourced within the region. It depends on bylaw details. WHL captures the flow of materials in and out of RDN sites and captures waste sourced within the region.

S. Willie – It may depend on how bylaw is designed.

S. Fisher – Does the CSWM have the authority to implement these strategies within the SRD through the SWMP, or would the SRD Board need to create and support their own bylaws?

L. Gardner – These bylaws would first need to be in the SWMP in concept. Both CSWM and SRD would need to be involved in supporting the strategy. A bylaw would also need to be approved by the MoE.

S. Fisher – Would there be competition issues with CSWM and development of bylaws and how would things overlap between CSWM and SRD?

L. Gardner – The Province has a great deal of oversight to ensure no one is dealt with unfairly through the legislation. Early in the concept of developing WHL, the Competition Bureau didn't raise concerns. It doesn't set up a monopoly or exclude operators from the system. The Board decides on the bylaw. The Province won't support a bylaw unless both regional districts have support from their communities.

S. Willie – Our establishment bylaw covers the entire area. For the SWMP, would the consultation for the proposed bylaw be accounted for in the proposal of bylaws in both jurisdictions?

L. Gardner – It's ultimately the regional board's decision. You could go out and consult on the SWMP, the community could oppose it, and the board could still approve it. When they then go to the Province, the Province would turn it down. The Province won't support it unless the regional district can demonstrate support from the community.

S. Willie – It's important to note that it would probably require approval from the SRD and CVRD Boards and not just the CSWM Board. TBD by Legislative Services. It's important to clarify the concepts, provide enough information to the public so they understand what we're talking about, and go forward from there.

R. Telegus – There would need to be a screening mechanism on building permits for the provision of bins for the ICI sector.

S. Willie – Maybe in the multi-family realm. It can be difficult to add all the bins retroactively. Also, it's a challenge with ICI and multi-use buildings.

R. Telegus – Liaising with builders would be key. They work in many regional districts. It would be helpful to have consistent requirments.

L. Gardner – I would encourage looking into the authority of local government to require the bin infrastructure. The RDN came up with a bylaw saying you need to have containers or contract out for post-collection sorting.

L. Gardner – As for the earlier question about regulating haulers, if you haul material generated from outside the regional district into the RDN landfill, transfer station or licensed facility, you don't require a license. If you're hauling waste within the region, then you do require a license. It's a longer discussion about why all that works but hopefully this addresses the question about how it works. It helps ensure waste isn't disposed of illegally.

S. Willie – How does WHL ensure garbage won't be illegally dumped?

L. Gardner – Record keeping and reporting requirements, as well as an economic advantage to being a licensed hauler with reduced tipping fees.

M. Rutten – How many licensed haulers do you expect there to be in the RDN?

L. Gardner – Approximately fifty. We look at account holders.

S. Willie – We ballparked it similarly here. It's not everyone who hauls waste, it's the people who are in the business of making profit by hauling waste. A developer or construction company might have a tonnage comparable to small haulers but they're not in the business of profiting from hauling waste as a service.

L. Gardner – The RDN does expect some who aren't only in the business of hauling waste for profit to sign up because of the benefit of reduced costs. It will encourage diversion and reporting even if others sign up, but it's targeting the businesses like those in WMABC.

S. Willie – Our biggest account holders are local governments and major waste companies. Then we get people you might see weekly, but they're much smaller private sector entities. There are some other pieces of the puzzle such as wood waste collectors and landfills receiving waste directly to consider when creating policies.

L. Bryan – The CRD's WCI program is something service providers lean towards accepting more than a hauler licensing program. They like the voluntary aspect. There seems to be a decent participation level so far. Metro Vancouver has a generator levy on their facilities. They didn't get WHL approval in 2019 and the Competition Bureau provided an opinion at that time. One of the biggest reasons was the large amount of material going to the FVRD. After five or six years, very little waste is going outside of the Metro Vancouver region and this was accomplished

without hauler licensing. The Competition Bureau recently indicated they would encourage local governments to increase competition. I encourage you to look at Commissioner Bothwell's most recent report and can provide a link to it. The RDN received conditional approval for WHL from the MoE and it had to be resubmitted. Do you know what conditions needed to be applied to the new WHL submission?

L.Gardner – The RDN is working on the termination date for the WHL bylaw. There's no existing model. The bylaw can be introduced and if doesn't work, it'll go away. They can request for the termination date to be extended or removed. They're expecting a decision within weeks. I would welcome getting a copy of the Competition Bureau report.

Hands on Exercise – In-Person Participants

V. Schau led participants in discussing how a waste hauler levy and reduced tip fee would work in a practical example. A visual display of a case study for a multifamily residential unit was presented with data on two scenarios: status quo and waste hauler licensing. The display used waste materials labeled with disposal costs as a discussion tool. [see case study handout provided by VS]

Advisory comments:

The discussion group generally agreed the WHL option with a diversion incentive landfill discount of $45/tonne was slightly less expensive and better for the environment than the status quo. Several participants also commented on the importance of public perception about how recycling is handled and where it ultimately ends up.

Roundtable Discussion – Virtual Participants via Zoom

S. Willie led a roundtable discussion on the tools and strategies presented. Participants encouraged to share comments and questions.

R. Telegus – The material presented was huge in scope and fascinating.

S. Willie – Memos will be sent out this week to take a deeper look and make refinements.

C. Perry – We're already achieving source separation in some of the municipalities and the Islands. We have the ability to separate at the source already.

S. Willie – Would you say the same for ICI?

C. Perry – There are a lot of requests from ICI to do more, especially around composting. It comes down to how the compost facility was designed for capacity.

Many businesses and multi-family properties would like to participate in an organics program. We're currently not able to extend the program that far with the CSWM. We're making sure new developments are accommodating for additional space within their garbage enclosures for organics collection.

S. Willie – To clarify, you're offering recycling services to MF and ICI properties?

C. Perry – Yes, we offer recycling through our container services.

D. Baar – The reduction in garbage was startling when compost collection started. It would be great to see that for ICI. L. Gardner noted bins are required at source but it's still problematic to move that into a place where source separation is accepted and there's space for it. Just an observation.

S. Willie – We need to ensure there are offerings, so we're not requiring separation or banning disposal of material streams if there are no alternative locations.

D. Baar – We need somewhere for it to go and that still seems to be coming into place.

M. Jeffs – It was an interesting presentation. It sounds like the financial incentives are the way to go. Make it profitable to do the right thing. Here in Sayward, this is already going on. For instance, one business feeds food waste to pigs. There's a lot of that kind of activity in rural communities because we have a much different landscape.

S. Willie – How do you think the people of Sayward would react to compulsory garbage pickup service if it's not complemented by any other streams?

M. Jeffs – The participation in the drop-off for recycling is pretty good. It's always full. Adding services there would be helpful. I think some businesses use the drop-off as well as residents. We'd rather have them do the right thing. They can do it for free so they do it.

K. Lovely – It was interesting to see how Nanaimo was right at the top of the list in terms of reducing waste compared to other municipalities and the idea of incentivizing people to participate rather than enforcing. Otherwise, you create a system you need to enforce and there aren't people to do that. Another point that stood out is how important it is to separate out compost. I'm wondering how to get that to happen in bigger places such as hospitals, businesses, and schools. The Cumberland school was trying to do that for a while, but you need someone to manage it. They were trying not to provide garbage cans so families could see the waste kids were bringing home, but that's fallen by the wayside.

S. Willie – There are models for that and it's something we're considering. The private sector could also support it.

L. Eason – When I talk with people in the community, there's a misconception that costs should be lower if they're recycling. If you look at the numbers, diversion is more costly. It's a matter of getting people to understand that, but also keeping it incentivized where it's cheaper to divert as much as possible. My hope is that MF gets all the same services as residential. They all want to divert organics and recycling. I think businesses would as well. I think it's possible to do wide scale diversion with three streams.

S. Willie – You're talking about back-of-house rather than front-of-house. L. Eason is working on a MF pilot to see where the challenges are.

L. Eason – There are no options for organics collection, except for one private service.

R. Crisfield – My comments reflect what we've heard about the incentives. Incentivizing is the way to go. Look at how many rules and regulations we have. Enforcement is not an easy way to go. Each community is unique. I would suggest Cumberland would have a high uptake with expanded organics removal if you have the ability to receive and process it. Providing bins for everyone creates false expectations unless you can take that diverted waste and do something with it. Like recycling, people hope it's being handled properly with an end product where it's not ending up back in the garbage stream. We could educate people to point out tangible products.

S. Willie – There is capacity within a reasonable proximity. There's the private Convertus composting facility in Nanaimo where they're able to handle more contamination. They accept compostable bags.

L. Gardner – Nanaimo contracts with Convertus for residential organics and organics received at the transfer station. They have a lower tipping fee than for waste. If the hauler has the ability to collect a different stream and can pay less for managing it appropriately, they'll do that. It wouldn't involve the disposal levy because it's being diverted.

S. Willie – Nanaimo didn't build a composting facility themselves. The private sector did.

Co-Chair Cole-Hamilton – It's been great to listen to the feedback from people. Nanaimo's work has been impressive in the solid waste community with the levels of

diversion. Thank you to L. Gardner for spending the time to lay out how that happened. I hear a lot of support for incentives rather than enforcement. That makes a lot of sense to me. Reflecting on K. Lovely talking about the schools in Cumberland, I think some groups don't need to be incentivized at all. I think there are many classrooms eager to be a test case. It's not easy. It does require extra capacity among janitorial staff and other people to keep that contamination out. What I hear from members of the public is that people in MF buildings and schools are chomping at the bit to get to the point where they're not putting organics in the garbage. We've done a great job of telling people why we shouldn't put organics in the waste stream. Now people want to do it. I'm excited to hear we're starting to work with multi-unit buildings. And there are always pigs. Thanks to M. Jeffs for that suggestion. Thanks to S. Willie for organizing the afternoon.

M. Jeffs – I'm curious about Nanaimo. They are very restrictive in their residential practices. They give residents smaller bins and pick up less frequently. They force people's hand because there aren't other options. There has been some heavy handedness there. They do pass out tickets to residents.

C. Perry – The City of Courtenay and Town of Comox took a similar approach with the new cart program. We kept 120-litre garbage cans but restricted it to biweekly pickup. We've provided larger organics and recycling bins with the intention of forcing the conversion. We're nearing the end of our trial period in the Town of Comox. Starting July 1, we'll look at letting people trade out and make exchanges with bin sizes. We're expecting some people to ask for larger garbage bins. We're planning on doing a garbage audit with anyone who requests a larger bin before providing it. We want to ensure we're diverting as much as we can. We received many complaints initially about the size of the garbage bins, but over the last couple of months we've only had a couple of complaints from families with kids in diapers. Providing larger bins would have to be on a case-by-case basis. I was interested to hear L. Gardner's comment about enforcement not working in the past and being expensive. We only have one bylaw officer for the Town of Comox.

L. Gardner – In the eight years I was with the RDN, I'm not aware of any residents ticketed or fined under the system. Typically, we hired students to go around and leave notices with no monetary penalty on containers as an educational tool. It was about keeping unacceptable materials out of recycling and organics. Better to throw something out than contaminate organics or recycling if in doubt. We didn't try to restrict people from using a larger garbage bin, they just paid more for it. The cameras in garbage trucks are still in the works. It's always a balance to get the right triggers to change behaviour.

C. Perry – We're supposed to have the garbage truck cameras for contamination monitoring. Emterra is working with temporary trucks by now. We've been pushing to get the cameras installed for the organics and recycling. There are hefty penalties in our contract with Emterra. We won't be ticketing right away. We'll be sending out information to homeowners to educate them first before we start on enforcement. It's a change in the level of service people received in the past. We want people to participate to meet diversion targets.

R. Telegus – I'm curious about the idea of competition. L. Gardner mentioned the possibility of having multiple haulers on single streets in residential areas, rather than having a municipal contract. There's lots of competition with a municipal contract. It might be inaccurate to say there's more competition with having multiple haulers. The competition was fierce to implement curbside collection in the City of Chilliwack.

L. Gardner – Great question. The devil is in the details. If you're in a city and you have lots of business and MF, you may be better off with multiple haulers collecting when there's large enough density. Residential services with smaller density and wouldn't have the same benefit. It's challenging to make generalizations.

S. Willie – There's a small hauler locally who encourages rural customers to sign up neighbours to create enough demand to provide service. L. Bryan also addressed that both were necessary.

R. Telegus – What is the goal of having a competitive system? Is it to lower costs?

L. Gardner – Cost is one goal. Innovation is another. The industry may be more innovative and adaptable than government.

R. Telegus – You get a lack of innovation in larger companies. I tend to lean towards government. Waste Management Canada is the largest company in North America. Are they innovative?

L. Gardner – There are many different opinions on how governments contribute to GDP compared to the private sector. My general conclusion is that we see a better economic benefit by industry provided services than government provided services.

D. Baar – Regarding innovation, my own experience has more to do with scale. Small teams can often be more agile and innovative, but large teams/organizations may be required to have the desired function, e.g. waste management at a municipal scale.

R. Telegus – I'm enjoying this discussion because you're helping me move my position.

Next Steps and Wrap-up
Review draft memos on regulatory tools, provide feedback by Friday, May 17, 2024.

GENERAL:
The next Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee is scheduled for June 27, 2024 at 1:00 pm. Discussion topics will be ICI Diversion Strategies and Food Waste Reduction.

TERMINATION:
Co-Chair Cole-Hamilton adjourned the meeting. The meeting terminated at 4:15 pm.

Recorded by:

B. Meagher
Bridget Meagher
Branch Assistant – Engineering Services

Certified correct:

S. Willie
Sarah Willie
Manager of Solid Waste Planning and Policy Development