

PROJECT NAME: a  
 LOCATION: Regional District of Central Okanagan office, 1450 KLO Road, Kelowna  
 DATE OF MEETING: April 26, 2005  
 TIME OF MEETING : 4:00 – 6:00 P.M.

PAGE: 1 of 2  
 DATE: May 02, 2005

PRESENT:

Carol Suhan	RDCO
Alan Newcombe	Earth Tech
Sarah Wilmot	Earth Tech
Jan Enns	Jan Enns Communications
Ron Brown	Previous PAC member
Colleen Bryce	Kelowna General Hospital
Graham Kershaw	OUC, Property & Custodial Services
Mark Koch	Resident
Brian Galton	Westbank Resident's Association
Gary Morris	Central Okanagan Bear Aware
Lloyd Manchester	Canadian EarthCare Society
Tom Loewen	BFI Canada Inc.
Bill Scutt	Downtown Kelowna Association/Business Owner
Lydia Reith	North Westside Ratepayers Association
Brad Talbot	Rutland Senior Secondary
Rebecca Whidden	Environmental Studies
Tim Teeple	Waste Management of Canada Corp.

REGRETS:

Lloyd Nelson	Rutland Residents Association
Shelley Benson	Ink Jet
Jim Dixon	Lakeview Heights Community Association
Bill Gladstone	Past V.P. Central Okanagan Homeowner Assoc.
Gordon Hirtle	Rotary: Environment Committee
James Pengilly	Constable Neil Bruce Middle School
Bert Put	Chair, Peachland EDC
Richard Soneff	Soneff Construction & Knight Gate Prop. Ltd.
Tony Sali	Trader's Cove Residents Association
Lance Shaw	OK Environment Waste Systems
Deanne Stephenson	Metro Materials Recovery
Erin Thomas	Thomas Scott SignCraft Ltd.

PURPOSE: Discussion of future waste management options and evaluation criteria.

DISTRIBUTION TO ALL ABOVE AND: Konrad Fichtner, Gillian O'Sullivan, Earth Tech Canada

WRITTEN BY: Jan Enns

PROJECT NO.:

DATE: May 3, 2005

CONTRACT NO.:

PAGE: 2 of 4

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Welcomes and Introductions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jan welcomed everyone to the second meeting of the Public Advisory Committee for the discussion of future waste management options and evaluation criteria.</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting Handouts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New documents circulated included a revised Summary of Long List Items, a flowchart showing waste flows (entitled “Where It Goes”), and a copy of the presentation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Review of Solid Waste Management in Central Okanagan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarah reviewed the sources of solid waste in the Central Okanagan, where the waste goes (recycling, landfill, etc.), and who handles the waste (local governments, private sector, etc.), followed by discussion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Review of Options and Discussion on Additional Options to be considered</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarah presented information about options for managing waste in five categories. After presenting the potential options for each section (see the Long List document), additional options were brought forth by committee members. As well as general discussion, comments and additional options were recorded on the flip charts as follows:</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Additional Reduce and Reuse Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that ET investigate stewardship programs, particularly tires. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Where are the programs at in terms of development?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Could incentive programs be used to encourage waste reduction? For example, tax reductions could be given to MFU that offer recycling.</li> <li>• Education should be specifically targeted using measurable social marketing programs. Examples of potential targets include residents living in MFU and school-aged children, and specific topics mentioned were IC&amp;I and organics.</li> <li>• Packaging may best be addressed by giving a mandate to local governments to lobby senior governments</li> <li>• White Styrofoam packaging has been successfully recycled by Westside Road residents, who are taking a pick-up full every week to a woman in Vernon who shreds it for use in animal bedding and upholstery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The RDCO has contacted this women, and unfortunately she cannot handle larger volumes</li> <li>◦ Are there any concerns about off-gassing?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Options that are considered in this plan need to be able to handle large volumes on an ongoing basis.</li> </ul>	

PROJECT NO.:

DATE: May 3, 2005

CONTRACT NO.:

PAGE: 3 of 4

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY
	<p><b>Additional Recycling Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why isn't blue bag for MFU and ICI included in blue bag collection?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Discussion around flow control</li> <li>◦ Example provided from Peachland, where volumes from IC&amp;I were too high for blue bag collection</li> <li>◦ Tim and Tom spoke of difficulties in implementing/administering standard ICI programs – there are too many variables</li> <li>◦ Problems with standardized ICI collection can also result when an institution wants a different level of service from the norm.</li> <li>◦ Note that the “Dirty MRF” concept has been tried, and failed, in the lower mainland.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Additional Organics Management Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-consumer food waste may also have re-uses (other than composting) such as being used at feedlots</li> <li>• Would biosolids be included in composting?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Depends on the type of composting system used and the characteristics of the feedstock</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What about pit burning?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ This may be done in Lake Country for land-clearing waste, using an air curtain burner</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need to address the use of backyard composters – should the WRO continue to subsidize composters and provide education?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Earth Tech will estimate the cost/tonne, based on average use of backyard composters (according to the Compost Council)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Education should be directed to school children</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Additional Energy Recovery Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Other Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boy Scout/Developer partnerships to deal with land-clearing debris               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Concerns with liability</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pruning waste is an issue that is not yet being adequately addressed               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ RDCO had a program with a mobile grinder for the 80 largest orchards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Additional Residuals Management Options:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US regulations are more stringent than Canadian regulations for landfill construction and operation. This leads to concerns over hazards from landfills, both old and new.</li> <li>• Note that insurance requirements are more stringent than regulations, so landfill operators are working to meet insurance requirements, not only the regulations.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Additional options, questions and comments may be submitted until May 6, 2005 to <a href="mailto:solidwasteplan@earthtech.ca">solidwasteplan@earthtech.ca</a></b></p>	

PROJECT NO.:

DATE: May 3, 2005

CONTRACT NO.:

PAGE: 4 of 4

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION BY																																																												
5	<p><b>Develop Criteria to be used to Rate each Option</b></p> <p>Sarah reviewed the ways in which each of the options, including the new ones received from the committee, would be rated. The results will be used to evaluate the long list and generate the short list.</p> <p>The group was asked to provide a score or weighting for each of the categories of criteria, with 10 being the highest score. The following results were achieved:</p>																																																													
	<table border="1" data-bbox="391 680 1183 1129"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Cost</th> <th>Environmental</th> <th>Social</th> <th>Practical</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>10</td><td></td><td>6</td><td>4</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td></td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>2</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Avg.</b></td> <td><b>7.2</b></td> <td><b>8.6</b></td> <td><b>6.9</b></td> <td><b>7.9</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Cost	Environmental	Social	Practical	10		6	4	4	9	2	3		2	8	3	2	5	2	7	2		1	3	6	1				5	2				4					3					2					1			1		<b>Avg.</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.9</b>	
Score	Cost	Environmental	Social	Practical																																																										
10		6	4	4																																																										
9	2	3		2																																																										
8	3	2	5	2																																																										
7	2		1	3																																																										
6	1																																																													
5	2																																																													
4																																																														
3																																																														
2																																																														
1			1																																																											
<b>Avg.</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.9</b>																																																										
	<p>The group was then taken through the scores for the factors within each category. Time constraints meant that rather than scoring each factor, the group was informed how the TAC had scored the factors, and then members were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the scoring. The following issues with TAC`s scoring were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress towards Zero Waste may be ranked too high</li> <li>• Local desire may be ranked either too high or too low – recent studies show that most people are very concerned with environmental issues.</li> <li>• The group also suggested additional criteria that should be included when generating the short list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Health impacts need to be added (meeting environmental legislation is not good enough). These include health impact to society, as well as WCB issues. Health should be given a ranking of 8 or 9.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>																																																													
6	<p>Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.</p> <p>The next meeting will be in late May or early June. The date is to be announced.</p> <p>Thank you for your participation!</p>																																																													
	<p><b>These minutes are in the writer's best interpretation of discussions held during the meeting. Please inform the writer of any noteworthy omissions or errors.</b></p>																																																													