

Solid Waste Management Plan Update: Initial Draft Member Jurisdiction Workshop

Monday, February 9, 2026

Metro Vancouver – 4515 Central Boulevard, Burnaby
28 Floor, 2809 Conference Room

Attendees:

Alexandra Wiens, City of Delta	Kyle Simpson, City of Port Coquitlam
Bo Ocampo, District of North Vancouver	Linh Huynh, City of Richmond
Caroline Jackson, District of North Vancouver	Lucas Kelsch, City of North Vancouver
Cristy Houston, City of Richmond	Michelle Harris, City of Vancouver
David G Lee, City of New Westminster	Nichelle Cameron, City of Coquitlam
Emily Willobee, District of West Vancouver	Queenie Wong, City of Delta
Erik Schmidt, City of Burnaby	Shannon Hadley, Township of Langley
Erin Blaney, City of Langley	Stacey Neves, City of New Westminister
Jeffrey Martel, City of Surrey	Tom Madigan, District of North Vancouver
Kristina Nishi, City of Richmond	Trevor Doré, District of West Vancouver

Metro Vancouver is updating its regional solid waste management plan, building on the strengths of the current plan and identifying ways to further reduce waste, increase recycling, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and advance a circular economy.

On February 9, 2026, Metro Vancouver held a workshop with member jurisdiction staff to receive feedback on the initial draft solid waste management plan. Members of REAC, REAC Solid Waste Sub-Committee, and the Regional Waste Reduction Coordinators' Committee were invited. Prior to the meeting, Metro Vancouver polled members to identify priority parts of the plan for small group discussion. Final small group topics were:

- Member actions
- Strategic approaches
- Targets and metrics
- Dispose actions



we are here

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Below are highlights from feedback at the workshop, categorized by the small group topics at the workshop. Detailed notes were recorded to capture all feedback related to the initial draft plan and Metro Vancouver will consider each comment as the draft is revised in preparation for providing to the Zero Waste Committee and GVS&DD Board. Following Board approval, there will be an additional opportunity for comment prior to submission of the draft to the Minister of Environment and Parks for approval.

MEMBER ACTIONS

Member feedback:

- Inconsistency in how member actions are displayed. Preference for member actions to be separated so they are visually distinct from the other actions in the plan and easy to find, and note what type of intervention is represented (e.g. regulation, education, business change)
- Some supported current wording in the plan whereas others felt member jurisdiction roles are too voluntary, and that language could be strengthened. Discussion that a balance must be struck so that the actions are not prescribing actions but serve as a guide.
- Question whether there is a municipal action related to food waste
- Note that member action on recycled concrete (4.1.2) could be broader to include other materials
- Actions should drive collaborative work and sharing between members, to help increase consistency across the region
- Support for Action 2.1.7 as commercial and institutional waste is the biggest opportunity, but also flagged as difficult to measure at a local level
- Support for Strategy 4.4 and 4.5 on improving recycling convenience and education
- Support for maintaining and enhancing behaviour change campaigns, developed by Metro Vancouver and amplified by member jurisdictions
- Comment to expand the actions around reuse, beyond just reuse at recycling and waste centres. For example, one municipality is collecting furniture for reuse
- Could we relate member actions to targets, noting potential impact?
- Request for breakdown of what will make the biggest impact and relate to cost (aim for maximum impact and low investment first)
- After plan is approved, develop a summary table to aid with implementation

STRATEGIC APPROACHES

(Regulatory, Recycling and Waste Centre, Residual Management)

Member feedback:

- Need for clearer regulatory strategies
- Importance of managing construction and demolition materials, including recycled aggregates
- Municipalities need to be able to leverage plan actions to drive local progress
- Working well: inclusion of regulatory strategy, education actions related to recycling including multi-family, alignment of the approaches with regional district authority, and innovation strategies are appreciated
- What's missing:
 - Clear timelines for implementation, especially for mandatory source separation
 - Stronger regulatory strategy overall, including more explicit regulatory tools (e.g. Hauler licensing, generator-level requirements)
 - Clear connection between regional actions and other government level responsibilities
 - Mechanisms for benchmarking and tracking progress that can be adopted by members
 - More discussion of advocacy in the strategies and actions
- What needs to be strengthened:
 - Collaboration with and reliance on other regulatory bodies
 - Clearer articulation of actions that fall within regional authority
 - Stronger regulatory tools
 - More emphasis on high-impact actions and quick wins
 - Clarity on regional processing capacity for organics and construction and demolition
 - Stronger language in general for firmer commitments
 - Educational components to accompany regulatory changes
- Desire for regulatory options that put pressure on manufacturers
- Interest in replicating successes similar to the organics disposal ban
- Accessibility concerns need to be considered, such as placement of bins
- Suggestion to highlight where readers can find actions by other levels of government

TARGETS & METRICS

Member feedback:

- Interest in aligning with municipal metrics and targets where they exist
- Many municipalities rely on regional targets and metrics as they do not have local versions
- Agreement that the targets feel ambitious but achievable, and even if targets are aspirational, they help the region to progress

TARGETS & METRICS

- Support for per-capita targets
- Request for more information on specific pathways (e.g. actions) to achieve targets. How were targets calculated, and describe supporting analysis
- Suggest a visual tool or dashboard to track progress towards targets
- Responsibility cannot rest solely on consumers or education efforts
- Suggest having specific by-sector targets, such as single-family, multi-family, commercial, to help municipalities understand where to focus efforts
- Measuring progress is challenging as municipalities do not have access to the necessary data locally
- Need to determine who will be supplying data for secondary metrics, and what the responsibility of municipalities will be in collecting that data. Concern about workload and added costs for municipalities to track new metrics.
- Suggested modifying the secondary metrics on single use items and food waste to include metrics on the amount found in recycling/organics, to continue to push up the waste hierarchy to waste prevention rather than simply recycling.
- Suggestion that secondary metrics should clarify whether it is the number of buildings or number of units (for construction and demolition materials reuse)
- Interest in exploring technology such as AI to improve data collection, as measuring performance remains a major challenge

DISPOSE ACTIONS

Member feedback:

- In Action 6.1.1 remove reference to greenhouse gas emission offsets, focus on maximizing landfill gas utilization
- Consider enhanced actions to address illegal dumping, particularly in relation to it as a member jurisdiction action/role
- Support for high level actions under dispose
- Action 6.4.4 – Remove reference to City of Vancouver as that appears to have been included in error
- Suggest an action to ensure there are easily accessible options for residents to dispose or recycle challenging materials such as drywall
- Suggest member action to expand large item pick up programs
- Amend Action 6.6.5 to include illegal dumping of construction and demolition waste
- Include definition of international waste in the glossary
- Need more specifics about the education component for residents to recycle large items as illegal dumping often becomes the alternative. Touched on in 3.2.5 but not specific to education.
- It is confusing that some member actions are separated out while other actions that are not designated member actions still involve collaboration with members

