

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC/TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, May 8, 2025

Online Meeting

1:00 pm – 3:30 pm

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Director Sarah Kirby-Yung, Chair; Director Craig Hodge, Vice-Chair; Adelyn Chan, Allen Lynch, Amika Watari, Ben Liegey, Bill Chan, Brianne De Man, Christoph Schultz, Cody Irwin, Daniel Rotman, Daryl Foster, Doug Schell, Jake Turek, Jennifer Henry, Kevin Huang, Komal Fatima, Louise Schwarz, Marcelle Moreira dos Santos, Michael Zarbl, Sarah Scanlan, Sean Miles, Sue Maxwell, Tara Immell, William Selten.

Absent: Brenda Martens, Cassidy vander Ros, Christian Dietrich, Gil Yaron, Grant Hankins, Jamie Kaminski, Jaye-Jay Berggren, John Doherty, Lori Bryan (IAC Chair), Lyndsay Poaps, Matthew Morin, Raman Johal, Sara Larter, Stephanie Voysey, Ulwiana Mehta-Malhotra, Yasmin Abraham.

Metro Vancouver Staff: Brooke Atkinson, Chris Underwood, Chris Allan, Karen Storry, Paul Henderson, Sahar Ahmadvand, Stephanie Liu, Terry Fulton, Samantha Joy, Zack Ha, Allen Jensen.

	INTRODUCTIONS Meeting started at 1:00 pm	Chair
1.	Welcome from the Chair - Director Kirby-Yung welcomed Committee members - Territorial acknowledgement	
2.	AGENDA Reviewed the May 8, 2025 meeting agenda.	Chair
3.	MEETING MINUTES – April 10, 2025 - Reviewed the April 10, 2025 meeting notes and members requested revisions: - On the Draft Climate 2050 Solid Waste Road Map - there was a question on where the statistics for a chart on the Vancouver Landfill were from – staff noted they are working on a fulsome response and will update the notes - Record committee comments on including embodied emissions - On the draft hierarchy request emphasis on ‘recycle as energy’ category, noting strong opposition	Chair

	○ Staff advised that committee members can email to request any additional edits	
4.	ACTION/STANDING ITEMS	Chair
	4.1 Action tracker The action tracker was reviewed, and updates were provided. • Pending action items: ○ Breakdown for organic material versus recyclable materials generated in the multi-family sector will be presented at the June PTAC meeting ○ Full list of ideas from ideas generation engagement will be provided prior to options analysis feedback session • Completed action item: ○ Additional PTAC meeting, held today May 8	Brooke Atkinson
5.	New PTAC Member Introduction	
	5.1 New PTAC Member Introduction Introduction: Sarah Scanlan, Regional Sustainability Consultant, Energy and Environmental Sustainability, Vancouver Coastal Health.	
6.	DISCUSSION ITEMS	
	6.1 Solid Waste Management Plan Update Draft Options Analysis Criteria Karen Storry, Senior Engineer, Solid Waste Services Discussion summary: • Question if the greenhouse gas emission reductions criteria is taking into account direct and indirect emissions. ○ Staff confirmed that there is not enough data currently to apply embodied carbon to each evaluation criteria, but circularity is planned to be included in the evaluation criteria. Ideas which improve circularity are also likely to reduce embodied carbon. • Circularity and waste reduction are also cross cutting, in that they should foster a local economy, social component, and improve affordability • Other criteria may also be seen as cross-cutting • Are the criteria weighted? For example, will economic be weighted more heavily than a social item?	

	○ Staff clarified, there is no plan to weigh criteria, rather consider the criteria to assess if an action meets multiple of these criteria and supports the guiding principles • After the ideas are evaluated members request that the results be provided so they can review how the criteria was applied • Consider not using the word ‘evaluation’ if no scoring rubric is being used • Staff noted the “improve convenience” category could be broadened if members have suggestions Members had small group discussions on the proposed options evaluation criteria. A summary of these discussions is included as Attachment 1. Updated Draft Hierarchy, Goals, and Metrics Following April 10 Meeting Terry Fulton, Senior Project Engineer, Solid Waste Services Discussion summary: • Create fossil fuel substitute should not be in the ‘recycle’ category ○ Staff will be considering and revising the fossil fuel substitute item ○ Staff confirmed any updates/changes to the draft hierarchy will be circulated to PTAC members in advance of it being considered at the Zero Waste Committee and Board. • Canadian Standards Association Plastics Recycling Standard is clear that recycling is processing plastic waste materials to produce secondary material from which new products are made • Recommend Zero Waste Canada’s Zero Waste Hierarchy and European definitions of recycling be considered • Food donation at ‘reduce’ does not show the difference between food waste prevention and food donation ○ Staff to consider where food waste prevention and donation should be included in the hierarchy • Clarity is required for the meaning of various terms in the heirarchy? ○ Staff will provide a definition of terms used in the hierarchy • Suggestion that the different sectors in waste management need their own hierarchies • Suggestion that capture rate should be a metric in addition to recycle rate. Capture rate being the amount recyclable materials that are collected and doesn’t account for portion of that material that is disposed of. ○ Staff noted efforts and continued work to add clarity to recycling rate measure • ‘Make it easier to recycle effectively’: Are materials being recycled effectively? Just increasing recycling rates is not enough, note stewardship of the material not just the usability of the program	
--	--	--

	• ‘Minimise waste generation’ should be focused on reducing the material use • Add sixth goal to ‘stop burning waste’ • Enable circular economy – look at partnerships • ‘Create fossil fuel substitute’ – as a member of the public are items from your blue bin used for this? ○ Staff clarified that no, this category would primarily include construction and demolition waste used as fuel • ‘Rethink’ should add ‘track waste generated’ metric • The public can rethink, reduce, reuse, dispose, but cannot actually take action to recycle. An option from the European Union hierarchy is ‘preparing for recycling’. Make it clear how a citizen can partake. • Economics of recycling, can a dollar value of the budget be assigned to each level of the hierarchy? Proportionality of the different levels and where resources are focused	
7.	INFORMATION ITEMS	
	7.1 Zero Waste Committee and Other Updates • May Zero Waste Committee meeting was cancelled • Staff confirmed any information shared via email with the Zero Waste Committee members is included in the next months Manager’s Report if the meeting was cancelled. • Question regarding the allocation for land purchase in the 5 year Solid Waste Services capital plan ○ Staff clarified that land purchases would likely support the development of future recycling and waste centres based on increased growth and demand. Items included in the five year financial plan beyond those items in the immediate next year, are for the purpose of forecasting and establishing a plan, and are not approved to proceed with.	Paul Henderson
8.	OTHER BUSINESS	
	8.1 Additional PTAC Meeting in October • Interest to tour a recycling facility • Staff will poll members on their preference for the October 3 meeting to be in-person or online, as well as the preferred facility for the PTAC tour • Residuals Waste Management Options review will be circulated ahead of the June PTAC meeting included in the agenda package • Staff asked whether there was an interest in a Sharepoint site where committee members could provide information to be updated, and choose which communications to receive notifications for to reduce the number of emails sent between committee members. Following discussion, no	Brooke Atkinson

	Sharepoint is contemplated for now, but members suggested it would be important for members to consider email etiquette if emailing the entire committee.	
9.	ADDITIONAL ITEMS	
	9.1 Public/Technical Advisory Committee Updated 2025 Work Plan 9.2 Regional Waste Flows April 2025	
	ADJOURNMENT Adjourned at 3:13 pm	Chair

Attachment 1: Small Group Discussion Summary – Solid Waste Management Plan Update Draft Options Analysis
Criteria - PTAC May 8 2025 Meeting

Solid Waste Management Plan Public/Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Small Group Discussion Summary – Solid Waste Management Plan Update Draft Options Analysis
Criteria

May 8, 2025

At the May 8, 2025, Public/Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) meeting, Metro Vancouver sought input/feedback from members on the Draft Options Analysis Criteria related to the solid waste management plan update.

PTAC members broke into small groups to have in depth discussion and provide their input/feedback on the draft criteria for idea evaluation.

DRAFT IDEA EVALUATION CRITERIA

For developing options

Cross cutting		
• Practicality of Implementation • Accountability • Transparency		• Consistency/ harmonization • Collaboration • Resilience
Economic	Environment	Social
• Affordability • Economic prosperity • Innovation	• Circularity • Waste reduction • Greenhouse gas emissions reduction • Environmental stewardship	• Inclusion • Convenience • Community participation • Supports waste prevention habits and actions

WHAT WE HEARD

The table below summarizes themes that emerged through the small group discussions. All feedback will be taken into consideration as Metro Vancouver finalizes the solid waste management plan update options analysis criteria.

Draft Options Analysis Criteria <i>Is there anything missing from the draft criteria?</i> <i>Is there anything that should be removed or changed?</i> <i>Any other feedback?</i>	
Theme	What We Heard
Goal / use of the criteria	- Where is the waste hierarchy in these criteria? The hierarchy should be reflected more specifically - Very visionary and looks good on paper, but wondering how practical this criteria is and how much execution/implementation ability there is - What value are we receiving and how are we measuring that value? This needs to be the driver of every criteria we chose - Need to understand what the true cost options are and this should somehow be reflected as an overarching criterion - Questions on who will be using the criteria: - Metro Vancouver will be documenting how strategies and actions are selected to be recommended in the draft plan – to demonstrate how they were chosen, and then spark discussion with committees, public, and others - How do we ensure that the interpretation is consistently applied and matches our understanding - How do we make sure the criteria is applicable to more remote areas of the region - Support for setting the plan bar high - Many of these criteria can be seen as cross cutting
Missing from the criteria / definitions	- Definitions of the terms in the draft criteria as an appendix could help understand the specific use of each term - Add: Reuse, there is nothing specifically about <u>reuse</u> currently - With respect to Consistency/Harmonization/ Collaboration – what about “synergies”? something that reflects mutually beneficial relationships - Synergy, harmonization, how to communicate why we are doing a specific action

	• Innovation, accountability, and transparency in leadership, some are not fully understood or defined • Consider adding the word “value” to reflect options that offer benefits in multiple areas • “Circularity” could be under “Economy” or in a cross-cutting theme • One item that should be included is “impactful”, or “bold” – if we want to be global leader in waste reduction. “Innovation” is related to this. Maybe “bold innovation” – not just fixing small things • Environment: suggest “waste prevention” rather than “waste reduction” which may include recycling • Behaviour change is missing – need systemic changes that can influence behaviour • Focus on consumer awareness for reduction/reuse/prevention/education process • Missing: Extended producer responsibility – which column would that fall under? Environmental stewardship is part of that, but not the whole picture ○ Could tie into community participation or other social pieces • Avoiding contamination or protection of natural spaces • Missing is the protection of human health and the environment • Caution on convenience: ○ Can lead to increased contamination (e.g. putting everything into one bin) ○ It can take effort to change behaviour and properly recycle ○ Standardization versus ease ○ Convenience can be related to infrastructure ○ Can be looked at with respect to innovation ○ Relates to infrastructure/logistics/accessibility ○ Relates to participation/signage/labeling • Consider practicality of proposed solution versus convenience • Missing competitiveness • Economic prosperity – Have a clear set of definitions of the criteria for those who are using them to filter out actions • Missing in economic section: cost to benefit ratio • Economic prosperity ○ Does recycling add to GDP? ○ Adding legislated recycled content can create a market and increase value of a material ○ Incineration can take up resources that could be used on innovation in the green economy
--	---

	▪ If things are going to incineration, how do we make sure it's not just due to convenience ▪ Making things less convenient can help in other areas ○ Could be "creating economic value of recycled material", value added for recyclable material ○ There's a connection between prosperity and innovation • Missing is indigenous impact or indigenous inclusion
Social / inclusion / accessibility	• Rather than inclusion, perhaps accessibility could be considered to include alternative languages and comprehension of the system • Challenges in terms accessibility and accountability/responsibility by whom • Add: Accessibility to the Social category – Accessibility should not just be implied in convenience or another criteria • Social – inclusion is not same as diversity. Suggest adding "Diversity, equity, and inclusion" • Underrepresented groups such as immigrants and ethnic communities, have different ways of stewarding the environment but not necessarily through recycling but more reuse • People without vehicles don't have access to depots • Making sure to bring diverse voices along and incorporate into the plan •
Communicating the criteria	• What about comprehension or "buy-in", shared understanding, actionability? • The social, economic, and environmental buckets are helpful but an alternative way to visualize could be helpful that shows how one criteria (word) may fit into different buckets • A Venn diagram or alternative visual could be considered to show the linkages between the terms • Specific reference to leadership or forward thinking – avoid "innovation" or other buzz words that may be overused and diluted with diffused definitions ○ Embodied leadership
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)	• GHG reduction, good to have, but there should be reference to "life-cycle" thinking – think more economically: What is the life cycle cost? (services, process, materials) Life cycle thinking – intentionality. • For GHG emissions reduction – if plan is to focus on scope 1 and 2, does that mean that you would prioritize items that

	reduce direct emissions v.s. indirect emissions. Scope 3 emissions should be included.
Other	• Consistency, harmonization, collaboration, innovation: ○ Harmonizing ICI use of the built infrastructure in BC. A lot has been built because of Recycle BC EPR Program ○ Would like harmonization on private waste haulers and materials they are willing to accept, and bringing them to same facilities that the Recycle BC material goes to ○ Comprehensive recycling is not available in ICI in the same way it is for residents. Regulation can address this gap by harmonizing what haulers accept from ICI • Are there risk assessments being completed? Are there alternatives being considered? • Accountability – good to consider Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to be accountable to international frameworks. Last meeting when KPIs were shared there was nothing on SDG 12.3