

**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
PUBLIC/TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**October 3, 2025
In-Person Meeting
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

MEETING NOTES

The Meeting Notes of the Public/Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC), held in person at the Metro Vancouver – Head Office. The meeting commenced at 1:00 p.m. Pacific Time on Friday, October 3, 2025.

Attendees: Director Sarah Kirby-Yung, Chair; Director Craig Hodge, Vice-Chair; Adelyn Chan, Amika Watari, Brenda Martens, Cody Irwin, Doug Schell, Gil Yaron, Jamie Kaminski, Jennifer Henry, John Doherty, Komal Fatima, Raman Johal, Sarah Scanlan, Sean Miles, Sue Maxwell, William Selten

Absent: Allen Lynch, Ben Liegey, Bill Chan, Cassidy vander Ross, Christoph Schultz, Daniel Rotman, Daryl Foster, Grant Hankins, Jake Turek, Jaye-Jaye Berggren, Kevin Huang, Marcelle Moreira dos Santos, Matthew Morin, Michael Zarbl, Stephanie Voysey, Tara Immell, Ulwiana Mehta-Malhorta

Metro Vancouver Staff: Brooke Atkinson, Chris Underwood, Karen Storry, Paul Henderson, Stephanie Liu, Terry Fulton, Joanna Gauci, Allec Wu, Faith Sabourault

Independent Consultation and Engagement Panel Members: Andrea Reimer, Celena Bendorff, Ryan Williams

1.	<p>WELCOME</p> <p>The Chair, Director Sarah Kirby-Yung welcomed PTAC members and introduced the following Independent Consultation and Engagement Panel Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrea Reimer • Celena Benndorf • Ryan Williams 	Chair
2.	<p>AGENDA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair, Director Sarah Kirby-Yung presented and reviewed the October 3, 2025, meeting agenda. <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair noted today’s session is a workshop format, with the majority of time allocated to reviewing the solid waste management plan potential strategies and actions, and there will be discussion on the options under Recover and the ideas that staff consider inadvisable. • Suggestion that the agenda item titled “Plenary discussion on actions under Recover, and ideas staff consider inadvisable” be discussed in plenary before 	Chair

	<p>the workshop on the potential strategies and actions. Members and Chair agreed that this item would be moved for discussion first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion that financial discussions were important to have before discussing strategies and asked if there would be budget for actioning these strategies. 	
<p>3.</p>	<p>PREVIOUS MEETING NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed September 18, 2025, previous meeting notes and there were no additions made. 	<p>Chair</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION ITEMS</p>	<p>Chair</p>
	<p>Solid Waste Management Plan Update:</p> <p>4.1 Potential Strategies and Actions Feedback Session</p> <p>Terry Fulton, Senior Project Engineer, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, presented on the plan timeline, feedback session objectives, outcome of the options analysis phase, waste hierarchy, and additional opportunities for feedback.</p> <p>Plenary discussion on potential strategies and actions under Recover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members expressed concern with sending wood to be used as alternative fuel. • Members asked that Metro Vancouver consider the fact that the Vancouver Landfill is closing and there is a carbon neutral goal by 2050. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff noted that the bottom ash pilot diverted 40,000 tonnes of material from disposal. In addition, 100,000 tonnes of small load waste material could be diverted from disposal. Acknowledgement that pilot initiatives (e.g., bottom ash beneficial use, small load waste) show potential but need scaling. • Members discussed concerns that funding and resources are being put into the recovery efforts and taken away from other areas (recycling, reuse, reduce, rethink). • Members asked about salvaging reusable materials from garbage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff confirmed that Metro Vancouver does have an agreement with Urban Repurpose at the North Shore Recycling and Waste Centre that includes collecting reusables • Suggestion for clear articulation of triage systems at landfills and transfer stations to capture reusable/recyclable material. • Opposition to further reliance on incineration/waste-to-energy, citing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Environmental/climate impacts ○ Risk of diverting resources away from higher priority 4R strategies ○ Potential cost escalation and conflict with Zero Waste objectives • Concern that including incineration in the plan risks locking resources into low-priority disposal instead of upstream actions • Interest in whether it's possible to set proportional metrics for funding for each strategy <p>Actions Considered “Unadvisable” by Staff</p>	<p>Terry Fulton</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Staff presented ideas identified as unadvisable by staff for inclusion in the updated solid waste management plan.</p> <p>Member discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to align these suggestions with Metro Vancouver’s Climate 2050 commitments. • Questions about cost assumptions used to justify continued operation of the Waste-to-Energy Facility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff confirmed that no work is being done to expand waste-to-energy capacity. • Need for a hybrid approach that ensures all residual waste undergoes pre-processing/triage (Material Recovery Facility/Material Recovery and Biological Treatment systems) before landfill or incineration. • Source separation is preferable although there is no perfect separation system. Materials could go through a Materials Recovery Facility before going to landfill or waste-to-energy. • Many reasons to close the Waste-to-Energy Facility. • Privatization of the solid waste system is not advisable, with members citing risks of reduced accountability and oversight. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Important to maintain public system accountability and ensuring that resources are directed toward reduction, reuse, and recycling first. <p>Stephanie Liu, Program Manager, Community Engagement, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, provided the breakout group exercise details and instructions, highlighting the six tables to choose from including Rethink, Reduce, Reuse (Reuse, Refill, and Repair), Reuse (Food and Built Environment), Recycle (Infrastructure and Programs), and Recycle (Education).</p> <p>Feedback Session – Four Rs (Rethink, Reduce, Reuse, Recycle)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members chose small groups based on topics (Rethink, Reduce, Reuse, Recycle). • Groups reviewed and ranked strategies based on their level of priority to include in the draft plan. • Key themes identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strong support for upstream prevention actions (food waste reduction, circular economy initiatives, reuse/repair systems). ○ High priority placed on education, consistency, and convenience in recycling programs. ○ Support for expanded partnerships and advocacy at higher levels of government to drive systemic change. ○ Need to have more ambitious zero waste objectives throughout the plan update. 	Stephanie Liu
	<p>Breakout group notes are included in Attachment 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rethink • Reduce • Reuse (Reuse, Refill, and Repair) • Reuse (Food and Built Environment) 	

- Recycle (Infrastructure and Programs)
- Recycle (Education)

Highlights from the feedback are presented below:

Rethink, Reduce, Reuse

- Support for actions in top three R's
- Increase focus on infrastructure to make reuse convenient and accessible (land, storage, software, facilities)
- Funding or incentives for piloting reuse and repair initiatives
- Systems already exist but can be further supported/enhanced
- Increase accountability for designing out waste and increasing reusability of products (e.g. use incentives)
- Identify opportunities in reuse and repair industry and skills required for repair; the knowledge exists but needs more focus

Regulation and Incentives

- Advocacy, tools, templates, and education are not enough – they need to be combined with regulation, enforcement, and financial incentives
- Incentivize innovators and entrepreneurs providing solutions for materials so they aren't disposed
- Financial disincentives for disposal vs. recycling
- Advocate for additional materials to be added to EPR regulation

Implementation, Education, and Outreach

- Actions need to be more specific, ambitious, and actionable
- In general, actions need to be stronger – e.g. "fund" instead of "support"
- Support for advocacy and partnerships to drive systemic change
- High priority placed on education, consistency, and convenience in recycling programs
- Strong support for upstream waste prevention (food waste reduction, circular economy initiatives, reuse/repair systems)
- Discussion on motivation for recycling is required; education only works if people are motivated and keen to recycle; maybe introduce penalties
- Education is not enough for event recycling; system needs to be made accessible and easy
- Standardization across the region would help

Public/Private Service Provision

- Solid waste system privatization is unadvisable. Concerns included risks of reduced accountability and oversight. Support for public system accountability, with resources directed toward reduction, reuse, and recycling first.
- Certification/verification of receiving facilities (such as construction and demolition) would enhance confidence in accuracy of data reported

Residual Waste

- Funding currently going to disposal or recovery could be redirected to efforts

	<p>under rethink, reduce, reuse, and recycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposition to further reliance on waste-to-energy, citing environmental impacts, diverting resources away from the top 4 R's, and costs; comment the facility should close • Residual waste should undergo pre-processing before landfill or incineration; source separation is preferable but still results in some recyclables in the garbage • Review health care waste to direct the materials back to recycling and waste centres 	
	<p>4.2 PTAC Feedback on Draft Plan Outline and Residual Waste Management Options Review</p> <p>Paul Henderson, General Manager, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, provided an opportunity for any further feedback on the draft plan outline and residual waste management options review that was presented to the committee at the September 18, 2025 meeting.</p> <p>Member discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan update should consider other Metro Vancouver management plans such as the climate action plan, climate 2050. Focus on Integrated plans. 	Paul Henderson
5.	INFORMATION ITEMS	Chair
	<p>5.1 Zero Waste Committee</p> <p>Paul Henderson, General Manager, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, provided an update on the October 2025 Zero Waste Committee agenda.</p> <p>Member discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Electricity Purchase Agreement locks the region into a long term commitment, whereas a shorter term interim agreement could have been an option while the solid waste management plan is being updated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff noted that the agreement includes cancellation provisions which are confidential. • A member noted the province updated waste-to-energy regulations in 2011. A consultant reviewed best practices for regulations. <p>5.1 Zero Waste Conference 2025 Reminder</p> <p>Paul Henderson, General Manager, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, provided a reminder about the upcoming Zero Waste conference on November 27, 2025. PTAC members are invited to attend at no cost.</p>	Paul Henderson
6.	ACTION/STANDING ITEMS	
	<p>6.1 Action tracker</p> <p>The action tracker was reviewed, and updates were provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Circulation of full list of plan update ideas from idea generation phase of engagement 	Brooke Atkinson

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information on landfill Greenhouse Gas Emissions shared with members previously via email ● In progress: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Detailed regulatory strategy to be brought forward in November PTAC meeting ○ OCEANA may present to PTAC at the November 20, 2025, meeting (time-permitting) 	
7.	ADDITIONAL ITEMS 7.1 Responses to Questions from PTAC September 18, 2025 Landfill Tour (Attachment 5) 7.2 Public/Technical Advisory Committee Updated 2025 Work Plan (Attachment 6) 7.3 Regional Waste Flows August 2025 (Attachment 7) 7.4 Metro Vancouver Disposal Ban Report (Attachment 8)	Chair
8.	NEXT STEPS AND NEXT MEETING DATE	
	The upcoming meetings are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● November 20, 2025 Next PTAC Meeting: Targets and Metrics (in-person at Metro Vancouver) – last meeting of PTAC in 2025. 	Chair
9.	ADJOURNMENT The Chair thanked members for robust discussion and feedback with an emphasis on consolidating input into the draft Solid Waste Management Plan. The meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m.	Chair

**SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
PUBLIC/TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BREAK OUT GROUP NOTES**

ATTACHMENT 1

RETHINK
Round 1 – Strategy 1.1
Number of Participants: 4

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID005	20
ID003	19
ID004	19
ID090	17
ID001	12

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Broad Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need zero waste objectives re-integrated into the plan – municipal regulatory pieces are not reflected in this draft. • Advocating is important but need to be more directive with action-oriented tasks. • Not setting ambition high enough or recognizing systems change that is needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Actions need to be stronger than just advocating and have a bigger vision and ambition. • Need to support more transition to circular economy over long-term while also supporting meaningful systems change. • Need more of an economic development framework – economic pieces need to be more fully considered – i.e., if you are a local innovator, how can regulation support your innovation? • Circular economy frameworks should have zero waste strategy embedded within it. • Big thing that’s missing – redesigning the systems, reverse logistics, how do we think about procurement and business model transformation instead of incremental change to what is already happening. • Behaviour change needs to be more explicit. • Important to shift funds and resources and develop circular economy solutions through zero waste tools.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need economy of scale which can't be achieved through pilots. Need more living labs to demonstrate economic models. • Need bolder supports to see changes. E.g., same with single use cup fee. Need to set up test systems to provide signal to market. • Need more bold commitments – e.g., commit \$10 million over 10 years.
Specific feedback on Actions	
Strategy 1.1 Action ID001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside supply is a constraint now; so important to get foundational policies in place and that's something that comes out of it. This may come organically through other actions like ID003 and ID004, feels more of a secondary action.
Strategy 1.1 Action ID090	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to include, but calls out only the circular food systems sector and likely should be broader.
Strategy 1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider how to support transition – important to build on the existing innovation, it will cultivate itself. Need stronger action and ability to quantify current landscape and change.
Strategy 1.2 Action ID008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider creating a business certification – partner with existing organizations.
Strategy 1.2 Action ID079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should include zero waste education.
Strategy 1.2 Action ID009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change action to have Metro Vancouver to lead by example in zero waste.
Strategy 1.2 Action ID0074	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to food systems – but these concepts are overarching to all sectors.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make action more specific for collaborating with external groups. • Collaborate with circular innovators and entrepreneurs on the ground and across the country.

RETHINK
Round 2 – Strategy 1.3
Number of Participants: 2 (plus one observer)

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
ID029	10	ID017	7	ID099	5
ID098	9	ID027	7	ID019	4
ID026	9	ID023	4	ID023	4
ID160	8	ID022	8		
		ID021	5		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 1.3 Action ID029	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this action. Look at BC Housing, heavily weight cost. More facets we work into developing and implementing procurement policies that pull weight away from costs, towards circular criteria, is great. • All member jurisdictions have different criteria, so businesses are working in a patchwork. Higher ambition mandated through procurement criteria is what we want.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action should go further and be specific about showing business case, collaborating is good but businesses need to know future direction –need to have regional commitments. • Harder words would be better – less about collaborating and educating, moving towards enforce and regulate (e.g. mandate and enforce). • Need to focus on accelerating the adoption of circular business models - this results in setting behavioural norm in the industry. Be transparent with business community about direction Metro Vancouver is going.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with regional economic development agencies is important to develop digital tools. There is existing technology that tracks origin of the material. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tool should focus on high value materials. If we deconstruct the building, if we don't know origin of material don't know what to do with it. • Consider digital passports and material banks. • How can we facilitate wider adoption, to ensure that tracking and forecasting is included. Working with retrofits – digital tools would be able to be scaled up.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID098	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs stronger wording on how to integrate Indigenous practices, important piece is how to do this at scale. • How to be able to have composting programs in every community. • Agro-ecology is a good term to think about and possibly integrate as it's broader principle.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would be action that comes out of identifying new circular economy initiatives in communities? This action maybe folds into others. • There are enough materials and for-profit companies that are not getting the lift off or voice that they need to scale. Once we get to scalable systems and technologies – need to not pause before we give them lift off. • Need people participating – and need to widen the tent.
Strategy 1.3 Action ID023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deprioritize this in draft plan.

Strategy 1.3 Action ID027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of requirements for new and up and coming circular economy businesses. Too high risk for businesses – insurance, land, cost margins. Not sure this action will address these issues, clarify and include this if not elsewhere and this is only reference recycling businesses.
Less relevant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> About scale and enforceability – some of these don’t fit from this perspective. E.g., ID018 – continue to learn – feels like we are past that.

REDUCE
Round 1 – Strategy 2.1
Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
ID161	14	ID 162	11	ID043	6
ID028	5	ID 020	10	ID028	5
ID101	14	ID062	8	ID040	4
ID002	13	ID024	8	ID100	1
		ID102	7		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 2.1 Action ID028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sector education should come first for this action to be implemented. If they don’t know where to go, this action won’t be as relevant. Feedback that this ID doesn’t address ‘reduce’. Sectors have been taking materials to transfer stations for several years; it comes down to the amount of room they have on the ground. Good for some industries (like schools) but not others (construction). Tools and templates do not go far enough – we shouldn’t be doing that. We should go further and put regulations (e.g. you cannot buy/sell things that end up in our landfills). Works in settings where there is a universal request for proposal process and they can then put it into their policy. Needs to be enforceable.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action needs to be paired with enforcement. Need to have a clear strategy to promote/require businesses to participate. If you have someone from Metro Vancouver coming into the businesses to talk, that’s impactful and makes a big difference.

Strategy 2.1 Action ID002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires a financial incentive (e.g. if not using hard to recycle plastics was somehow saving producers money). Convenience and staffing are also factors. Companies will only take action if they are pressured.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear who is the one developing method to estimate or provide score card for businesses
Strategy 2.1 Action ID161	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see requirements for new construction. Disappointed we're on the 'workshop' stage rather than further along into implementation. If businesses aren't not forced to do it, it won't happen.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This action should have happened years ago. Educational tools are too 'soft' to be the focus. Need more requirements rather than educational tools.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action should include that healthcare has compactors, and when you remove a compactor you should reassess the system. There's groups within the healthcare system that advocates for recycling, but hard to execute because once there is a contaminant from health perspective it goes to incinerator. Force healthcare to put in programs to listen to subject matter experts and do the right thing. We like "co-develop waste reduction solutions" – because in industry, there are experts on what to do with their waste instead of 'workshops'. Tie to a 3rd party certification – this helps motivate as well.
ADDITIONAL ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have mechanism like a sensor in bin so that you only pay for pickup when the bin is full, rather than a regular schedule like weekly – provides an incentive for reducing garbage.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID0403	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could be effective for other industries but not C&D – they will not respond to a toolkit. They need rules, requirements, and financial incentives/disincentives.
NEW ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements to submit a zero-waste strategy, implement waste audits or waste plans, etc. could be effective.
NEW ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idea of licensing manufacturer, retailer, hauler. We don't have a clear picture on what receiving facility receives waste from where and which hauler.
NEW ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste reduction coaches – have people supporting businesses directly
NEW ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circular procurement – use the region's procurement power, or procurement guidelines. Only buy from companies that do XYZ. Ban could also have the same effect – if something is banned, you look for alternatives.
Strategy 2.1 Action ID028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing about Metro Vancouver implementing procurement strategy that incentivizes/awards sustainable procurement. Need more commitment – more committal language.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need 10-year plan to develop full procurement policy to then implement. • Metro Vancouver’s own internal procurement would be year 1-2, then the next few years expand from there.
General comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t embed examples in the action – maybe can add examples after. Embedding examples makes these actions confusing.
General Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a timeline for stages of implementation of these actions.

REDUCE
Round 2 – Strategy 2.4
Number of Participants: 5

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID107	20
ID105	19
ID106	19

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
General Comments on strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem with bans is we don’t have infrastructure to support reuse. • Reengineer the way we manage materials to support reuse. • The bans don’t come into place until there is infrastructure in place to handle the material flow (for recycling/reuse). • Regional District of Nanaimo has a study on clean wood ban – set up streams for wood in advance of the ban – they were revenue generating streams. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good case study to look into when implementing bans. • Disposal Bans should not be under ‘Reduce’ as they encourage diversion as opposed to waste reduction. • Ban does not reduce the amount of waste generated in the first place. • A ban will mean they’ll go over border to dispose of banned materials. • Need a system to track waste from producer, hauler, and receiver so we know it’s left the region. • Should have certification of receiving facilities and regular audits, especially C&D facilities – need certification.
Rubric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment on the rubric – people getting fined is impacting affordability. Haulers getting fined should not impact affordability.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordability should apply to low-income residents. It should not play in as a factor when deciding on strategies for businesses or high-income residents. Apply an equity lens.
Strategy 2.4 Action ID 107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear bags should not be lumped with “technologies” – they are two separate things.
Strategy 2.4 Action ID107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instal tech to monitor customers, rather than clear bags at the disposal site. More important to monitor at source.
Strategy 2.4 Action ID106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beyond just providing incentives for collectors, the region should look into incentivizing innovators/entrepreneurs that provides solutions for materials so that they can then be banned. Consideration is as EPR comes in, that creates risk for innovators. Is there a way for EPR to not quash innovation. If there is a thriving system in place already, EPR should not be able to come in and displace that successful system.
Strategy 2.4 Action ID105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a pathway for waste from certain sectors to be banned from Metro Vancouver facilities to have a review process. Need a clear audit and review process to revisit items that are currently unable to go to recycling and need to go to WTEF (e.g. hospital waste).

**REUSE (Reuse, Refill, Repair)
Round 1 – Strategy 3.5
Number of Participants: 3**

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total (fingers)	Action ID	Total
ID061	12	ID059	14
ID086	11	ID065	11
ID058	10	ID060	13
ID166	14		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 3.5 Action ID058	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metro Vancouver can offer support, but lots of groups are already doing this work.
Strategy 3.5 Action ID059	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge of increasing cost of rent for nonprofit organizations doing reuse work. Increase focus on infrastructure to make reuse convenient and accessible (land, storage, software, facilities, etc.)
Strategy 3.5 Action ID060	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for larger industry to pilot reuse and repair initiatives or collaborate with smaller community groups to ensure the funding has the biggest impact.
Strategy 3.5 Action ID061	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a directory of organizations and businesses already working in the space for people to connect to (e.g. reporting mechanism).

Strategy 3.5 Action ID086	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same issues as thrift stores.
General Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Top-down change is required. Currently too much bureaucracy so that there is no room for change. Too risk adverse (Example of putting in a reuse collection bin at Kitsilano beach being shut down by strict policies). Need incentive to adopt new practices (resources, time, money).

REUSE (Reuse, Refill, Repair)
Round 2 – Strategy 3.3
Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
ID047	10	ID167	7
ID025	10	ID066	6
ID083	8		
ID164	8		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 3.3 Action ID047	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also create a cleaning and washing infrastructure for reusable product processing throughout the region (not hubs).
Strategy 3.3 Action ID025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take back more than just clothing such as electronics, etc.
Strategy 3.3 Action ID083	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase awareness of these programs.
Strategy 3.3 Action ID164	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand barriers to resident participation in reuse, refill, and repair.
Strategy 3.3 Action ID167	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify opportunities in reuse and repair industry and skills required for repair. The knowledge exists but needs more focus.
New Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot broad reuse initiatives in a small community (complete top to bottom change to reuse)

REUSE (BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD)
Round 1 – Strategy 3.2
Number of Participants: 2

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
ID037	10	ID036	6	ID068	8.5
ID039	10	ID038	6	ID071	7

ID046	10	ID045	5	ID087	6
ID035	8	ID067	10		
		ID069	9		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 3.2 Action ID071/ID087 – Food recovery data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs should be considered before data. • Measurement is challenging; best estimates can be more practical.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID035 – Reuse in C&D sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider just reuse in construction sector; demolition by definition doesn't include reuse.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID046 – Land use for reuse activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this action; shouldn't have to drive out of region for reused building supplies.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID037/ID039/ID046	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critically important for Metro Vancouver specifically to implement. • Addressing the time component is key for incentivizing deconstruction. Currently the biggest disincentive is the increased time it takes.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID045 – Incentive program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incentive is already built in to some extent. • Scaling deconstruction is important for contractors. • Time component more important than incentive component.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID038 – Online marketplace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower support, there have already been a lot of tries and failures in this area.
Strategy 3.2 Increase reuse of building materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we missing a C&D data action under reuse? • San Francisco requires reporting on C&D leaving the region. • No regulation actions in the C&D strategy currently – need to look beyond just incentives. • Look to Nanaimo for a successful example of a wood ban
Strategy 3.6 Scale efforts to recover food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay the people doing the work, rather than apps and software to inform the business. • Major food recovery organizations could get together and operate a “Hub and spoke model”. • Relationships with non-profits are important. • Buildings and space are key to expanding the sector. • No regulations currently shown under this strategy; would be helpful.

REUSE (BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD)

Round 2 – Strategy 3.2

Number of Participants: 1

Action ID	Total (fingers)	Action ID	Total (fingers)	Action ID	Total
ID045	5	ID035	5	ID036	1
		ID037	4	ID046	1
		ID038	1		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 3.2 Action ID038 – Online marketplace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This already exists; Facebook marketplace. Maple Ridge New and Used and other physical locations already exist.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID045/35 – Advocate/work collaboratively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These actions are what Metro Vancouver should focus their effort on, but they need to be more direct. Don't like the term "advocate", "foster", "encourage"; these don't speak to action. Incentivize may be better to use rather than advocate. Consider disincentives for not using reused material. ID045 and ID035 could be combined. Support for regulation, asking for more regulatory authority rather than advocating.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID037 – Foster second hand material markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This already exists, doesn't need resources. Consider a free store model at recycling and waste centres – both drop off and pick up of reusable materials.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID046 – Land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is not an issue, action not supported. Ensure the material gets to facilities rather than supply land for it.
Strategy 3.2 Action ID039 – Triaging facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentivize rather than 'encourage'. Doesn't need to be in-region – consider elsewhere. Should go through a MRF first.

RECYCLE (INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROGRAMS)

Round 1 – Strategy 4.2

Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
116	14	120	11
118	12	064	13
119	13	117	5
121	12		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 4.2 Action ID116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and advocate for additional materials to be added to Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) programs. Include mention of expansion of deposit return programs within EPR.

Strategy 4.2 Action ID064 Action ID119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace “encourage” with “incentivize”. • Replace “encourage” with “incentivize” or “advocate”.
Strategy 4.2 Action ID117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This action is redundant when considering the other actions in this category.
Missing action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for curbside collection of EPR materials for 100% of Metro Vancouver residents.
Missing action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create/require accountability and transparency confirming chain of custody, end of life true recycling of materials, markets and recycled products from EPR materials collected.
Missing action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase accountability for the first priority of EPR which is design changes to reduce waste and increase reusability in the products at source. • Incentivize upstream changes to focus on reusability or products and packaging.

RECYCLE (INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROGRAMS)
Round 2 – Strategy 4.3
Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
044	15
122	12
124	8
123	14

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Missing action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all municipal solid waste is processed for the purpose of taking out recoverable materials. • Provide financial disincentives to not recycle (charge more for garbage to incentivize diversion).

RECYCLE (INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROGRAMS)
Round 3 – Strategy 4.1
Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score	Action ID	Total Score
113	9	112	15
109	2		
111	15		
110	15		

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
Strategy 4.1 Action ID112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a stronger word e.g. pursue, collaborate, fund, prioritize – and for the purpose of creating a network/ecosystem. • Missing is working with subject matter experts, innovators, enabling startups. • Consider changing the wording from ‘enhance’ to “mandate”.
Strategy 4.1 Action ID110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure performance specs are met – don’t compromise performance to achieve the waste diversion and climate objectives. • Utilize learnings from elsewhere/successes to demonstrate it is possible.
Strategy 4.1 Action ID111	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a very important action that supports circular supply chains. • Creates market supply/demand. • By Metro Vancouver pursuing this (within own operations) they would then be seen as a role model/champion that others can learn from and point to when they are developing a business case for their own organization. • Builds a network for information sharing. • Acts as an entry point for others; creates and incentive for others
Strategy 4.1 Action ID113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action is focused on the wrong actor(s) – it should not be waste reduction organizations, should instead work with national and regional producers and manufacturers. • Alternative would be to “regulate” or “incentivize and regulate.” • If this would be changed to reflect the first bullet, this action would be top scorer.
Strategy 4.1 Action ID109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This effort takes away from reuse, which should be the focus. • Need to have more systems thinking. • Better value and use of resources if focussed on higher level actions (reduction and reuse). • Not circular economy focused.

RECYCLE (EDUCATION)
Round 1 – Strategy 4.5 and 4.6
Number of Participants: 1

Fist of 5: Did not complete with only one participant.

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
In general – apply to the whole Recycle category	The whole R assumes that people care enough to recycle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This only really works in circles where there is keenness for the change (e.g. PTAC and environmental groups).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we change actions based on people who don't really care? • There is a cultural and societal norm around caring for recycling how do we get them to care regardless of their value system? This is something that the actions should also include an aspect of more than just behavioural change.
Strategy 4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it more clear which type of recyclable is being referred to for each item in each action (e.g. what types of recycling are you referring to make it easier and more effective? Which items currently have the most confusion for recycling that need to be focused on?) • How do we ensure whatever is left from reduce and reuse can be recycled? • Whatever those materials are – should be specified within the strategy before diving into the actions – makes it more clear on what the action is tackling to the audience reading and interpreting these actions
Strategy 4.5 Action ID134	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be great to have standardized system collection across the region to be able for residents to understand it.
Strategy 4.5 Action ID132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have some sort of penalization for the people who do not participate – have different penalization rules per each large recycler, so they know when they disobey the rules, what the repercussions are. • What do the rewards systems look like for those who do participate and are avid recyclers in the system? Maybe specify that a bit more in the action.
Strategy 4.5 Action ID 137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this action because it looks upstream rather than downstream – good action to have to intervene with those not good at recycling.
Strategy 4.5 Action ID146	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational resources just aren't enough for people to participate in this action – need to really make the system accessible that they will hold their event at (i.e. have mandatory recycling and compost bins at large event areas)– and make it clear where and what to recycle and where it goes
Strategy 4.5 Action ID150 and 154	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These actions seem similar enough - could put them together
Strategy 4.5 Action ID103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This action is operating under the assumption that education changes the behaviour of residents – there isn't strong enough proof to support that currently with recycling data, maybe look to other ways of enforcement in multi-family residents.
Strategy 4.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With transparency of what happens to materials, there needs to be honesty. • Acknowledging that the products that are being made in the system aren't necessarily getting recycled because there's no end market for them currently (i.e. certain plastics and

	<p>products)– that is part of the process, to collect those products in the solid waste system, so what does NOT get recycled because it cant be, should be part of the transparent data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should also be transparency of how the businesses are making money off of those recyclable products. • Recycling is value creation – how do we ensure to send the benefits back to the consumer and community? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explaining EPR more throughout education of what happens to that money and why it is baked into the cost of the items would be a useful start with transparency and honesty. • Mandate bins that are decaled – whether MURB or single family – would decrease contamination a lot. • Consider the space given to garbage bins versus recycling - when recycling should be a priority for most households – yet the garbage collection bin is the one with the most space and always largest.
<p>General comments of actions under RECYCLE – Education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All actions are very important – they all seem incomplete on their own, but stronger together. There needs to be stronger language – e.g. changing “support” to “fund” – explain how Metro Vancouver supports by funding – rather than having them as high level. • Could outline the importance of each action – and link the dependencies in the system – how they link together well.

**RECYCLE (EDUCATION)
Round 2 – Strategy 4.6
Number of Participants: 2**

Fist of 5: Not done with two participants, only discussion on each action.

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
<p>Strategy 4.6 Action ID103</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must include alignment with specific building needs and producers or products. • Include non-profit organizations as facilitators of education where possible (e.g. Bidders).
<p>Strategy 4.6 Action ID147</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify what ‘environmental advisors’ are in the description of this action (RCBC Hotline) – could be interpreted differently. • Consider language and cultural barriers to regional participation for the information services being provided. • Spend the money on the services for translations – see if it would be helpful or not – then pivot if not.
<p>Strategy 4.6 Action ID 149</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some items on the agenda that needs to align with what is happening in the industry – relevancy is important.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get the stratas etc. to have buy-in for the recycling guidelines that they need to follow an be held accountable.
Strategy 4.6 Action ID 154	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This action is harder to do effectively with use of AI. • The GHG emissions created from using AI is not worth it to support this action – not great benefits. • Create systems where organizations like Binnars could help to sort – rather than spending money on AI to sort. • If going to use AI – make sure its not to in depth for the items because it will use more energy and power to create it.
Strategy 4.6 Action ID151 and 154	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very low support to gamify recycling and reduction education – think of other ways.
Strategy 4.6 Action ID146	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include education or resources for suppliers of party supplies including catering (e.g. Costco/grocery stores). • Have stickers on the plastic packaging that indicates very visibly that it is recyclable and should go in a certain colour bin.
Strategy 4.6 Action ID145	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify whether this action refers to non-profit organizations facilitating the recycling training within the buildings or running the buildings sorting programs.
Strategy 4.6 Action ID144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove reference to “ethnocultural” – could be misinterpreted as those communities are causing the issues or recycling and contamination – instead make reference to providing the resources in multiples languages.