Personal information has been redacted in the following submissions received from PTAC members

Comments on Metro Vancouver's Potential Strategies and Actions Being Considered

solidwasteplan@metrovancouver.org

Date: October 27 2025

General Comments on Recovery and Disposal Section

HSR Zero Waste appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Solid Waste Management Plan. We support Metro Vancouver's efforts to advance waste reduction and circular economy goals but have serious concerns about how recovery and disposal are currently defined and applied. The plan's treatment of combustion-based processes, industrial fuel use, and undefined categories such as "non-recyclable materials" risks undermining waste prevention, reuse, and recycling. Recovery should not be used to justify destructive disposal practices that release pollutants and discourage better upstream design and source separation.

Strategy 5.1 – Recover Materials and Energy from Non-Recyclable Materials

We strongly oppose the use of recovery to include combustion-based or fuel-substitution systems. This strategy risks rebranding destructive processes as beneficial outcomes. In particular, the undefined category of "non-recyclable materials" is deeply problematic. It may include materials that are technically recyclable but were not separated at source, as well as genuinely non-recyclable materials that contain hazardous substances. Without a clear and safe definition, Metro Vancouver risks allowing recyclable materials and toxic composites to be burned under the label of recovery.

Much of what is referred to as "non-recyclable" in current practice includes laminate and composite woods, MDF, engineered wood, and plastics with resins, adhesives, or coatings. These materials often contain formaldehyde, chlorine, and heavy metals. When burned in waste-to-energy facilities or cement kilns, they release harmful pollutants such as dioxins, furans, and fine particulates. Even with emission controls, these pollutants accumulate in ash residues and the surrounding environment, contributing to long-term exposure risks.

The plan should not encourage more effort to identify or process these materials for burning. This diverts resources away from more sustainable solutions, such as prevention, design improvements, and source separation. If materials cannot be recycled or reused safely, the least harmful option is landfilling after biological stabilization. This approach avoids the creation of toxic air emissions and prevents pollution transfer from air to soil.

Strategy 5.2 – Material Recovery and Biological Stabilization

We support the inclusion of mechanical material recovery and biological stabilization as best practices prior to final disposal. However, these processes should be categorized as disposal, not diversion. Mechanical recovery can capture some materials from residual waste, but the recovered outputs are generally lower quality and limited in market value. Recognizing these facilities as disposal ensures that they do not undermine the importance of source-separated recycling programs.

Biological stabilization, such as composting or anaerobic digestion of residuals, plays an essential role in reducing methane, odour, and leachate formation. By stabilizing waste before landfilling, this practice improves landfill performance and reduces long-term emissions. This should be identified as a disposal best practice rather than a diversion measure. Together, mechanical and biological treatments offer responsible management of residual waste without misrepresenting their role in the waste hierarchy.

Waste-to-Energy and Industrial Fuel Use

HSR Zero Waste opposes any classification of combustion-based activities as recovery, including waste-to-energy operations and the use of waste-derived fuels in cement kilns or pulp mills. Burning waste destroys valuable materials and emits pollutants that must still be managed through ash handling and environmental controls. It also delays progress toward upstream waste prevention, repair, and reuse systems. Treating these processes as recovery undermines the region's circular economy goals.

Industrial fuel use is particularly concerning because it allows toxic and composite materials, such as treated wood, laminates, and plastics, to enter fuel streams where emissions are less visible to the public. These materials release hazardous pollutants, including heavy metals and persistent organic compounds. If Metro Vancouver permits such practices to continue, it must require continuous emissions monitoring, regular soil testing near participating facilities, and full public disclosure of monitoring results. Transparency and accountability are essential for public trust and environmental protection.

Waste-to-energy should remain classified as disposal. While it plays a limited role in current waste management, it is not a circular solution and should not be expanded or redefined as recovery. The region's long-term focus should be on reducing residual waste through prevention and material redesign rather than maintaining combustion infrastructure.

Additional Comment – Recommendation to Close the Waste-to-Energy Facility

We are deeply concerned that Metro Vancouver staff have recommended rejecting public proposals to phase out or close the Burnaby Waste-to-Energy (WTE) facility. The reasons given for rejecting this idea are weak and do not stand up to scrutiny when weighed against the environmental, policy, and social benefits of phasing out incineration.

Staff have argued that the facility must remain in operation because the region still requires disposal capacity, that costs are comparable to landfilling, and that emissions are within

regulatory limits. Each of these points overlooks critical facts.

The claim that disposal demand justifies ongoing incineration is a circular argument. High disposal volumes are the result of insufficient waste prevention, reuse, and repair systems. Keeping the incinerator in operation locks the region into a constant need for feedstock rather than motivating investment in programs that would actually reduce waste generation. In other words, the incinerator sustains the very waste problem it is meant to solve.

The assertion that costs are comparable to landfilling also fails to consider escalating expenses and external impacts. The facility's operational and maintenance costs continue to rise, and new air pollution control systems will add further costs. In addition, the financial comparison excludes the environmental and public health costs associated with emissions, ash disposal, and cumulative exposure to fine particulates and persistent pollutants. When these factors are considered, the facility is neither cost-effective nor sustainable.

Finally, the argument that the facility operates within emission limits is not reassuring. Meeting outdated regulatory thresholds does not mean the operation is harmless. The Burnaby facility has required extensions to its air quality limits and is still in the process of implementing new emission control systems. Compliance within interim limits does not address cumulative or long-term effects on air quality, soil contamination, or health outcomes for nearby residents.

In contrast, the rationale put forward by those advocating for closure or phase-out is stronger and more aligned with Metro Vancouver's own stated goals. Closing the WTE facility would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, eliminate a source of toxic air pollutants, and redirect significant financial and technical resources toward upstream solutions such as reuse, repair, and product redesign. It would also remove the structural dependence on waste generation required to feed the facility, freeing the region to pursue true zero waste outcomes.

The staff's recommendation to reject this proposal therefore represents a short-term, risk-averse position that conflicts with Metro Vancouver's long-term sustainability commitments. A transition plan to phase out incineration is not only feasible but necessary. It would allow the region to focus on prevention, material recovery, and landfill stabilization, while avoiding the continued environmental and financial burden of maintaining combustion infrastructure.

Closing the Burnaby WTE facility would be a decisive step toward aligning Metro Vancouver's waste management system with its stated goals for climate action, circularity, and community health. The public rationale for keeping the facility open is weak, and the case for closure is far stronger, both in principle and in practice.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Metro Vancouver has the opportunity to lead with a waste management plan that prioritizes prevention, reuse, and safe residual management over destructive end-of-pipe solutions. To achieve this, the region should clearly distinguish recovery from disposal and remove combustion from the definition of diversion. It should acknowledge that non-recyclable materials often include both recyclable and hazardous materials and should not invest additional resources in defining or processing them for fuel use. Effort and investment should focus on preventing waste, improving separation at source, supporting local reuse and recycling infrastructure, and stabilizing remaining materials before landfilling.

We recommend that Metro Vancouver:

• Classify all combustion-based processing, including industrial fuel use, as disposal, not recovery.

• Identify mechanical material recovery and biological stabilization as disposal best practices prior to landfilling.

• Avoid allocating resources to define or develop recovery systems for 'non-recyclable materials.'

• Prioritize prevention, reuse, and landfill stabilization over combustion-based solutions.

• Require continuous emissions monitoring, regular soil testing, and public reporting for all facilities that burn waste-derived materials.

[redacted]

[redacted], HSR Zero Waste

MV Options and Rubric Comments

Overall

There are many good actions included but the rubric seems to have been somewhat arbitrarily designed and applied. In addition, the actions do not seem to be laid out in a way that shows a comprehensive and strategic look at addressing the different types and sources of waste. Further, the last plan was meant to be a five year plan at the time of creation and this one as a ten year plan seems to be lacking a ten year lens with phases of actions, and ambitions of scale. Finally the inclusion and ongoing support of incineration and energy recovery means the plan is doomed to failure due to inadequate support of zero waste strategies and competing priorities.

Rubric Comments

- Affordability -this should be edited from evaluating if it increases costs (even if those are fines for poor separation) to if it increases costs for those who can afford it the least
- Circularity/Zero Waste -add in Zero Waste as defined by the Zero Waste International Alliance (especially important as the term circular economy is now getting misused more often). It should be defined using the Ellen MacArthur Foundation definition.
- Waste reduction -is about reducing materials getting discarded, not disposed. Need to decrease compost and recycling as well, also good to target materials that are larger components of the waste but if not looking enough at reduction, may see others creep up (household hygiene for example)
- Environmental Stewardship -need to make Toxicity its own line as this is going to be playing a bigger role going forward as we learn the harms of toxic materials and as the biodiversity crisis increases.
- GHGs should be all scopes not just 1 and 2, should not be net of GHG compared to fossil fuel burning but actuals, also needs to look at increased emissions from burning materials.
- Looking only at high volume materials is problematic as this is a 10 yr plan and everything is small when broken into chunks- the question should be: will it move the needle and does it move another piece of the pie out of disposal.

Options Comments

Note can't see all actions in spreadsheets (end of lines are missing)

1 Rethink

1.1 Advocate for circular economy policies

- Add "and zero waste "(overall ZW should be brought back into the plan),

ID004 -work with munis/regions

- not innovative or difficult as should have been doing this with NZWC for over a decade? Also CCRI, UBCM, FCM, Climate Caucus, BC PSC and used to with RCBC. Likely others like C40 etc. Should already be doing with member municipalities.

1.2 Support the transition to a more circular regional economy through waste prevention -

ID079 include ZW education
ID088 Business certification

- make this easier by partnering with Zero Waste Canada or others who already do this. Instead push businesses to get certified. Don't reinvent the wheel.

ID009 integrate waste prevention

- change to MV to lead by example in ZW

ID013 Build on the innovation

- add "and zero waste "

1.3 Build on and foster an inclusive and collaborative circular economy
ID0029 circular procurement

- very good and much needed

2 Reduce

2.1 Collaborate with businesses and institutions to reduce waste at the source
ID101 Increase in person education where business and others can talk directly with experts on how to reduce waste.

- should be core part of program, actually working with them for tech guidance and so should help decrease costs.

ID 024

- Textiles still important especially over a 10 yr plan if have success on higher weight materials like organics/plastic/paper

2.2 Support residents adopting waste prevention habits &
2.3 Prioritize food waste reduction
initiatives
Over all lots of actions about education but really should be about supporting behaviour change which can include policy/incentives/reminders, etc.

2.4 Enhance approaches to Metro Vancouver's disposal ban program
ID107 Explore options to enhance disposal ban inspection efficacy such as the use of clear bags or innovative technology solutions.

- Strongly disagree that affordability should be used as a way to avoid this action. Should not measure affordability on ability to skip proper costs. Same for convenience -it should be about making the right thing more convenient, not the wrong thing.
- Should have clear bags as its own action, not with tech.
  Same for ID105 on textiles

3 Reuse

3.1 Support consistent approaches to reuse
ID063 regional harmonization on reuse -Think SUI are important to tackle -not sure if affordability has to be impacted or more that it needs to be considered in how it is implemented.

3.2 Increase reuse of used building materials

ID 039 encourage the development of an in-region facility for triaging building materials to their best and highest use.

- Very important

3.3 Foster the broad adoption of reuse, refill, and repair

- Needs some direct action to foster this

3.4 Work with event organizers, businesses and institutions to increase reuse

ID054 -add on subsequent action - “and then implement if suitable”. This is an example of where the action is not suitable for a ten year plan but is instead the first step of many that could be implemented in a ten year span.

ID055 -reusable food ware - Think SUI are important to tackle -not sure if affordability has to be impacted or more that it needs to be considered in how it is implemented.

ID066 – unclear how better data by itself is having any impact so not clear how the rubric was used to evaluate this. It is a good action but more from a foundational level and not because this alone will reduce waste or GHGs or impact affordability. Or perhaps the action is about communicating options for repair but it is not stated this way.

3.5 Increase access to reuse, refill and repair

ID060 explore feasibility… add on subsequent action - “and then implement if suitable”. This is another example of where the action is not suitable for a ten year plan but is instead the first step of many that could be implemented in a ten year span.

3.6 Scale efforts to recover food

- Important

3.7 Encourage and celebrate residents and businesses that prioritize reuse and refill practices

4 Recycle

4.1 Promote design for recyclability and the use of recycled content in products and packaging

- This should be under rethink as it is about design.

ID 109 Research and advocate for improvements to the recyclability of plastic-lined paper products such as coffee cups.

- Is this about trying to recycle hard to recycle item or can it be replaced, or the non-recyclable components phased out? If just about plastic lined items, how is this not ranked low under existing scale? If the latter, should be under rethink.

4.2 Enhance EPR programs

ID119 Advocate for accelerated deployment of direct collection of an expanded suite of materials including film plastic and foam.

- This should not increase costs unless the EPR program is not paying for it (which it should) and this would be a key way to decrease contamination (saving those penalties). So far, costs for Recycle BC are not showing up in consumer costs.

4.3 Encourage the development of new recycling infrastructure

- MV should develop its own composting infrastructure, in region.
- MV should start furniture recycling across region
- MV should offer book recycling across region
- For all non-EPR non-food/garden materials MV should track data and systems to support transition to EPR

4.4 Improve participation in green bin programs and alternatives for multi- family residents and businesses

- Plus institutions!!!
  ID 128 Determine what role, if any, compostable plastics can play in organics management systems.
- Key is not to introduce new forms of contamination into existing streams and to ensure it is not a way to EPR programs to offload costs-this is not noted in the factors

4.5 Make recycling easier and more effective by reducing confusion and improving convenience
ID 133 -standardized sign tool very good -collaborate with other governments on this and offer decals

4.6 Target recycling education

- More on behaviour change and coaching, less on what sounds like brochures, such as involving artists/influencers (rationale for low makes no sense) ID 148 and ID 151 comparison
  ID 129 Promote and educate residents on worm bins, backyard composting.
- Should factor in human-wildlife issues and develop tools/coaching like the North Shore Recycling Program had before it folded.

4.7 Increase transparency of what happens to materials from recycling and green bin programs

- Needed

4.8 Prevent litter and illegal dumping through public space recycling initiatives

- This should be under 6.0 Disposal
- Not going to help on most criteria but needed

5 Recover

5.1 Recover materials and energy from non- recyclable materials
ID 169 burn dimensional wood
ID 172 burn demolition wood waste
ID170 burning in cement plants
ID179 "beneficial use of ash –

- 100% disagree with all of these, this is why we did not support the energy recovery part in the hierarchy, but including it in the hierarchy led to a goal and now it has these actions. Please reverse this inclusion in the hierarchy.
- Keep in mind grant funding and private investment is still someone's money and it is money that does not then get used for other better purposes.

This section if it continues to exist should be looking at Material Recovery, Biological Treatment (MRBT) for mixed waste, recovering tires from landfill (saw many on the landfill tour). It should only focus on recovery of Materials, not Energy as it will always waste more energy than if the materials are recovered or ideally managed through any of the higher hierarchy levels.

6 Disposal

There should be a section for disposal. This should include the following:

- Phase out the incinerator by 2028
- Implement a ban on waste to energy and incineration in the region and for waste coming from the region
- Waste will go to landfill but landfills will be selected based on their ability to meet the best in class environmental criteria (minimizing gas emissions, leachate control, etc.) and social criteria (minimize impact to those nearby, social acceptance by receiving area, etc.)
- Gathering information on what was wasted and critically, why? Good data exists from waste composition studies which could be scaled back to every other year or when systemic changes are enacted to determine the impacts. Instead, start researching the cause of the waste (did not have bins, lack of enforcement, confusion over material, lack of pother options locally, etc.)

Ideas for other sections

Engaging with First Nations is a needed step but there should also be co-planning for any waste that may be collected on First Nation reserves that enters the MV waste system, as well as collaboration on tools/educations, etc. that could benefit multiple communities. Also recognizing the many First Nation members that are living in MV (off reserve).

Wildlife attractant management should be a part of the management plan.
Recycle bins and garbage bins should be wildlife resistant like having locks on them.

- This should be part of the SWMP as well as the debris plan -there are lots of bear issues across the region, but also litter with crows, coyotes, raccoons.

Looking at partnerships with fellow regional districts to see how we might be able to work together. For example: dealing with drywall together, addressing wood waste in an economic development plan (Like King County has looked at for highest and best use of wood - i.e. not burning).

Adopt the ZW hierarchy as the guide and encourage others to do so as well.

- This is still a necessary step and the failure to do this is resulting in these subsequent problems

Items now grouped under the development of recycling and waste centre strategic approaches

- should be a strategy in the plan, like the others and then be clear on what will be done and what is goal
- Same for regulatory strategies

Ideas considered unadvisable

Close the Waste- to-Energy Facility- MV rationale for not including:

1. In spite of the region's success in reducing waste, approximately 1,000,000 tonnes per year of garbage from residential commercial and institutional sources require disposal. Waste-to-energy costs are consistent with local landfilling, and half of remote landfilling.
    - Cost information is inaccurate -would be cheaper to pursue closing facility. A quick glance at the line items of any year of the Metro Vancouver five year financial plan will show this. Metro Vancouver continues to avoid sharing the cost information related to its budget lines that proves its claim of incineration being cost effective.
    - If the region is as successful as stated, should be able to decrease the waste enough to not require this facility and that should be a goal. It has done this before which is why a new incinerator was not built so it can do it again.
2. Emissions from the Waste-to- Energy Facility are closely monitored and openly shared in real time online, in addition to being reported to regulators. All regulated emission parameter values are below regulatory emission limits, with most parameters less than 10% of limits.
    - What is more accurate to say is that permitted levels of pollution are out of date. MV is not required to test continuously for the most toxic pollutants as is required in Oregon and for some in the EU. The province is requiring MV to hold a public consultation on updating the pollution levels and testing. Health Authorities are required to be part of developing a public health risk assessment.
    - There is a difference between "meeting parameters" and not causing harm to the environment and health
    - Also similar to findings around newer incinerators, there are dioxins in the close vicinity. There needs to be a thorough testing of the actual levels of pollution and work done to eliminate them.

I fully support the closure of the incinerator and investment in zero waste actions instead.

I am also very concerned that Metro Vancouver has not been more frank with the committee in terms of noting that it is pursuing agreements that can last for up to 50 years and where significant financial penalties could be incurred if the facility does not exist. The most recent one also mentions the possibility of rebuilding the facility, which Metro Vancouver has been indicating they are not considering. Our committee has been in existence since 2022 and yet has not been asked about these important decisions. The process seems to have been designed to have the incinerator locked in before there is any committee decisions or discussion.

Don't send materials to cement kilns and other industries for recovery -MV rationale for not including:

1. Where a feasible alternative exists, Metro Vancouver aims to manage materials according to the highest applicable level of the waste hierarchy (e.g. recycling before recovery). Recovering energy and resources from non-recyclable materials is preferable to disposal according to Metro Vancouver's waste hierarchy, which is consistent with the provincial and federal hierarchies.

- This is not consistent with the ZW hierarchy.
- These facilities are nowhere near the level of pollution control and testing of a provincially regulated facility.
- As noted for some recover actions, this further incents bad design, bad systems and does not decrease waste.
- The guidelines for SWMPs clearly state that the federal and provincial hierarchies do not need to be followed -communities can choose stronger ones, in fact leading jurisdictions have.
- Metro Van to date does not seem to be actively seeking better (reduce/reuse/recycle) options for these materials.

Agree that closing the landfill, adding new incineration (WTE) capacity and privatizing the collection /sorting systems, and single stream collection are all bad ideas. Extending the life of landfills as long as possible through waste reduction is recommended.

- MV should make it explicit in the SWMP that no new waste incineration or WTE facilities will be allowed.

[redacted]

October 28, 2025

Comments Regarding Metro Vancouver Solid Waste Management Plan Potential Strategies and Actions

Light House Sustainable Building Centre is a Canadian non-profit organization committed to advancing sustainable and low-carbon building practices. Our work focuses on fostering innovation in policy, design, and construction to reduce the environmental impact of the built environment. Light House's [redacted] of Circular Innovation, [redacted] currently sites on Metro Vancouver's Solid Waste Management Plan Public/Technical Advisory Committee.

Light House appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on potential strategies and actions presented by Metro Vancouver in relation to the development of the region's Solid Waste Management Plan.

While we appreciate the process that Metro Vancouver has followed to receive input on action items and frame the feedback received in the context of the evolved prevention hierarchy, it is our view that the action items fall short generally in several ways:

- The actions detailed are limited concepts that do not address the system-level changes that are required to move towards a circular economy. Actions need to focus on re-engineering existing systems and infrastructure, driving behaviour change and shifting capital to scaling circular economic activities.
- As part of a 10-year plan for managing solid waste in the region, the actions lack SMART targets and outcomes to define the desired outcomes of the region's material management strategy. Without clear outcomes there is no accountability for attaining circular objectives.
- All actions continue to use waste terminology focused on tailpipe solutions and language that devalues materials -- waste prevention and waste reduction -- rather than circular economic terms that highlight the inherent value of material resources, including reducing use of virgin materials and treating excess and salvaged materials as a resource.

We submit that Metro Vancouver's SWMP include a select number of bold and tangible actions directed at systems-level change towards a more circular economy; each action accompanied by SMART targets.

It is not possible to comment on all the actions detailed in the list provided by Metro Vancouver. The following is a reframing of a select number of actions under some of the pollution prevention hierarchy categories for illustrative purposes. We submit that the entire list of actions needs to be reconsidered with reference to the principles stated above. In addition, we endorse the comments made by [redacted] with HSR Zero Waste and [redacted] of Zero Waste BC.

1. **RETHINK**

Currently, all proposed actions under section 1.1 (Advocate for circular economy policies) focus on advocating for change rather than leading on change through action. Metro Vancouver should set out clear actions that demonstrate leadership and move the region towards a circular economy in a tangible way. For example,

- Develop and implement a circular economic policy framework that addresses all three elements of the circular economy as defined by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation to replace the Solid Waste Management Plan.
- Reframe all regional solid waste policies and programs in terms of circular economy principles and concepts.
- Require that all regional and regionally-funded projects have material diversion targets with reporting that clearly identifies end fates.
- Require that all regional procurement policies prioritize use of reclaimed materials, including minimum reuse requirements.

We support a number of concrete actions under section 1.2 (Support the transition to a more circular regional economy through waste prevention), such as ID088 (develop circular certification programs for business) and ID042. However, most actions fall short of what is required to achieve this desired transition. Accordingly, Metro Vancouver should outline clear and impactful actions, not just support, to transition to a circular regional economy, such as:

- Allocating $X millions to developing and scaling circular initiatives over 5 years.
- Establishing programs in partnership with industry associations and educational institutions to foster awareness about the circular economy amongst, students, SMEs and other community stakeholders.
- Modifying ID009 to specify the exact policies that Metro Vancouver will integrate, including:
    - Allocation of underutilized regional lands for waste diversion programs
    - Reuse requirements in new regional construction or regionally-funded construction
    - Introducing bans on importing materials into the region that do not have a recycling option.

Sincerely,

[redacted] Circular Innovation
Light House
P: [redacted]
E: [redacted]

Metro Vancouver Solid Waste Plan
PTAC Comments to the Draft Strategies and Actions Options Analysis 2025
November 8, 2025

Comments via track changes

1.0 RETHINK
1.1. Advocate for circular economy policies

ID090 Advocate that federal and provincial governments develop regulatory programs to improve reporting and implementation of circular economy (including food systems) that provides for standardized terminology, specific metrics and timelines of performance.

New comment
Advance the thought leadership on circular economy by providing support through speaking engagements, venues and learning opportunities for stakeholders.

New comment
Advance the framework and obligation of manufacturers and producers of protecting the environment and protecting the public interest.

4.0 RECYCLE
4.1. Promote design for recyclability and the use of recycled content in products and packaging

• ID112 Enhance partnerships with the provincial government, academia, and community groups where industry provides funding to research and develop solution to overcome barriers to reuse and recycling and opportunities to incorporate recycled content into new products.

Develop support with the provincial government on consumers unclaimed deposits (i.e. beverage containers) that arise from the Recycling Regulation to fund general recycling initiatives of Metro Vancouver.

4.2. Enhance EPR programs

• ID116 Identify and advocate for additional materials to be added to extended producer responsibility programs including non-residential packaging with and without readily available markets, such as mattresses and household furniture.
• ID118 Advocate for full funding of producer responsibility programs and the expansion of residential-only programs to businesses.
• ID119 Advocate for accelerated deployment of direct collection and recycling of an expanded suite of materials including film plastic and foam.

Deleted: industry,

Deleted: such as

Deleted: and challenging materials

Deleted: small

Deleted: Document9

• ID121 Advocate and have a regulated framework for expanded recycling drop-off options funded by the stewards or producers of the product for materials such as household hazardous waste, batteries, and items that are not traditionally recycled through the residential blue box, considering mobile options to improve convenience and accessibility.

• ID117 Continue to participate in BC product steward engagements and provide feedback on their regulatory obligations of EPR, the public interest and improvements to existing programs and the development of new programs

Deleted: potential

4.5. Make recycling easier and more effective by reducing confusion and improving convenience

• ID131 Improve access to textile donation and recycling collection services and advocate for textile producers and retailers to set up infrastructure for recycling.

• ID132 Recognize and reward those who recycle well so others are inspired to follow their example; by creating app

Deleted: .

• ID135 Provide a leadership to standardize national guidelines on what can and cannot be recycled; with standardize symbols and colors

Deleted: clear, consistent

Deleted: .

• ID138 Review multi-family residential waste and recycling container space and access guidelines, including determining if the guidance needs to account for increased amounts of material or additional types of materials.

• ID134 Centralize information sources to make it consistent and easier for the public to find information and look for resources.

78992557

• ID136 Advocate for producers, businesses and recycling depots as a responsible steward to work towards streamlining the types of materials accepted where practical.

Deleted: Work with

Deleted: across the region

Deleted: Document9