

Solid Waste Management Plan Options Analysis – Potential Strategies and Actions Review

October 7, 2025

Meeting Notes

A Solid Waste and Recycling Industry Advisory Committee meeting was scheduled for October 7, 2025, in person, at Metro Vancouver Offices (4515 Central Boulevard, Burnaby). The meeting did not have quorum so the meeting was considered a workshop with participation from members of the Solid Waste and Recycling Industry Advisory Committee (Industry Advisory Committee). Feedback from the workshop will be shared with the Industry Advisory Committee.

Two members of the Solid Waste Management Plan Consultation and Engagement Panel were observing the session: Celena Benndorf and Komal Fatima. The Engagement Panel was established to ensure the engagement process for the Solid Waste Management Plan was transparent, inclusive, and informed with diverse perspectives throughout all phases of the project.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Craig Hodge, Director, Zero Waste Committee (Co-Chair)
Charles, Terry – Northstar Clean Technologies (alternate for Gord Johnson)
Crawford, Jeremy – Waste Control Services
Collins, James – Tymac Launch Service Ltd.
Janzen, Tessa – Recycle BC
Kaminski, Jamie – HSR Zero Waste
Kiani, Aiden – Lock-Block Ltd

Lannin, Mike – Super Save Group
MacFarlane, Angus – Growing City
Mallari, Achilles – Sierra Waste Services Ltd.
Pantazopoulos, Dimitri – Waste Connections of Canada
Prasad, Shad – Cascades Recovery +
Punja, Rustam – Geocycle Canada Inc.
Vargas, Pinky – Republic Services

METRO VANCOUVER STAFF:

Brooke Atkinson, Senior Engagement Specialist, Metro Vancouver
Terry Fulton, Senior Project Engineer, Metro Vancouver
Allen Jensen, Senior Project Engineer, Metro Vancouver
Stephanie Liu, Manager, Community Engagement, Metro Vancouver
Zeenia Mizan, Program Assistant, Metro Vancouver

Paul Henderson, General Manager, Metro Vancouver

Karen Storry, Senior Project Engineer, Metro Vancouver
Chris Underwood, Division Manager SW Planning, Metro Vancouver
Lynne Vidler, Lead Senior Engineer, Metro Vancouver

GUESTS:

Celen Benndorf, Panel Member
Komal Fatima, Panel Member
Corey Magee, Republic Services, Observer

PREPARATION OF NOTES:

Priya Kullar, Raincoast Ventures Ltd.

PLENARY DISCUSSION ON ACTIONS UNDER RECOVER, AND IDEAS STAFF CONSIDER UNADVISABLE

Paul Henderson, General Manager, Metro Vancouver, shared information about [actions under 'Recover'](#), as well as the [draft summary of ideas that staff consider inadvisable](#).

Paul Henderson invited members to share related questions and/or comments. The following questions and comments (Q/C) and *responses* (R) were captured:

- Q/C: Clarity is needed on what wood is considered “unsuitable” for reuse or recycling/composting. Are we only talking about painted or treated materials that cannot be composted?
- R: *Manufactured wood products and dimensional lumber, if not recycled, are currently being used as a fuel source. Clean wood (untreated) may be used as fuel if there is insufficient processing capacity for composting.*
- Q/C: The text on the slide refers to “unsuitable for reuse or recycling” and dimensional lumber could technically be composted. We should clarify the language if we are actually talking about wood that is beyond what can be managed at processing facilities.
- R: Agree that a clarification would make sense.
- Q/C: Consideration should be given to how we can build composting capacity.
- Q/C: A significant amount of laminate flooring has glue, and that should not be burned because it can become toxic.
- Q/C: Metro Vancouver has not shared provided sufficient detailed information sufficient to understand the costs of various disposal options.
- R: *At the last Zero Waste Committee meeting, a report contained a summary of costs related to the Waste-to-Energy Facility, Vancouver Landfill, and contingency disposal at remote landfills. The next Zero Waste Committee meeting is Thursday, October 9, 2025, and the agenda contains additional information with more detail on the breakdown of the costs. This information can be shared with the Industry Advisory Committee afterwards.*
- Q/C: There were a number of ideas that have been identified as considered inadvisable by staff, but it was not discussed with the Industry Advisory Committee. For example: “replace source separation programs with mixed-waste collection and sorting programs” was marked as inadvisable, but we have not seen fulsome information shared with the Industry Advisory Committee comparing mixed waste processing with source separation programs.

R: We have observed over the years the challenges associated with mixed waste processing facilities. There is additional information in the Residuals Management Options Review report that was provided to the committee.

Q/C: The ideas considered inadvisable by staff – this is ideological and irrational, specifically around privatization. There are no activities that cannot be performed privately, and everyone is being told this is not an option to explore, simply because Metro Vancouver exists. The private sector could provide services with appropriate regulation in place.

R: Metro Vancouver has repeatedly requested that committee members share information demonstrating other systems / models that have performed well compared to our region and achieved higher recycling rates.

Q/C: Performance is a subjective measure. The reality is that the private sector can achieve the same performance, particularly with regulation in place that imposes the same rules, and the private sector would assume all associated risks, but Metro Vancouver is not letting this happen. The system would be more robust if run by the private sector compared to the public sector. Metro Vancouver should have considered and researched privately run systems, and not suggest that it is up to committee members who participate on a volunteer basis to provide that information.

POTENTIAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FEEDBACK SESSION

Terry Fulton, Senior Project Engineer, Solid Waste Services, Metro Vancouver, shared a presentation titled “Potential Strategies and Actions” and informed that the ideas generated in the Idea Phase were reviewed and consolidated, noting that some ideas are considered inadvisable by staff. The purpose of the small group discussion is to help identify what strategies and actions should be prioritized for inclusion in the solid waste management plan.

It was noted that the full list of [potential strategies and actions](#) is published on the website, and a [feedback form](#) is available for comments until October 31, 2025.

Stephanie Liu, Program Manager, Solid Waste Community Engagement, provided instructions for the small group breakout activity. Industry Advisory Committee members were invited to select topics they wanted to discuss and provide feedback on. A Metro Vancouver staff member facilitated discussions at each table and took notes. It was noted that the activity would help prioritize the different potential strategies and actions, and if elements were missing, members were encouraged to highlight these to the facilitators.

After the small group discussion, participants were encouraged to share any information that was highlighted during the breakout activity. No comments were shared.

Notes from the small group discussion are included as **Attachment 1**. All feedback will be tracked and considered as the strategies and actions are further refined before the solid waste management plan is drafted. Some highlights from the feedback are presented below.

Topic	Industry Advisory Committee Comments
Regulation and Incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives are preferred as opposed to regulations • Regulations should consider impact on businesses and affordability overall • Caution related to a potential hauler incentive program to help their customers reduce waste – there are limitations to the tools available to haulers to be able to participate. • Emphasis on ensuring markets exist before introducing new disposal bans, and the need for clear criteria and rationale
Recycling / Composting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include zoning and permitting considerations in the action about facilitating siting of private sector recycling activities • Metro Vancouver to support recycling markets through procurement policies and potential regulatory requirements for recycled content (e.g. concrete, compost) • Support for expanding Extended Producer Responsibility programs, with a focus on low-impact packaging and direct collection of materials like flexible plastic and foam, while acknowledging implementation challenges
Implementation, Education, and Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for education for strata corporations. • Identified where efficiencies could be realized, such as strategic use of AI to provide information to residents. • Identified practical challenges related to some of the potential actions such as collecting data on residential waste reduction efforts, in person education for residents, or improving recyclability of paper products like coffee cups. • More examples and guidance are needed to support commercial and institutional reuse/refill initiatives • Industry would benefit from Metro Vancouver produced resources showing waste destinations and processing methods, which could also enhance resident participation • Recommendations to streamline recycling databases and improve existing digital tools rather than creating new ones • Litter and clean-up efforts are too focused on disposal – need to focus more upstream
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions to combine certain actions that are related to avoid repetition • Actions should be more specific and actionable

IAC DISCUSSION/FEEDBACK ON SWMP DRAFT OUTLINE AND RESIDUAL WASTE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS REVIEW

Information on the solid waste management plan draft outline and residual waste management options review was included in the September 9, 2025, Industry Advisory Committee meeting package. Participants were invited to provide additional feedback regarding these two items. No comments were shared.

ZERO WASTE COMMITTEE AND OTHER UPDATES

Paul Henderson, General Manager, Solid Waste Services, shared a presentation titled, “Zero Waste Committee and Other Updates,” which highlighted the following:

- Upcoming October 9, 2025, Zero Waste Committee agenda items, including 5-year Financial Plan and 2026 Tipping Fees (increasing by \$7 per tonne)
- Proposed tipping fee of \$7 per tonne (aligns with last year’s projection)
- Two proceedings are ongoing related to the British Columbia Utilities Commission including the Waste-to-Energy Facility Electricity Purchase Agreement renewal and the Waste-to-Energy Facility District Energy System.
- In September 2025, the Ministry of Environment and Parks issued an updated Operational Certificate for the Waste-to-Energy Facility, including requirement for a series of studies and proposed draft revised discharge limits by September 2026.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Small Group Discussion Notes – Potential Strategies and Actions Feedback Session

SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Potential Strategies and Actions Feedback Session

October 7, 2025 – 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

In-Person Meeting

Metro Vancouver Head Office

28 Floor, 2809 Conference Room

Feedback Summary

6 Table Groups:

- Rethink
- Reduce
- Reuse (food and built environment)
- Reuse (reuse, refill, repair)
- Recycle (education)
- Recycle (infrastructure and programs)

RETHINK

Round 1

Number of Participants: 3

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID001	13
ID003	12
ID090	12
ID002	10

Action ID	Total Score
ID005	8

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is considered compostable is a key policy piece to work on • Consistent regulation for recycled material is important
ID090	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate food waste would be positive • Need to make sure there are no liability implications with respect to donating food. • Making it a requirement to donate food could help. • Need to paint a picture of what this looks like as it is unclear what this means.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementation of regulation is key. The approach needs to keep the cost for government and business down.
ID003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
ID004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
ID005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the administration cost would result in a need to increase taxes. This could have the biggest impact if done correctly without increasing cost for government and business. Prefer incentives instead of regulations. If we want to put in regulations, we need to make sure they allow the industry to make money, or at least not lose money. Concerns about the impact of regulation on the cost of housing. Suggestion that it would better to increase the cost of C&D disposal to encourage diversion of construction and demolition waste.

REDUCE

Round 1

Number of Participants: 5

Strategy: 2.2 Support residents adopting waste prevention habits

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID104	17
ID080	11
ID081	11

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID080	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment that the practicality is difficult – how do you gather the data to then get a scorecard for people? Hard to do on a personal level where it's the most beneficial. Easy to get data collectively but that's not as effective.
ID104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important for strata's to know what they're supposed to be doing.

ID081	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good idea but not sure how many people would show up. • Should go to schools – especially upper high school to show them what to do. Grade 10-12. • Hard to tell a 30-year-old what to recycle. Start them young. • Make it more targeted – not general but more targeted like schools. • Could create AI strategies for answering questions firsthand instead of hiring people to do this. • Must be intuitive. We don't have to use people / do in -person. Use other methods. • We can have this action, but it shouldn't be in person.
-------	--

Round 2

Number of Participants: 5

Strategy: 2.4 Disposal Bans

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID107	4
ID106	13
ID105	18

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the fine actually help to divert waste or does it just increase revenue to Metro Vancouver? • It's not going to change behaviour because you have several customers and buildings in one load – it will be impossible to find out where the one clear bag came from. • What happens after the fine – do we then remove the recyclable item and divert it? • The disposal bans are most effective for small customers who are bringing in their own materials. However, those customers are a large percentage of customers but a small percentage of the waste.
ID106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good idea but depends on implementation and what those incentives look like. • There are limitations in technologies that would assist haulers to participate. • For example: cameras – way to scan baled cardboard and plastics to see moisture content, density, etc. • I don't need Metro Vancouver to give incentives to me to have a broader list of services to provide to customers. I do that on my own as that is good for business.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who could be against incentives.
ID105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low support for this action. It only works if there is somewhere to recycle these materials If there's a market for it, I'm 100% for this. We can't create a ban just because we don't think it should go in a landfill – but it needs to be able to go to higher and better use, or it's hazardous in the waste. Don't ban just for the sake of banning it. We need a rationale. Need to include these criteria in the action – i.e. at what point would you introduce a disposal ban (currently the action doesn't specify) Also consider whether materials are problematic in landfill or not. Materials that are not as problematic should be lower priority for adding as a ban. Add "Continue to" at the front of the action, to say that it's something that is already happening now.

REUSE

(food and built environment)

Round 1 and 2

Number of Participants: 0

- No participants at this table during small groups on both rounds

REUSE

(reuse, refill, repair)

Round 1

Number of Participants: 2

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

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID051	3
ID084	0
ID054	4
ID050	4

Action ID	Total Score
ID053	4
ID056	2
ID055	3
ID165	4

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
In general – Strategy 3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What kind of success are third party reuse agencies having? What examples can you point to make it easy to understand the programs and approach. Need more public education about reuse opportunities.
ID084	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear what it means – need more information. Provide examples, how would this actually work?
ID056	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has it been successful, is it gaining any traction? Would like to see the metrics about how the existing program has worked. Having the opportunity to salvage on site may increase uptake (e.g. success of city-wide garage sale events– community has the opportunity to pick up used items from their neighbours before the city comes to pick it up.) Clearer messaging and promotion of the existing reuse days needed. Make sure there are easy places to take materials they are no longer using.
ID053	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Really interesting concept – longer life model (like reusable glass bottles) is desirable. Could be tied to ID050 – schools and universities would be a good place to launch pilot programs. Youth might be more enthusiastic about a pilot, passionate sustainability advocates. Control is important to ensure a successful program.
ID054	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having one spot with re-use businesses together might help with uptake – communal collection place.

RECYCLE (education)

Round 1

Number of Participants: 2

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

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID159	12
ID156	9
ID157	7
ID158	5

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID 159	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify what materials this action is referring to (compostable vs. bottles) Educate the residents and customers on what efforts are being made to divert materials from landfills Currently industry businesses spend a lot of time researching materials and where they go so that they can create communications for their customers to build confidence Would be nice for Metro to put this together for industry to use Consider including items like cooking oil and parmesan cheese (products that come off cruise ships) Fibre disposal industry – gets the wrong materials all the time (e.g. raw meat) Consumers seem to think it's just easier to pass on the responsibility to industry rather than doing their own diligence to find out where to properly dispose of materials Education could be helpful to reduce the confusion and reduce the mentality that it is easier to just put on the industry to deal with, which ends up being costly for industry
ID156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change language to specify if it's "which" organizations or "how" organizations are handling materials Would this action call out each organization? Or just in general have a type of material and how it is generally handled in the system? Could include "which" and "how" to expand on this action
ID157	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This action is only for very specific audiences like school tours or NGO's – not as applicable for industry
ID158	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus more on making the current databases less confusing for the users There is a lot of redundancy and deficiencies in the current databases (Waste Wizard and Recyclepedia) Would be best to focus on making ONE app that does it all and has all materials where they go and what happens to them after (lifecycle process)

Round 2

Number of Participants: 2

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

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID136	5
ID135	5
ID142	5
ID134	5

Action ID	Total Score
ID132	4
ID138	4.5
ID131	3
ID140	3

Action ID	Total Score
ID137	3

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standardizing materials will make it easier, but does this action mean doing this by collaborating with EPR programs with signage for accepted materials and education? Consider creating a potential working group for EPR program leads and Metro Vancouver to collaborate on to ensure consistency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does something like this working group already exist? Is there a working group for the Regional Districts that exists to discuss EPR programs?
ID135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This feels like a very high-level action, whereas action ID 142/131/135 seem to be the actual actions to take to make this action happen of providing clear, consistent guidelines on what can and cannot be recycled Consider combining into one action that encapsulates the objective (clear and consistent guidelines, and the tangible ways to do that)
ID142	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate this action with the Waste Wizard if possible, should be easy enough to add these layers of accessibility to the existing Waste Wizard to improve it Encourage all existing apps to include accessibility options and multilingual instructions in QR Codes rather than creating a new app which could get lost in how many currently exists
ID134	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine this action with 135/136 to bundle the objective of providing clear guidelines and centralizing information sources
ID132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This action could include multi-family residents easily by having a recycling champion on each building, or working with property managers to include the encouragement through signage in the building The success of each multi-family building being a champion could build community around being a green conscious building How do we tackle this in single family homes? How could a reward system work for them?

ID138	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make this action most effective by having the residents in the building be the ones to educate others on how to use the recycling room correctly • Added space will be very valuable in the future as more bins are potentially added to some municipalities (i.e. flexible plastics in Vancouver) – will need more room
ID131	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider having more EPR programs in place before this action can exist and be effective in the system • Accessibility to textile recycling will increase if there are end markets for the materials and EPR programs that help with this
ID140	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update action to have more clear language around what access requirements mean in this action • Specify what type of knowledge sharing, or how to best implement knowledge sharing between Metro Vancouver, members, and industry
ID133	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine this action with 135 so it outlines the objective of this action better and the customizable tools to be the way to achieve it • Could shorten the list of actions by doing this

RECYCLE

(infrastructure and programs)

Round 1

Number of Participants: 5

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

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID109	11/25
ID110	13/20
ID111	23/25
ID112	12/20
ID113	9/25

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lot of industry greenwashing and this action would help address this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why just coffee cups -- e.g. Tetra Pak and milk containers are missing • Very difficult to implement. • No clear definition of recycling. • Consumers have a difficult time properly grading plastics.
ID111	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead by example. • Should include concrete and others, don't limit to compost. • Should include supporting regulation for the purpose of incrementally increasing the amount of recycled material, based on a percentage.
ID113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective can Metro Vancouver be with this given the broad market. • Should be more focus on education. • This is beyond the scope of Metro Vancouver's responsibility. But should focus on advocacy. • Should focus more on regulation. e.g. a minimum percentage recycled content • Advocate senior government for supporting regulation. • Be realistic – Metro Vancouver is only one player.

Strategy: 4.2 Enhance EPR programs

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID117	19/25
ID119	13/25
ID120	20/25
ID121	23/25

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's challenging. • Only worthwhile if there is market demand. • Should focus on alternatives to foam and plastic packing materials instead. e.g. shredded cardboard
ID120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inherent problem with EPR programs is that they are too downstream.
ID125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worthwhile to ensure these materials stay out of municipal solid waste.

Round 2

Number of Participants: 4

Strategy: 4.3 Encourage the development of new recycling infrastructure

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID044	10/20
ID122	17/20
ID123	18/20
ID124	14/20

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID044	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New industry needs support to catch up to existing established industries. • Need to strengthen definition of recycling. • Not an issue of government funding, issue of establishing the right priorities. i.e. where money is being spent is the issue • Need government funding to support the private sector's advertising and promotion of their initiatives. i.e. shift existing government funding to private sector • Should not rely on government funding. • This is a low priority.
ID123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should consider zoning and permitting.

Strategy: 4.8 Prevent litter and illegal dumping through public space recycling initiatives

Fist of 5

Action ID	Total Score
ID174	17/20
ID175	19/20
ID176	10/20
ID177	3/20
ID178	14/20

Discussion

Action ID and brief description	Comments / Feedback
ID175	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don't include waste collection in these events.• "Significantly increase"• Based on performance metrics.• Continuous improvement.• "Explore" is vague, can this be more specific and actionable.• Missing actions: household hazardous waste and bulky items pickup days.
ID176	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What does "support" mean? e.g. funding?• Ineffective.• Too back end, need to focus on upstream.