

## Solid Waste and Recycling Industry Advisory Committee Key Topic Discussion Feedback Summary – November 4, 2025

At the November 4, 2025, Solid Waste and Recycling Industry Advisory Committee meeting, committee members provided feedback on proposed metrics and targets for the updated solid waste management plan. There was a plenary discussion on primary metrics and targets. Following this, members were given the choice of joining small groups on secondary metrics related to Rethink/Reuse, Reduce/Recycle, and Recover/Dispose groups. Members participated in the Reduce/Recycle and Recover/Dispose groups only. A summary of feedback received is presented below and will be included as an attachment to the November 4, 2025 meeting minutes.

Discussion Topic	Feedback
<p><b>Potential metrics and targets for the solid waste management plan</b></p>	<p><b>Transparency and clarity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metrics need detailed breakdowns to enable informed discussion and evaluation.</li> <li>• One-sentence summaries are insufficient; targets must be clearly calculated and justified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recycling rates and data integrity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inaccurate numbers can mislead the public and impact realistic planning.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current reported recycling rates are inaccurate; suggestion that actual rates are lower (closer to 30%).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concrete and asphalt skew recycling stats and should be excluded from municipal solid waste recycling rates.</li> <li>• C&amp;D waste should be tracked separately from industrial, commercial, and institutional (e.g. hospital) and residential municipal waste with individual targets.</li> <li>• Recovery (especially energy recovery) should not be included in diversion targets.</li> <li>• Recycling metrics – more information needed:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How much recyclable material is used to produce new items?</li> <li>○ Are current recycling collection systems effectively reducing plastic production?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Climate considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public awareness of climate and GHG issues has evolved.</li> <li>• Shipping waste outside the region increases emissions and costs.</li> <li>• Limited local disposal capacity exacerbates environmental and financial impacts.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Scope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current plan is too complex. Simplify to 4–5 clear, achievable goals.</li> <li>• Conditional support for secondary metrics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need clarity and transparency in metric definitions and calculations.</li> <li>○ Reuse metrics (e.g., food rescue) need clearer definitions—human use vs. animal feed.</li> <li>○ Waste-to-Energy should be classified as “Dispose” if purpose-built, “Recover” if used as fuel substitute.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggested secondary metrics lack transparency. Cost transparency is essential (e.g. where do tipping fee revenues go?). Metrics should reflect realistic, cost-effective outcomes.</li> <li>• Waste composition studies should inform targets. Show clearly how targets relate to waste composition and key actions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cost and infrastructure concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tipping fees and C&amp;D disposal costs have risen sharply</li> <li>• Vancouver Landfill and Ecowaste capacity are uncertain in the long-term.</li> <li>• Organics processing capacity has declined over the past decade.</li> <li>• Affordability and property tax implications must be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional comments</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
	<p><b>Future engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More committee discussions are needed to refine goals and strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Focus should remain on materials and sectors within regulatory control.</li> <li>○ Emphasis should be on source-separated recyclables and organics, not recovery.</li> <li>○ Realistic goals must reflect material value and market viability (e.g., wood and plastics have low/no value).</li> <li>○ Cost transparency across disposal options should be included in presentations to IAC.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Bryan, Lori, Executive Director, Waste Management Association of BC (Co-Chair)  
Craig Hodge, Director, Zero Waste Committee (Co-Chair)  
Abrams, Izzie – Waste Connections of Canada  
Agassiz, Sam – West Coast Reduction Ltd.  
Furtado, Glen – Cement Association of Canada  
Hankins, Grant – Canada Minibins.com Ltd.  
Johnson, Gord – Narthstar  
Kaminski, Jamie – HSR Zero Waste  
MacFarlane, Angus – Growing City  
McRae, Ralph – Revolution Infrastructure Inc.  
Mallari, Achilles – Sierra Waste Services Ltd.  
Millman, David – Waste Management of Canada Corporation

Moucachen, Maya – Merlin Plastics  
Muir, Wesley – Veolia North America (Canada)  
Pantazopoulos, Dimitri – Waste Connections of Canada  
Prasad, Shad – Cascade Recovery+  
Punja, Rustam – Geocycle Canada Inc.  
Sigmund, Sandy – Encorp, Return it  
Skei, Dayton – EverGen Infrastructure Corp.  
Skoropada, Lorne – Ridge Meadows Recycling Society  
Van Beusekom, Brent – Product Care Association  
Vargas, Pinky – Republic Services  
Zarbl, Michael – Major Appliance Recycling Roundtable