



Box 219, 1350 Aster Street
Pemberton, BC V0N 2L0
P. 604-894-6371 TF. 800-298-7753
F. 604-894-6526
info@slrd.bc.ca www.slrd.bc.ca

SWRMP Update Advisory Committee Public Consultation

Feedback Form

Public Surveys

Public surveys were conducted in person at Let's Talk Trash events and hosted online on the SLRD's website. Different surveys were created for Lillooet, Pemberton, Whistler, and Squamish with questions relevant to each area.

In general, public surveys showed respondents to be supportive of composting activities, curbside services, and re-use facilities and services. Please see the attached survey results for more information on the questions asked and detailed breakdowns of the number of respondents. Below is a summary of the some of the results:

Lillooet: 43 Respondents

- 60% of respondents were very supportive of a curbside recycling service. An additional 14% were somewhat supportive.
- 42% of respondents were very supportive of a curbside yard waste collection service. An additional 16% were somewhat supportive.
- 46% of respondents would provide materials to a Re-Build-It Centre, 19% would take materials from a Re-Build-It Centre, and 16% would both provide and take materials from a Re-Build-It Centre.

Pemberton: 87 Respondents

- 47% of respondents already collect food scraps for composting. A further 31% would like to start.
- Most respondents were either very or somewhat supportive of curbside services:
 - Organics: 55%.
 - Recycling: 68%.
 - Garbage 60%.
- 21% of respondents would provide materials to a Re-Build-It Centre, 6% would take materials from a Re-Build-It Centre, and 55% would both provide and take materials from a Re-Build-It Centre.

Whistler: 40 Respondents

- 94% of respondents were somewhat or very supportive of establishing a 3-stream bylaw on all commercial properties.
- 88% of respondents were somewhat or very supportive of establishing a 3-stream bylaw on all multi-family properties.
- 70% of respondents collect food scraps for drop-off at the drop-off depots.

Squamish: 27 Respondents

- 81% of respondents are already engaged in composting activities. An additional 11% intend to start soon.
- 59% of respondents use the Re-Build-It centre, 44% go to the Re-Use-It Fair, 100% use thrift stores, and only 33% use online services such as craigslist and kijiji.

Please provide any feedback you may have on the public surveys below:

Municipal Councils

SLRD staff presented the draft SWRMP Update to the municipal councils of Lillooet, Pemberton, Whistler, and Squamish.

In general, councils expressed their support for the draft SWRMP Update. Below are any recommendations made by councils for changes or inclusions to the draft report:

Lillooet:

- More public education on recycling (what is recyclable and where items can be dropped off for recycling). The suggestion was made to run events focused on educating the public on recycling.

Thoughts for discussion:

The Communications Strategy and proposed initiatives outlined in Section 6 of the DRAFT Solid Waste and Resource Management plan (SWRMP). Communications adequately address the need for more/better public education on recycling.

Please provide any feedback you may have on the recommendations made by the District of Lillooet Council below:

Pemberton:

1. Any decision on an initiative contained in the Plan that identifies the Village of Pemberton with the responsibility for implementing, including budget, public consultation, operations and management, be referred to the Village of Pemberton for approval.

Please provide any feedback you may have on the recommendations made by the Village of Pemberton Council below:

Whistler:

Please see the attached document “RMOW comments on SWRMP.pdf” for the RMOW’s complete feedback on the plan update. Below are the RMOW’s recommended additions and areas of concern:

1. Include Zero Waste definition [Zero Waste International Alliance (ZWIA) definition].
2. Include ZWIA waste hierarchy (or RCBC hierarchy).
3. Add bans especially for organics as facilities and systems are set up. Roll out bans across SLRD (does not all have to be the same). This will harmonize with the MOE service plan which advocates for organics bans.
4. SLRD and member municipalities should be advocating to MMBC to deliver comprehensive service to all multi-family buildings and to “street-scape” urban areas.
5. Minimal emphasis on reduction and no funding directed to it (could include a region wide promotion of Canada wide red dot program, work on reducing single use bags, bottled water, single use take out containers, straws, receipts, printing, etc).
6. No annual reporting on progress to public.
7. Does not include interim targets.
8. Has no reduction targets, only diversion.
9. Considers WTE as better than landfills and advocates for looking at using new WTE capacity if built.
10. Considers WTE as part of zero waste.

Thoughts for discussion:

NOTE: All section references are referring to the DRAFT SWRMP unless otherwise listed.

1. Link to ZWIA definition: <http://zwia.org/standards/zw-definition/>
2. Link to ZWIA hierarchy: <http://zwia.org/standards/zero-waste-hierarchy/>
Link to RCBC hierarchy:
<http://www.rcbc.ca/files/u7/RCBC%20Zero%20Waste%20Hierarchy%20-%20APR%2014.pdf>
3. Section 8 addresses the possibility of disposal bans. Bans on EPR products (where collected) is proposed. The option to implement additional disposal bans is included in the plan should variable tipping fees not result in the desired level of waste reduction (the option to ban organics is not precluded from the SWRMP).
4. See p27 line 6. Furthermore, MMBC already provides some level of funding to Carney's to facilitate collection in multi-family buildings.
5. See 2014 SWRM Strategic Communications Plan. Almost all proposed initiatives in the SWRMP are aimed at reducing waste; see relevant budget estimates. Initiatives suggested in (5) may be incorporated into communications initiatives during roll out of the SWRMP.
6. See Section 23 and Appendix C. The Plan Monitoring Advisory Committee reports on the progress of plan implementation to the SLRD Board on an annual basis. These reports would also be publically available. The SLRD also submits waste tracking information to MOE on an annual basis. This information is presented so that the public can view the district's waste reduction progress in relation to other regional districts.
7. See Section 22. The AC recommended that plan targets align with MOE (350 kg/capita and 75% of the population engaged in organic waste diversion by 2020).
8. See Section 22. The plan adopts the MOE target of reducing per capita waste generation from 525 kg (2012) to 350 kg by 2020. The scope of this target incorporates both reduction and diversion.
9. See Section 15.
10. A sentence could be included in Section 15 indicating that waste to energy is not considered part of zero waste (if the ZWIA definition were to be included in the SWRMP), in addition to its being identified as presently unfeasible in the district.

Please provide any feedback you may have on the recommendations made by the Resort Municipality of Whistler Council below:

Squamish:

1. The Resource Recovery section should be fleshed out to include information on what population size or tonnage of waste generated is required before resource recovery technologies become feasible (i.e. what are some “triggers” that would indicate the potential for resource recovery technologies to be feasible in the district?).
2. Wood waste (talked about in section 14 of the DRAFT SWRMP, Landclearing Waste Management) should be considered as an energy source in the Resource Recovery section and examined when exploring the feasibility of resource recovery technologies.

Thoughts for discussion:

The feasibility of resource recovery technology, such as waste to energy, is dependent on a number of factors such as the type of technology, pace of technological development, the economy of scale and population size (related to the amount of MSW generated), waste composition and properties, a supportive population, the cost of the technology, the timeline to implement the project, and the energy market. To put an approximate numerical trigger value on the viability of a particular type of resource recovery technology would require a significant amount of investigative work. This type of work could be added to the SWRMP and budget; however, it may impact the acquirement and availability of funding for other plan objectives within the district. The second paragraph in section 15, Resource Recovery, begins:

“Resource recovery technologies such as mixed waste processing and waste-to-energy were reviewed during this process but determined to be unfeasible at this time because the region has insufficient residual waste to make these technologies economically viable.”

If this section could be expanded with basic quantifiable reasons as to why resource recovery technologies are unfeasible at this time then this may be adequate for the time being. The bulleted proposals listed beneath the above excerpt in the DRAFT SWRMP provides the opportunity for feasibility assessments to be done on particular resource recovery technologies within the district, and to explore the use of resource recovery technologies outside the district, if either option may appear viable.

Please provide any feedback you may have on the recommendations made by the District of Squamish Council below:

Please return your SWRMP Update Advisory Committee Public Consultation Feedback Form by email to msole@slrd.bc.ca by 12:00PM December 11, 2015.