

Proposed Revision to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan

The following tables highlights level of support, specific comments, and how public feedback can be taken into consideration when finalizing the Plan.

Within the tables, the level of support is provided as portion of respondents who agreed or disagreed with proposed strategies. “Agree” includes respondents who selected “strongly agree” or “agree” with a strategy and “not agree” refers to those who selected “strongly disagree” or “disagree”. The unaccounted percentage refers to respondents who responded ‘Neutral’ or ‘Don’t know’.

Table 1 Proposed revisions to Strategy 1

Strategy 1: Lobby for improved EPR programs in the PRRD			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
No survey question asked specifically about this strategy as lobbying for improved EPR was implied through the other questions. Many comments at the end of the survey indicated strong support for placing more responsibility for recycling on the producers of the products.	One respondent asked for EPR for C&D waste.	In the context to Strategy 1, the Plan provides a list of materials the PRRD wish to see covered by the Recycling Regulation. C&D materials could be included in this list. C&D waste is on the Ministry’s list of future EPR materials.	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p> <p>Include C&D materials in the list list of new materials under the Recycling Regulation on page 27.</p>

Table 2 Proposed revisions to Strategy 2

Strategy 2: Promote and educate on the pollution prevention hierarchy			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority of respondents regarded waste diversion as either very important, or important, to avoid landfilling by making less waste, composting, and/or recycling (<i>Online: 63%, mail: 86%</i>).</p> <p>The top four initiatives that were prioritized by residents in both the online and the mail survey include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing more information on recycling options, • placing a “share board” at each share shed, • adopting successful waste reduction campaigns used in other regions, and • encouraging material and product repair activities and providing more information on recycling options. 	<p>Many respondents expressed interest in share sheds, and other opportunities to divert reusable items such as furniture, wood and construction materials. Others indicated that educating residents on the 3 R's (reduce, reuse and recycle) and implementing zero waste strategies would be beneficial.</p>	<p>The comments supported strategies and initiatives already outlined.</p> <p>The Plan can identify that the PRRD will prioritize the initiatives favoured by survey respondents.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p> <p>To include as a stand-alone paragraph ahead of infographic for Strategy 2 on page 29, as follows:</p> <p>“The PRRD will prioritize the initiatives that had strong support during the public consultation.”</p>

Table 3 Proposed revisions to Strategy 3

Strategy 3: Research options for recycling agriculture plastics			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of focusing on recycling agricultural plastics at PRRD.</p> <p><i>Online: 83% agree and 4% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 87% agree and 3% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Respondents expressed support for EPR programs and in having drop-off locations for chemical containers. A few respondents indicated that recycling of agricultural plastics is too time consuming for farmers, who typically dispose of or burn the material</p>	<p>The comments supported strategies and initiatives already outlined. The PRRD will lobby for EPR for agricultural plastics and can review the possibility to collect chemical containers as part of the household hazardous waste collection. The issue of lobbying for EPR is also addressed by strategy 1.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 4 Proposed revisions to Strategy 4

Strategy 4: Increase ICI waste diversion by promoting the waste hierarchy			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>A slight majority was in support of increasing ICI waste diversion by increasing tipping fees.</p> <p><i>Online: 58% agree and 27% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 62% agree and 18% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Some respondents felt that the PRRD should focus on educating and promoting the principles of reducing and reusing.</p>	<p>The comments supported strategies and initiatives already outlined. Waste diversion includes reduce, reuse and recycling initiatives, as such the promotion of all 3Rs are part of the strategy and are emphasized by the guiding principles.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 5 Proposed revisions to Strategy 5

Strategy 5: Improve collection of hazardous waste and targeted EPR materials			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of household hazardous waste collection.</p> <p><i>Online: 81% agree and 8% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 78% agree and 8% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Respondents' comments reflected concerns that collection events every 3 years is not enough.</p>	<p>The Plan can note that the frequency will be determined based on the pilot of permanent drop-off option and success of round-up events.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p> <p>To expand on the statement after the infographic for Strategy 5 on page 32: "Cost of round-up event every three years", to also include:</p> <p><i>"The frequency will be determined based on the pilot results of permanent drop-off option and success of round-up events."</i></p>

Table 6 Proposed revisions to Strategy 6

Strategy 6: Increase diversion of construction and demolition waste by promoting the waste hierarchy			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of C&D waste diversion.</p> <p><i>Online: 84% agree and 4% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 86% agree and 2% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Many comments asked for improved reuse opportunities for C&D waste and the provision of space for reusable C&D materials.</p> <p>Respondents suggested implementing source separation requirements and having deconstruction bylaws.</p>	<p>The strategy targets waste diversion, which includes reduce, reuse and recycling initiatives. Initiative 6B can be revised to enable the PRRD to pilot reuse and recycling of C&D materials.</p> <p>The option of bylaw requirements for source separation was explored during Plan development but was not deemed necessary at this point. The PRRD can review the need for regulatory tools to increase C&D diversion during the 5-Year effectiveness review.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p> <p>Revise wording to proposed action on page 33:</p> <p>6B Investigate feasibility of reusing or recycling additional C&D materials and implement pilot when deemed feasible.</p>

Table 7 Proposed revisions to Strategy 7:

Strategy 7: Establish organics processing capacity in the Region			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of organics diversion.</p> <p><i>Online: 79% and 7% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 81% agree and 4% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Many comments in support of in-region organics processing with the suggestion to sell the compost product to residents and local gardens to help offset costs.</p>	<p>In reviewing the organics processing solutions for the region, the PRRD will consider the benefits from local uses of the final compost, whether from a small or large scale solution.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 8 Proposed revisions to Strategy 8

Strategy 8: Support curbside collection of compostable organics in member municipalities			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of organics diversion.</p> <p><i>Online: 79% and 7% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 81% agree and 4% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Many comments were in support of in-region organics collection.</p>	<p>The comments supported strategies and initiatives already outlined. The Plan states that once suitable composting solutions have been identified, the PRRD can work to investigate organic waste collection options that fit the selected organics processing solutions.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 9 Proposed revisions to Strategy 9

Strategy 9: Assess suitability of technologies for energy recovery for organics in the Region			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority were in support of assessing energy from organics.</p> <p><i>Online: 67% agree and 11% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 70% agree and 9% disagree.</i></p> <p>Less than a majority support cost increases to pursue energy recovery.</p> <p><i>Online: 44% agree and 29% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 43% agree and 27% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Some respondents were concerned about the costs, environmental impacts, feedstock requirements and potential effects on the surrounding community (e.g., odour, noise, etc.).</p>	<p>These are all aspects that will be considered when the feasibility of energy recovery is assessed.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 10 Proposed revisions to Strategy 10

Strategy 10: Assess suitability of technologies for energy recovery for residual waste			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>A slight majority are in support of assessing energy from garbage. <i>Online: 66% agree and 13% disagree.</i> <i>Mail: 53% agree and 13% disagree.</i></p> <p>Less than a majority support cost increases to pursue energy recovery. <i>Online: 44% agree and 29% disagree.</i> <i>Mail: 43% agree and 27% disagree.</i></p>	<p>Some respondents were concerned about the costs, environmental impacts, feedstock requirements and potential effects on the surrounding community (e.g., odour, noise, etc.).</p>	<p>These are all aspects that will be considered when the feasibility of energy recovery is assessed.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 11 Proposed revisions to Strategy 11

Strategy 11: Improve accessibility and efficiency of the solid waste network			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority are in support of improving accessibility as long as it's economically feasible.</p> <p><i>Online: 69% agree and 12% disagree.</i></p> <p><i>Mail: 70% agree and 14% disagree.</i></p> <p>Many respondents like the current level of service and do not want to pay more (<i>online 48%, mail 38%</i>).</p> <p>Many respondents indicated that they want better waste diversion services and are willing to pay more (<i>Online: 42% and mail: 49%</i>).</p> <p>There is a low level of support to increase costs to regional taxpayers by more than 50% (<i>Online: 13% and mail 11%</i>).</p>	<p>Comments reflected concerns that tax increases would need to be justified by visibly better services.</p> <p>There were both concerns and support for piloting 24 hr access to free garbage disposal. There were some concerns about it leading to landfilling of recyclables.</p>	<p>These are all concerns that will be considered when the PRRD is reviewing accessibility and changes to service levels. These concerns will also be considered when the PRRD is implementing actions under strategy 16.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>

Table 12 Proposed revisions to Strategy 12

Strategy 12: Monitor the PRRD's three active landfills to continually assess long-term disposal options			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
No survey question asked specifically about this strategy. The associated actions all relate to fulfilling provincial landfill regulations, monitoring requirements, and following best practices.	-	-	-

Table 13 Proposed revisions to Strategy 13

Strategy 13: Develop an illegal dumping strategy			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
The majority are in support of reducing illegal dumping. <i>Online: 88% agree and 2% disagree.</i> <i>Mail: 84% agree and 5% disagree.</i>	Some respondents suggested implementing disposal bins along remote highways, offering more free disposal programs, more enforcement and surveillance, and maintaining affordable tipping fees that will not deter residents from using the waste management system properly.	The comments supported strategies and initiatives already outlined in the Plan. The issue of accessibility is addressed by strategy 11, and the other aspects will all be considered when the PRRD is implementing actions under strategy 13, such as the development of an illegal dumping strategy.	No changes to strategy wording.

Table 14 Proposed revisions to Strategy 14: Develop an emergency debris management plan

Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
No survey question asked specifically about this strategy. PRRD is responsible for emergency management in the Region and development of a plan is following best practices.	-	-	-

Table 15 Proposed revisions to Strategy 15

Strategy 15: Set limits on recycling cost and implement other management methods as necessary			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
A slim majority are in support of limiting recycling costs. Online: 66% agree and 12% disagree. Mail: 56% agree and 14% disagree.	Respondents were concerned about the environmental and cost impacts associated with the transportation of recyclables. Some comments suggested that the PRRD investigate opportunities to reuse materials locally and implement a regional processing facility for recyclables.	The possibility of a regional processing facility for recycling could be investigated during the Plan implementation or during the during the 5-Year effectiveness review.	No changes to strategy wording. To include as an additional sentence ahead of infographic for Strategy 15 on page 45, as follows: “This is also the time when the PRRD can consider the need to establish a regional processing facility for recycling.”

Table 16 Proposed revisions to Strategy 16

Strategy 16: Continually assess financial model used to fund the solid waste system			
Level of support	Specific Comments from the Public	How comments are addressed by the Plan	Proposed revisions to RSWMP strategy / context
<p>The majority are in support of continually assessing the funding model.</p> <p>Online: 79% agree and 6% disagree.</p> <p>Mail: 82% agree and 2% disagree.</p>	<p>Respondents support reviewing how the solid waste system is funded to ensure programs are efficient, however there was some concern with the cost of such reviews and further increases to tipping fees.</p>	<p>Having regular reviews is an important part of providing a fair and financially sustainable waste management system.</p>	<p>No changes to strategy wording.</p>