

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

**MINUTES OF THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2016 AT 12:00 PM
RDN COMMITTEE ROOM**

Present:

Director A. McPherson	Chairperson
Director H. Houle	Electoral Area 'B'
Director M. Young	Electoral Area 'C'
Director B. McKay	City of Nanaimo
Director J. Kipp	City of Nanaimo
Director M. Lefebvre	City of Parksville
Director B. Luchtmeijer	Town of Qualicum Beach

Also in Attendance:

D. Trudeau	CAO, RDN
L. Gardner	Manager of Solid Waste, RDN
S. Horsburgh	Senior Solid Waste Planner, RDN
S. Schultz	Recording Secretary, RDN

Regrets:

Director J. Stanhope	Electoral Area 'G'
Director J. Hong	City of Nanaimo
Director T. Westbroek	Town of Qualicum Beach

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:02 pm by the Chairperson.

MINUTES

MOVED Director Houle, SECONDED Director Kipp, that the minutes from the Solid Waste Select Committee meeting held April 12, 2016 be received.

CARRIED

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED Director Houle, SECONDED Director Kipp, that the minutes from the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting held April 14, 2016 be received for information only.

CARRIED

REPORTS

North Berm Construction Project – Tender Award

L. Gardner circulated a revised report to the committee siting a change in calculations in table 2 regarding the "Construction Contract Administrative Services". An update was presented on the results of the berm tender that is designed to provide stability in an earthquake event. The berm also provides an additional 10 years of landfill capacity.

J. Kipp commented that he had an issue with the gravel in regards to stability and would prefer the utilization of rock to address seismic risk, sluffing and hydrogeology.

M. Lefebvre questioned if some bids were higher because they did look forward to problem events?

L. Gardner commented that pricing was based on costs per unit and that all the contractor bids were based on the same criteria. The contingency is for the RDN to provide assurance in the event of any unforeseen costs associated with a large earth works project. The recommended contingency is the same regardless of the contractor.

M. Young questioned if there is a perimeter surrounding the gravel in case of slippage?

M. Lefebvre questioned if there would be slippage with the use of gravel in a seismic event?

L. Gardner responded that the berm is engineered to address the slippage due to an earthquake event regardless of construction using rock or gravel.

M. Young asked, in regards to the asbestos would gravel allow it to permeate to the earth?

L. Gardner responded that there will be a new liner installed that prevents migration of substances from the site. All waste is placed within the liner system.

A. McPherson and J. Kipp commented that they would like to see the design of the berm and a more per unit breakdown in costs between the usage of rock and gravel before this comes to the board.

J. Kipp questioned if the longevity of the landfill is based on a 10 year old tonnage statistic per year or an increased current tonnage calculation?

L. Gardner commented that the landfill life is based on current landfill rates and is 25 years.

D. Trudeau commented that the whole premise behind this project is that it was included in SWMP years ago and this capital project is in the current financial plan. Communities without a landfill have very high export costs and it is very difficult to find landfill space. The RDN's landfill capacity is a huge cost benefit to us.

L. Gardner commented that the new berm's construction is primarily to provide stability. We would need to build the berm regardless of increased capacity.

D. Trudeau mentioned that this project has significant financial impact to the financial plan and the RDN will realize benefits into the future.

MOVED Director Houle, SECONDED Director Lefebvre, that the Solid Waste Management Select Committee recommend that the Regional Board approve the budget for the North Berm project as set out in Table 2 and to direct staff to proceed with tender award to Wacor Holdings Ltd. for the project construction utilizing the gravel option.

CARRIED

Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) Request for Asbestos Disposal

L. Gardner presented a report regarding the request from the CVRD, on behalf of the CSWM services, that the RDN consider establishing an agreement whereby asbestos and asbestos-containing materials from the CSWM service area be accepted for disposal at the RDN's Regional landfill through to December 31, 2017 with provision to extend the agreement for one year.

The RDN has the capability to manage asbestos waste from CSWM, however, it would be prudent to wait until the North Berm and new cell is constructed at the RDN landfill which is expected to be completed in the Fall of 2016. Accepting the additional out-of-district waste prior to the new cell will exacerbate the existing operational challenges working in a constrained area. Currently CSWM asbestos is being hauled to the Hartland Landfill in Victoria. With our rate increase we are now recovering our cost to manage out of district asbestos.

J. Kipp questioned how the product would be arriving at the facility and what is the product? As there is no treatment for asbestosis and is it in the best interest of the RDN to accept this toxic waste from the CVRD? By the RDN accepting this material the CVRD no longer have to address their own hazardous waste?

L. Gardner commented that there has been a 40% increase in asbestos last year and the greatest majority is drywall.

M. Young questioned if we are handling the asbestos dry or wet and will we be contaminating the site?

L. Gardner responded that the landfill is an engineered system with an impermeable liner designed to accept these types of materials in a safe manner. We do use water at times depending on packaging, weather and disposal area.

A. McPherson questioned if we perhaps take off the 1 year renewal aspect on the report it would make it more palatable of a motion to pass?

A. McPherson questioned is there a map of placement for asbestos in the landfill?

L. Gardner commented that it is almost impossible to map all asbestos as some enters the landfill with other waste.

H. Houle questioned why accept it when someone else is already taking it in? Why not let it continue to go to the Hartland Landfill?

B. McKay mentioned that the AVICC voted in favor of an Island wide conversation on waste and that we would be just helping a neighbor as we have availability and capacity.

B. McKay questioned that he did not see any tonnage specified in the agreement and thinks it would be wise to specify a maximum tonnage for the board.

J. Kipp questioned if the RDN can put our own standards in place if we do decide to accept it, such as; delivery times, days, and quantities. We should be encouraging the CVRD to have some accountability for storing and transporting this material.

L. Gardner mentioned we do have procedures in place at the landfill and manifests are required for transportation. We have set delivery times when trained staff and equipment are onsite.

M. Lefebvre questioned if there are safety controls in place for employees?

L. Gardner responded that there is asbestos and decontamination training given to employees as well as safety equipment such as respirators. Our asbestos control plan is very focused and detailed.

D. Trudeau mentioned we have safety protocols in place and we can take in this hard to manage material and this is an opportunity to create a cooperative relationship with our neighbour and this will help for future collaboration.

M. Lefebvre commented to add to the report that the RDN has controls in place, and how employees are protected from toxic waste and that they are fully aware of the risks before it goes to the board.

M. Young questioned the addition of mapping of asbestos or to set up a specific asbestos disposal area?

L. Gardner responded that we could look into these suggestions however costs would go up significantly.

M. Young would like to add to the report that employees only handle asbestos wet and not dry as it is safer.

B. McKay mentioned that specific disposal sites for asbestos are unrealistic as people will bury it in the garbage instead and contractors will charge more for construction for asbestos removal so homeowners will take it upon themselves and throw in the garbage. The landfill is littered with toxic materials we can't control.

L. Gardner commented that the CVRD is not handling the asbestos directly just finding a resource for their businesses and community.

B. Luchtmeijer commented on what the longer term impacts would be if we do not help in regards to illegal dumping and disposal of this hazardous waste and that we have an obligation to help out neighboring communities.

J. Kipp questioned if we cooperate by taking the asbestos should they cooperate by providing their community promotional materials regarding asbestos. If we are solving their problem they should have investment in this.

MOVED Director Lefebvre, SECONDED Director McKay , that the Solid Waste Management Select Committee recommend that the Regional Board grant the request to accept asbestos and asbestos-containing materials from the Comox Strathcona Waste Management service area starting on completion of the North Berm project and continuing until December 31, 2017 with provision to extend the agreement for one year.

CARRIED

Review of Curbside Collection Scheduling

L. Gardner introduced the report on Curbside Collection scheduling. He explained that add a day scheduling is more cost efficient as there is no need for extra staff and equipment and no overtime for staff. Overall, it would be more expensive to go to a fixed day schedule at approximately a \$90,000/year impact. There is no safety impact foreseen for either schedule.

MOVED Director McKay , SECONDED Director Lefebvre, that the report on the Review of Curbside

Collection Scheduling be received for information.

CARRIED

PRESENTATION

Status of 2016 Capital Projects. (Buildings, North Berm, Scale House)

L. Gardner presented on the current capital projects at the landfill, which include the construction of the north berm, the operations building and garage. The North berm needs to be built this summer to secure future landfill capacity and stability to accommodate the waste we manage. The new building has been built using local labor and supplies. The building will be transportable and gives the option to move or re-purpose the building in the future. The garage building is currently on schedule and is a permanent structure as equipment and resources will be needed for the care and maintenance beyond the life of the landfill.

The scale needs to be replaced as it has outlived its functionality and is under weighing but not significantly.

B. McKay commented that the public sector buildings are becoming too lavish and seems unnecessary for the functions they provide.

L. Gardner commented that the current buildings are very worn out and ergonomically not functional for the staff that work in them on a day to day basis. However it will be looked into regarding cost differentials between re-building and re-furbishing.

Status Update on SWMP Review Process

L. Gardner provided an update on the SWMP Review Process. Options that are being evaluated in Stage 2 include:

- Non-deposit glass at curbside
- Yard and Garden Waste at Curbside
- Compliance and Enforcement at Curbside
- Share Sheds at Regional Facilities
- EPR Stewardship Depots at Regional Facilities
- Zero Waste Policy
- ICI and Multi-Family Diversion
- Residual Management Options
- Demolition and Land Clearing Debris
- Education
- Special Drop off days

Regardless of the technologies used to deal with waste there will always be a requirement to landfill residuals and hazardous materials in the future. Further discussion in regards to additional authorities/enforcement and regulatory tools will also be reviewed. There is also an emphasis to adopt the Zero Waste International Alliance (ZWIA) Zero Waste Definition.

L. Gardner commented that the current plan says to export waste in the future when landfill capacity is reached. We need to review if this is still valid and review the costs associated with each choice.

B. McKay questioned the use of the incinerator technology is that getting better as time goes on.

L. Gardner commented that this is a thermal process with a residual at the end that will still need to be landfilled and that all new technologies, though they can be very efficient, are expensive. Managing waste thermally is environmentally controlled but at a high cost.

B. Luchtmeijer commented that the thermal energy approach requires a certain amount of waste and the RDN does not have the capacity to warrant the process and it would require Island wide participation to obtain the volume required.

L. Gardner commented that there will be a June RSWAC workshop relating to level of service options to establish a plan and diversion targets. A concept of interest for the Select committee to think about is that the value of recyclables is dropping creating increased cost to get higher levels of diversion.

M. Lefebvre questioned why we are not more focused on Producers of the packaging?

L. Gardner commented that the provincial focus of EPR programs is packaging and not the product itself which causes some issues with the products themselves not being recyclable. One option being considered is providing economic incentives for private business to play more of a role in driving diversion rates. The biggest barrier for diversion is convenience and the private sector would possibly provide more services and locations.

J. Kipp commented if education should be our responsibility regarding solid waste?

A. McPherson commented that education is needed for diversion but at whose expense. There should be more enforcement and fines regarding waste diversion.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Moved Director McKay, SECONDED Director Lefebvre, that the meeting be adjourned.

NEXT MEETING

Next SWMSC meeting To be Determined.



CHAIRPERSON