

The Regional Municipalities of Durham and York

**MINUTES
of the
JOINT WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP (JWVG)
for the
DURHAM/YORK RESIDUAL WASTE STUDY**

TUESDAY, MAY 30, 2006

A regular meeting of the Joint Waste Management Group for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study was held on Tuesday, May 30, 2006, LL-C Boardroom, Durham Regional Headquarters, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, at 10:11 a.m.

Present: Councillor Brunelle, Chair, Region of Durham
Councillor Clarke, Region of Durham
Councillor Crawford, Region of Durham
Councillor Ferri, Chair, York Region, left the meeting at 12:06 p.m.
Councillor Johnson, Region of Durham
Councillor Pidwerbecki, Region of Durham
Councillor Self, Region of Durham
Councillor Shier, Region of Durham, left the meeting at 11:25 a.m.
Councillor Wheeler, York Region
L. Burt, Resident, Township of Scugog, DEAC Representative
M. Evans, Resident, Township of Brock
I. Gray, Resident, Town of Newmarket
J. McGinnis, Resident, City of Pickering, Durham Conservation Centre
B. Mersey, Resident, Town of Markham, Markham Conservation Committee
S. Perrella, Resident, City of Vaughan, left the meeting at 12:06 p.m.

Absent: Councillor Heath, York Region
G. Rye, Director of Utility Services, City of Peterborough
Mayor T. Taylor, York Region

Also

Present: Mayor W.F. Bell, York Region
Regional Chair Fisch, York Region, left the meeting at 12:06 p.m.
C. Herrington, Mayor, Town of Brighton
B. Pyatt, CAO, County of Northumberland

Staff

Present: B. Boffey, Project Co-ordinator, MacViro Consultants Inc.
C. Bradley, Public Works Director, County of Peterborough
A. Campbell, Director, Solid Waste Management Branch, York Region
C. Curtis, Commissioner of Works, Durham Region
C. Harvey, Northumberland County

M. Januszkiewicz, Director of Waste Management Services, Durham Region
B. Karczmarzyk, MacViro Consultants Inc.
T. Lavery, Communications Officer, Durham Region
J. McKay, Jacques Whitford
D. Merriman, MacViro Consultants Inc.
S. Munns-Audet, Director of Corporate Communications, Durham Region
J. Ralph, MacViro Consultants Inc.
L. Riviere, Planner, Planning Department, Durham Region
P. Russell, Director of Transportation and Waste, Northumberland County
K. Spitzig, Policy and Planning Coordinator, York Region
C. Swan, Executive Assistant to the Mayor, Town of Whitby
C. Bandel, Recording Secretary, Durham Region

Councillor Brunelle assumed the position of Chair.

1. SUMMARY OF DELEGATIONS TO EUROPE

D. Merriman, MacViro Consultants, reported that the trip to Europe to tour thermal treatment facilities in the Netherlands was very successful and informative. To provide the Committee with a better understanding of the type of technology being used in Europe, he played a DVD on the Sysav Waste Energy Plant located in Malmö, Sweden, which explains the process of the thermal treatment of Mixed Solid Waste.

D. Merriman advised that the delegation met with the Minister of the Dutch Environment and learned about their waste management hierarchy and toured several plants throughout the Netherlands.

D. Merriman responded to questions from the members relating to the height of the stack, the required size of a facility, the disposal of residential and commercial waste, and the possibility of the energy created being used as a partially renewable fuel source.

2. OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON CONSULTANTS' CONCLUSION ON PREFERRED "ALTERNATIVE TO"

D. Merriman gave a PowerPoint Presentation on the Consulting Team's recommendation on the Preferred "Alternative To". A copy of the presentation was included in the Evaluation of "Alternatives To" and Identification of Preferred Residuals Processing System Report, which was distributed to each of the members.

D. Merriman recapped the Environmental Assessment process and the timelines to date.

He advised that the undertaking has been very focused and that only residual waste left over from aggressive diversion programs is being considered. He stated that (4) functionally different alternatives to recover materials and energy were considered:

1. Mechanical, Biological Treatment with Recovery of Biogas;
2. a) Thermal Treatment of Mixed Solid Waste (MSW) and Recovery of Materials from Ash/Char;
2. b) Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel; and
2. c) Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel with Biogas Recovery.

It was pointed out that all alternatives have some residue that requires landfill disposal.

J. McKay, Jacques Whitford, provided a comparison of the advantages and disadvantages between each of the systems. He advised that based on a seven step evaluation methodology and application of criteria approved with the Terms of Reference, the consulting team recommends that the preferred alternative be 2. a) Thermal Treatment of MSW and Recover of Materials from Ash/Char. He stressed that because new technologies may offer additional benefits, an alternative for further consideration is alternative 2. b) Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel.

D. Merriman provided an overview of the supporting documentation contained in the Report. He also reviewed the results of the consultation process.

3. OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC DELEGATIONS

D. Merriman advised that Public Information Sessions took place in both Durham and York Regions on May 9, 10, and 11, 2006 to discuss the consultants' conclusions regarding the preferred system. As well, public delegations were held at both York Region and Durham Region on May 17, 2006. which provided an opportunity for the public to express their opinion on a preferred system. An Ipsos Reid telephone poll of 400 residents (200 in each Region) was also conducted during the week of May 15th, 2006. He provided an overview of the results of these sessions and the major issues identified during the consultation process. A summary of the key comments/issues identified during the consultation process was also included in the Report.

B. Mersey submitted the following comments on behalf of the Markham Conservation Committee:

- The timeframe for response is too short given the nature of the report and they feel the decision has already been made

- The burning of garbage to boost energy goes against the main goal of diversion
- 60% to 75% diversion rate should be higher, they feel the current programs are too conservative
- The flexibility of the system is also a concern
- There is concern that the facility will be developed in a residential area. B. Mersey requested that this be addressed during the consultation process for site selection.

B. Mersey stated that people are looking to the policy makers to guarantee that waste reduction remains the main concern.

J. McGinnis stated that he is uncomfortable with the results outlined in the presentation, that at the public delegation session he attended, the majority of people did not support a thermal process. He also expressed concern regarding when the backup material would be made available for review.

D. Merriman clarified that the conclusion that there was support from the majority of participants in the consultation process was based on review of the comments from all of the PIC's, all of the public delegations and the results of the Ipsos Reid poll, as well as any comments that were received by mail. He also responded to the concerns regarding the availability of back-up material from the public delegation process. He advised that the bulk of the material hasn't changed from what was approved on April 18, 2006 and the most significant new item is the information from the public consultation process, which has been summarized and included in the Report. He advised that all back-up material regarding the public delegations would be available on the Durham/York website at www.durhamyorkwaste.ca, and provided to the members by next week.

4. RECOMMENDATION OF PREFERRED "ALTERNATIVE TO"

Discussion ensued regarding the recommendation on the preferred "Alternative To" put forward by the Consultants, as outlined in the Report on the "Evaluation of 'Alternatives To' and Identification of the Preferred Residuals Processing System". A copy of the consultant's recommendation was distributed to the members.

The consultant is recommending System 2a) Thermal Treatment of Mixed Solid Waste (MSW) and Recovery of Energy followed by the Recovery of Materials from the Ash/Char.

Further discussion ensued regarding the consideration of an alternative treatment process, the evaluation process for proposals, and ownership of the facility.

Councillor Heath submitted his concerns with regard to the recommendations put forth by the consultant via e-mail, which A. Campbell read out for the Committee.

MOVED by Councillor Ferri,

"THAT the Durham/York Residual Waste Study Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the respective Works Committees for the Region of Durham and York Region for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

- a) THAT the preferred system to manage the post-diversion or residual waste be System 2a) – Thermal Treatment of Mixed Solid Waste (MSW) and Recovery of Energy followed by the Recovery of Materials from the Ash/Char, as outlined in the Report on the 'Evaluation of "Alternatives To" and Identification of the Preferred Residuals Processing System' be approved;
- b) THAT, because new technologies may offer additional benefits, an alternative for further consideration in the upcoming competitive process be System 2 b) 'Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel';
- c) THAT the Staff and Consultant team for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study be directed to proceed with the evaluation of 'Alternative Methods' in accordance with the approved EA Terms of Reference, including (but not limited to):
 - i) Consult with the public and agencies and confirm the proposed evaluation methodology and criteria to be utilized throughout the evaluation of 'Alternative Methods';
 - ii) Determination of optimal facility size and throughput and resulting site size requirements;
 - iii) The identification and evaluation of siting alternatives for a processing facility;
 - iv) The evaluation of implementation methods, including ownership options, public-private partnerships and system financing; and
 - v) Initiation of a formal competitive procurement process as part of the evaluation of 'Alternative Methods' of implementing the preferred undertaking."

CARRIED

5. NEXT STEPS

D. Merriman advised that the next step would be to have the York Solid Waste Management Committee and Durham Works Committee consider the recommendation from the JWVG at their June 7, 2006 meeting for subsequent recommendation to the respective Councils. If direction is provided, work will begin on identifying a facility site and preferred implementation approach.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Joint Waste Management Group is scheduled for September 19, 2006, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at the York Region Administrative Centre, Seminar Room, Main Floor.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,
"THAT the meeting be adjourned."
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

M. Brunelle, Chair
Joint Waste Management Group
(JWVG)