M I N U T E S
7-2005
JOINT WORKING GROUP MEETING
Thursday, August 11, 2005
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon
Saltfleet Room, Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre
Highway No.8 and Jones Road, Stoney Creek

Attendance:

Hamilton Contingent:
Councillor David Braden
Councillor Phil Bruckler
Councillor David Mitchell
David Hart Dyke, Chairperson, Waste Reduction Task Force
Beth Goodger, Director, Waste Management Division
Pat Parker, Manager of Solid Waste Planning, Public Works Department
Adrienne Press, Policy Analyst, Public Works Department
Ida Bedioui, Legislative Assistant, Clerk’s Department

Niagara Contingent:
Councillor Gary Burroughs
Councillor David Eke
Councillor Damian Goulbourne
Councillor Gord Harry
Councillor Tim Rigby
Andrew Cavasin, Waste Management Advisory Committee
Catherine Habermebl, Manager, Waste Collection & Diversion Operations
Drew Berketo, Program Manager, Waste Management Services, Public Works Department
Cheryl Crawley, Program Manager, Waste Management Services, Public Works Department
(secondment, Jacques Whitford Limited)

Consultants:
Janine Ralph, MacViro Consultants Inc.
Steve Plaice, Jacques Whitford Ltd.
Kerrie Skillen, Jacques Whitford Limited

Observers:
Lawson Oates, City of Toronto
Matthew Green, City of Toronto
Katie Tulk, City of Toronto
Councillor Janice Wright, Region of Halton
Councillor D. Braden, who chaired the meeting, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

1. **Adoption of Agenda:**
   The Chair noted that today’s agenda is a revised version of the previously circulated agenda for the July 14, 2005 meeting which was cancelled.

2. **Delegations**
   Pat Parker advised the Working Group that there were no delegations to be heard today.

3. **Approval of Minutes from the June 9, 2005 meeting.**
   Moved by Councillor Eke
   Seconded by Mr. Hart Dyke
   That the Minutes of the June 9, 2005 Niagara-Hamilton WastePlan Joint Working Group meeting be approved as presented.
   Carried.

4. **Business Arising from the Minutes**
   Beth Goodger provided an update on the status of the covering letter to be distributed with her *FCM Mission to Sweden* presentation to other levels of government. The letter will be presented at the next WastePlan meeting for the Working Group’s consideration.

   a) **Alternative Public Input – Memo on Polling Proposal**
   Janine Ralph provided an overview of the report in which staff are proposing to undertake a public opinion survey as a means to solicit a greater public response with respect to the priorities of the environmental categories. The cost will be an addition of $12,500 to the overall project budget for 2005.
   
   Moved by Mr. Hart Dyke
   Seconded by Councillor Harry
   That staff be directed to accept the proposal from Ipsos Reid to conduct research by survey for a total cost of $12,500, which will represent an increase to the consulting budget.
   Carried.

5. **Budget Related Items**
   a) **Memo – Staff Report on Consulting Budget**
   Pat Parker briefly outlined the report indicating that it was necessary to reallocate unspent funds from the 2004 consulting budget to the 2005 consulting budget as a result of changes in the scope of work undertaken. Both municipalities would be able to do this within their
own budget processes, but this item was brought forward because of the unique working arrangement of the Joint Working Group.

Moved by Councillor Mitchell
Seconded by Councillor Eke

That unspent funds in the amount of $33,652.00 from the 2004 MacViro Consultants Inc. Budget be reallocated to MacViro Consultants Inc 2005 budget to cover a shortfall resulting from extra work required with respect to the Niagara Hamilton WastePlan Environmental Assessment Project.

Carried.

b) Quarterly Report on Activities to date and Expenditures

Copies of a chart entitled WastePlan Quarterly Expenditures & Total Project Cost – First and Second Quarter 2005 (January – June) were distributed at the meeting. Pat Parker provided an overview. Councillor David Eke requested that in future financial statements, staff provide more details in the breakdown of expenditures (i.e. advertising costs).

6. Environmental Assessment Study

a) Summary Report on April 5/6 Consultation Sessions

Steve Plaice advised that this report was essentially presented at the previous WastePlan meeting held on June 9, 2005. Hard copies were not provided to the members although electronic copies had been e-mailed prior to the meeting. The Working Group was requested to consider the following related staff report.

b) Staff report on the Summary Report on April 5/6 Consultation Sessions

Copies of the staff report were distributed at the meeting. Pat Parker and Beth Goodger commented on the purpose of the report.

The Working Group expressed concerns that they didn’t have a copy of the consultant’s report before them and didn’t know what they were approving. Staff explained that the Working Group is being requested to approve the scope of the criteria but not the environmental priorities.

The Working Group emphasized the importance of scheduling a meeting wherein they would have the opportunity to discuss and debate the issues arising from the public input before giving any final approval.

Moved by Councillor Goulbourne
Seconded by Councillor Bruckler

(a) That the Summary Report prepared by the consultants respecting the April 5 and 6 Consultation Sessions be received for information.
(b) That the scope of environmental categories, criteria and indicators identified in conclusions (from the report) be endorsed for the purpose of initiating the collection of data and the corresponding evaluation process for the alternative disposal systems.

(c) That the proposed environmental categories, criteria and indicators be forwarded to the list of government agencies for any additional input on their application in the evaluation process and that any input received be considered over the course of the alternative disposal system evaluation process.

(d) That the descriptions of the rationales or intent for each of the proposed evaluation criteria be documented for use in future consultation on the evaluation of alternative disposal systems.

(e) That the descriptions of the approach to be followed in the application of each of the indicators or measures be developed and documented for use in future consultation in order to provide for a traceable and replicable evaluation process.

(f) That the approaches and methods to solicit additional public input on the relative priorities of the environmental categories be investigated and undertaken to a reasonable extent in order to increase reliability in the priorities to be considered when selecting a preferred waste disposal system.

(g) That the measures described in subsection (f) be completed prior to the release of any results on the evaluation of alternative disposal systems and in particular the relative system advantages and disadvantages in order to maintain objectivity in the priority setting exercise.

Carried.

c) Summary Report on May 24/25 & June Consultation Sessions

Steve Plaice explained that this report provides the results of the public information sessions and the special delegation meeting. It includes eight (8) proposed alternative systems. He also advised that the draft report was adopted by the WastePlan Working Group at its May 2005 meeting. (No hard copies were provided but electronic copies were previously circulated.)

d) Staff report on the Summary Report on May 24/25 & June Consultation Sessions

Copies of the staff report were distributed at the meeting. Pat Parker provided an introduction and the Working Group was requested to approve the staff recommendations.

Moved by Councillor Mitchell
Seconded by Councillor Goulbourne

(a) That the Summary Report on the May 24 and 25 and June Consultation Sessions prepared by the consultants be received for information.
(b) That the projected material recovery rates, the overall at-source diversion rate of 65% for both Niagara and Hamilton and the regulating projections for the quantities of waste requiring management post-diversion as set out in the draft report on Additional At-Source Diversion be carried forward in the WastePlan EA Study for use in the evaluation of “Alternatives to”.

(c) That the eight (8) alternative systems which have been identified as being capable of addressing the purpose of the undertaking in a reasonable manner (as described in the EA Terms of Reference) and which are functionally different from each other, as set out in the summary report and in the draft report on Formulation of Alternative Waste Disposal Systems be carried forward for detailed evaluation in the WastePlan EA Study.

(d) That the additional feedback received regarding additional at-source diversion and the formulation of alternative disposal systems during the remaining steps of the process of evaluating the “Alternatives to” be considered and addressed as required, prior to making a recommendation on the preferred disposal system.

(e) That the final report on the evaluation of “Alternatives to” include conclusions and recommendations regarding the implementation of measures by Niagara and Hamilton to meet the target of 65% at-source diversion, as set out in the draft report on Additional At-Source Diversion.

Carried.

e) Air Environment Report

Copies of the staff report were distributed at the meeting. Steve Plaice provided a verbal overview of the report to the Working Group. He advised that this is the first of a series of background reports. There will be a total of 6 reports respecting air environment, land and aquatic environment, agricultural environment, economic environment, social and cultural environment and legal and jurisdictional environment. Janine Ralph addressed the Working Group with respect to the content and referred to the executive summary.

Moved by Councillor Gord Harry
Seconded by Councillor Phil Bruckler

That the consultants’ report entitled Draft Report on Environment Potentially Affected: Air Environment be received for information and released to the public for comments.

Carried.

David Dyke Hart requested a summary report on the status of all the consultants’ reports. Staff agreed and indicated that such reports were part of the work plan in order to keep the members updated.

f) Schedule of Meetings

Janine Ralph provided an overview of the meeting schedule and noted the proposed date change to the September meeting. She suggested that the October 13 meeting date would be a good opportunity for discussions and debate by the Working Group of the priorities. A
discussion followed with respect to the proposed schedule. Staff was directed to explore the options and possibilities of having public delegations at the WastePlan meetings prior to the Working Group meeting to debate the priorities.

Moved by Councillor David Eke  
Seconded by Councillor Damian Goulbourne

That Staff be directed to schedule two meeting sessions in October – the first to hear delegations and the second to debate and select the priorities.  
Carried


Copies of the Summary Emission brochure were distributed and Pat Parker advised that additional copies were available. She also indicated that copies were distributed to AMO and both (Niagara and Hamilton) Councils.

8. Other Business

a) AMO Conference – Co-Chairs memo to Councils

Pat Parker referred to the copy in the agenda of the memo from the WastePlan Co-chairs to the Niagara and Hamilton Councils advising of the 2005 AMO Annual Conference and WastePlan. She also indicated that Municipal World published the article written by the WastePlan Co-chairs and additional copies were available. A package containing copies of the memo, the Municipal World article and the brochure will be circulated to all Members of Regional and City Council.

a) Ministry of the Environment Liaison (new business)

Beth Goodger referred to a hand-out entitled Ministry of Environment Liaison concerning Provincial and Municipal relations with respect to waste management.

She advised that the G.T.A. Mayors and Chairs are trying to convene a meeting with the new Minister of Environment, Laurel Broten.

b) Toronto’s situation

The Co-Chair invited Lawson Oates to address the Working Group with respect to the current Toronto situation.

Mr. Oates spoke with respect to the possibility of the Canada/US border being closed to waste shipments. The U.S. government has been taking a new approach as a result of security concerns after September 11 and is in the process of considering tighter legislation. Toronto is watching the situation closely and has no back up alternatives if the border should close. The Joint Working Group acknowledged that there’s a two way exchange. (Ontario is taking hazardous waste from the States.) Currently, the G.T.A. is shipping municipal waste, industrial waste is being shipped from Hamilton, and bio-solids are being shipped from Niagara across the border to the States.
b) Next Meeting

It was confirmed that the date of the next meeting of the Niagara-Hamilton WastePlan Working Group will be changed to September 15, 2005. The location will be confirmed prior to the meeting.

The Co-Chair requested that staff arrange a session with representatives from Toronto to see what can be done to address the waste management problems.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. to meet again as indicated above.