

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

SOLID WASTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 14, 2002 MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Reg Rankin, Chair
Councillor Jim Smith
Councillor Gary Meade
Councillor Gary Hines
Councillor Dawn Sloane

STAFF: Mr. Brian Smith, Director of Solid Waste Resources
Mr. Jim Bauld, Diversion Planning Coordinator
Ms. Laurie Lewis, Collection & Processing Coordinator
Ms. Sherryl Murphy, Assistant Municipal Clerk
Mr. Kurt Pyle, Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA	3
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 7, 2001	3
3.	PRESENTATION - PEGGY CRAWFORD RE ECO EFFICIENCY CENTRE ..	3
4.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	5
5.	BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES	6
6.	SOLID WASTE OPERATIONS REPORT	6
7.	NEW BUSINESS	7
7.1	Implementation of C& D Waste Management Strategy - Status Report - Presentation	7
7.2	Biodegradable Plastic Bags - Information Report to Regional Council dated January 16, 2002	8
7.3	Setback for C&D Facilities	9

1. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Smith that the agenda, as distributed, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 7, 2001

MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Hines that the minutes of December 7, 2001 be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. PRESENTATION - PEGGY CRAWFORD RE ECO EFFICIENCY CENTRE

Ms. Peggy Crawford of the Eco-Efficiency Centre addressed the Committee indicating that the Eco-Efficiency Centre is an organization which encourages small and medium size businesses to adopt more environmentally sustainable practices. She went on to indicate that the approach is one that not only focuses on the environmental benefits, but also on the financial benefits to the businesses in terms of cost savings. Ms. Crawford noted that the role of the Eco-Efficiency Centre was one of providing resource and support. The organization is not a consulting group nor does it compete with other environmental businesses. The role of the Eco-Efficiency Centre is not one of advocacy. The Centre is a business organization. Ms. Crawford relayed that the organization was small and at the present time primarily focused on the Burnside Industrial Park.

Referring to the significance in the economy of small and medium size businesses, Ms. Crawford indicated that although she did not know the actual impact on the environment that these businesses have, she suspected that it was significant. Noting that the Centre had located in the industrial park because of the cumulative effect to environment of the businesses located there. Ms. Crawford indicated that individual businesses may not be exceeding the legal concentration for a particular substance, but when one considers the number of similar type businesses in the Park, there is cause for concern. Ms. Crawford advised that HRM has been a financial partner (primarily the Waste Resource area and the Water Commission). Dalhousie and Nova Scotia Power are the primary financial partners for the Centre.

Ms. Crawford briefly reviewed the accomplishments of the Eco-Efficiency Centre, as follows:

- development of eco business program model (100 members now enrolled in program)
- core service is an integrated environmental review
- annual breakfast and bi-annual rewards program

- companies have saved/generated \$121,000 as a result of the eco work they have undertaken
- Development of resource materials (Tools for Green - a business starter kit)

Ms. Crawford indicated that she believed that the Eco Efficiency Centre is a successful project which HRM has supported. She went on to note that she also believed that the Centre was playing an important role in helping HRM to work with this particular business sector. Ms. Crawford suggested that HRM's investment was worthwhile and noted that the Centre has garnered a lot of attention for the work it has undertaken in Burnside. Burnside is one of the best known industrial parks in the world for its environmental management and the Centre has been profiled in international publications. The Centre regularly hosts visitors from around the world and in April of last year were finalist in the Green Partnership Awards which honours successful business and municipal relationships.

Ms. Crawford went on to review how the Centre was improving. She advised that the work of the Centre is moving outside of Burnside to other areas of the municipality. The Centre is becoming more involved with specific projects and are working with HRM in educating grocery store personnel about better separation and cardboard handling. Ms. Crawford indicated that the Centre, on a limited scale, is beginning to work outside HRM and there is interest in the Centre in terms of replication in other areas of Nova Scotia.

In conclusion, Ms. Crawford indicated that there are ways that HRM can help the Centre be more effective and get information out to the business. HRM can encourage businesses to join the program and identify other businesses that the Centre could partner with. Ms. Crawford went on to note that the Eco-Efficiency Centre would like to have all three levels of government determine a way in which they could, comfortably, give a seal of approval and endorse the work of the Centre. Ms Crawford indicated that she would like to explore this possibility with HRM. She further indicated that the Centre would like HRM to continue to financially support the program and perhaps with a broader brush.

Ms. Crawford responded to questions from members of the Committee.

Mr. Bauld advised that the Centre was working with both the grocery industry and multi-unit buildings.

In response to a question from Councillor Sloane as to whether the Centre was addressing the packaging issue with grocery stores, Ms. Crawford indicated that yes they were in a small way, but that the focus was on the individual store rather than this larger issue.

Mr. Bauld noted that the Regional Chairs group was looking at the packaging issue. He noted that this matter has a national focus and there will be FCM involvement.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr. Jack Eisener, P.Eng., Eisener Contracting Limited, distributed a photograph depicting the processing of construction materials. Also distributed were the Solid Waste Resource Management Regulations under the Environment Act, HRM's Administrative Order 27, and HRM's By-law L-200 re the Licensing of Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling and Disposals Operations. Mr. Eisener provided a brief personal background and went on to advise that his company had just completed a contract with Metro Transit to expand their parking facility. To this end, his company has brought in the piece of equipment depicted in the photograph he distributed. Mr. Eisener noted that the piece of equipment was referred to as a mobile crusher. He indicated that the mobile crushers processes materials down to an aggregate. This aggregate was reused on the Metro Transit site.

Referring to Section 102 (2) (j) of the Solid Waste Resource Management Regulations under the Environment Act, Mr. Eisener noted that construction and demolition debris is defined as materials that are normally used to construct buildings, structures, roadways, and includes, but is not limited to soil, asphalt, brick, mortar, .etc.. Mr. Eisener went on to note that Section 31 (2)(a) of the Regulated Activities section of Division II-Disposal of Municipal of Municipal Solid Waste of the same regulations, states that 'No person shall own, construct, manage, operate, alter or modify a disposal site for construction and demolition debris without obtaining approval from the Minister. In (b) it indicated that 'Clause (a) does not apply to rock (excluding rock containing a sulphide bearing material), aggregate, soil, bricks, mortar, concrete, asphalt pavement, porcelain or ceramic materials..... . Thus the Provincial Government has defined construction debris and then in a further clause they have identified certain of those materials that do not have to be taken to a C& D disposal site or a processing facility.

Mr. Eisener referred to By-Law L-200, Respecting Licensing of Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling and Disposal Operations which defines in Section 2 (b) Construction and Demolition materials. Section 2 (c) provides a definition of a Construction and Demolition Materials Processing Facility. An exception to the rule, Administrative Order 27, indicates that certain materials shall not be disposed of in a Construction and Demolition Debris Disposal Site, under Bylaw L-200.

Bringing his comments to a conclusion, Mr. Eisener noted that Section 9 of By-Law L-200 states that 'All C&D materials shall be transported from the place of generation to either a Transfer Station or a C&D Processing Facility. He indicated that his interpretation of this is that if he has a construction site (i.e. reconstruction of a road), technically all material (asphalt, concrete curb, sidewalk) must be taken to a Transfer

Station or a C&D Processing facility. Mr. Eisener indicated that this would increase the cost of doing business for contractors in HRM. He suggested that the wording as it presently stands would require even excess fill to be brought to a C&D processing facility.

In response to a request from Councillor Rankin, Mr. Pyle indicated that it is possible that this section would be interpreted in that manner. He suggested that the appropriate manner in which to handle this is to have a clarification amendment approved by Council.

MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Meade that a clarification amendment relative to this matter be included with the amendments to By-law L-200 which will go before Council in relation to the upcoming MPS and Zoning By-law amendments.

Mr. Smith indicated that he would check with the administrator regarding an interpretation.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councillor Rankin, on behalf of **Ms. Linda Lake, Harrietsfield**, advised that Ms. Lake wanted to ensure that a public process relative to additional rights being granted to existing C&D operation owners (i.e. for a disposal facility) would include a meeting held in the affected community.

5. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

In response to a question from Councillor Smith regarding the impact of the Canadian Food Inspectors announcement that residual food products from restaurants which may contain meat or have come in contact with meat no longer be used as feed by hog farmers, Mr. Bauld indicated that diversion of this waste will add approximately another 1000 tonnes per year (3-4 tonnes per week) to the system. He indicated that the Canadian Food Association (CFA) is required to enforce this change in regulation.

Ms. Lewis noted that no impact has been measured to date in this regard. Note should be made that the CFA is still working toward getting some of the existing hog farmers re-registered under the new process. Ms. Lewis indicated that it is possible that the impact is not being felt due to the re-registering process.

6. SOLID WASTE OPERATIONS REPORT

- A Mass Balance (tonnage activity) report for the period April 2001 to January 2002 (10 months) was distributed to Committee members.

Ms. Laurie Lewis provided a brief overview of the report noting that at the last meeting she had reported increased tonnage for residential refuse and recycling. Ms. Lewis indicated that the growth is continuing and that year to date increase of 4.2% over last year. Ms. Lewis further indicated that there continues to be a decline in the commercial sector refuse at Otter Lake. This trend may be attributable to private sector separation of organics and construction and demolition materials. Organics derived from the commercial sector continues to grow. Ms. Lewis reiterated that the unusually dry summer can account for the lower year over year tonnage. Ms. Lewis noted that the remaining categories were estimates as HRM does not currently receive data from the private sector. In conclusion, Ms. Lewis indicated that estimated year end tonnages totals for refuse to be within budget. She noted that the same held true for organics and recycling.

Ms. Lewis responded to various questions from Committee members.

6.1 INFORMATION REPORT - BY-LAW, PRIVATE ROADS - SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

- This matter was dealt with at this time at the request of the Chair. An information report dated February 14, 2002 submitted by Paul Dunphy, Director, Planning & Development Services was before the Committee for consideration.

Mr. Peter Duncan, Senior Development Engineer, briefly reviewed the report and responded to questions from members of the Committee.

In response to a concern from Councillor Meade that the standards for private roads not only be in place, but enforced, Mr. Duncan indicated that changes in 1996, had required that private roads meet the same standards as public roads. Mr. Duncan noted that one of the checks is that if a road is not built to standard, development of the lots would not be permitted.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 Implementation of C& D Waste Management Strategy - Status Report - Presentation

- A staff report dated February 7, 2002 submitted by Brian T. Smith, Director of Solid Waste Resources was before the Committee for consideration.

Mr. Bauld briefly reviewed the discussion section of the February 7, 2002 regarding applications which have been received for additional rights to existing operations or recognition of new C&D operations. He indicated that staff believed it would be prudent to follow the process as set out in the report.

Mr. Bauld and Mr. Pyle responded to questions from members of the Committee noting that the criteria under which the applications would be evaluated were in draft form and would be undergoing some fine tuning. The development of criteria will not be complete until such time as a second round of input is received at the Community Council level.

Mr. Pyle, in response to a question from Councillor Rankin regarding whether staff would evaluate the proposals prior to final approval by Council, noted that staff would carry out the evaluation in order to bring forward a recommendation on which Council could base its decision to allow or not to allow a particular proposal. Mr. Pyle went on to advise that staff was also seeking an April 1, 2002 deadline for the receipt of applications in order to avoid undue delays in the process.

Responding to concerns from the Committee regarding a public process, Mr. Pyle noted that the process called for a public meeting in each community in which an application has been received.

Councillor Hines requested that a broad notification of residents be undertaken relative to these public meetings. Mr. Pyle is to meet with Councillors Rankin and Hines regarding public notification.

MOVED by Councillor Sloane, seconded by Councillor Hines that Halifax Regional Council:

- 1. adopt the process as outlined in the February 7, 2002 staff report for use when evaluating requests for additional rights for existing C&D operations or for recognizing new C&D operations as part of the planning amendment process for implementing HRM's C&D Waste Management Strategy and;**
- 2. set a deadline of April 1, 2002 for receipt of additional applications, to be considered as part of this planning amendment process.**

In concluding remarks, Mr. Pyle noted that the process outlined in the February 7, 2002 staff report allowed for a framework in which to evaluate these applications. The decisions regarding the granting of additional rights to existing operations or recognizing of new operations, will be decided by Council subsequent to the public hearing.

The **MOTION WAS PUT AND PASSED.**

7.2 Biodegradable Plastic Bags - Information Report to Regional Council dated January 16, 2002

- Correspondence dated January 22, 2002 from Seven A. Mojo, Executive Director, Biodegradable Products Institute to Councillor Len Goucher was distributed to members of the Committee. This correspondence was referred to

the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee by Councillor Len Goucher at the February 12, 2002 meeting of Council.

- An information report dated January 16, 2002 submitted by Brian Smith to the January 22, 2002 session Halifax Regional Council was also distributed.

Mr. Brian Smith indicated that the correspondence had only been received by staff today and requested that consideration of this matter be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee. Mr. Smith went on to propose that industry members address the Committee with regard to this issue.

Mr. Smith provided samples of a number of different types of biodegradable bags.

MOVED by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Sloane that consideration of this matter be tabled to the next meeting of the Committee pending a presentation from members of the industry. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

7.3 Setback for C&D Facilities

- This matter was added to the agenda at the request of Councillor Meade

MOVED by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Sloane that Council re-visit setback distances for C&D facilities with a view to requiring all new facilities (application received after April 1, 2002) to have a 100 foot setback.

A brief discussion ensued and the **MOTION WAS PUT AND DEFEATED.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Sherryl Murphy
Assistant Municipal Clerk

INFORMATION ITEMS

- Information Report - By-law, L200, Separation Distances
- Correspondence: Letter to Mr. Richard Cotton, Chair Regional Solid Waste Committee re: Amendment to Provincial Building Code for Source Separation at ICI Properties
- C&D Waste Management Strategy Public Meeting Minutes - November 19, 21, 28, 29 and December 3, 2001 & Extract - Peninsula Community Council - December 10, 2001