

Trail Focus Group Session and Open House

October 21, 2004

Attendance:

Perspective	Focus Group	Open House	Interview/Survey
Project Team	Laurie Gallant - Footprint Julia Roberts - Footprint Chris Bullock -Western Bioresources Raymond Gaudart RDKB Ron Mickel RDCK	Laurie Gallant - FP Julia Roberts - FP Chris Bullock -WBR Ray Gaudart RDKB Ron Mickel RDCK	
Hauler	Ed Canzian – Alpine	Anna McLean	
Local Organics Diversion		Fiona MacKay -Celgar	Karl Kistner
Institution			Sam Letanzio, KB Regional Hospital
Business			Brian LeRose – Best Western Alan McMartin – Ferraro Foods
Resident	Laurie Charlton	Marten Krusysse Ms. Wolff Dale Babcock	
Local Gov't	Marie Christensen (Area B) Tim Dueck RDKB	Libby Nelson Rick Hardy Art Benzer (Montrose)	Ross McPhee – Rossland (Regrets) Warren Proulx, Trail (Regrets)
Tourism/Econ. Dev't			Marten Krusysse Ian Thomas, Jim Wood (CFDC Trail)

Focus Group Agenda

1. Welcome and session overview
2. Introductions – name and perspective
3. Project overview and key decisions
4. Video: On the Road to Zero Waste: Nova Scotia
5. Service Levels: Collection System Options
6. Supporting Education and Policy
7. Economics: Business Structure and Cost Recovery Options
8. Decisions and Next Steps.

WHAT WE HEARD

PROJECT COMPONENT	DATA	CONCERNS	SOLUTION
General	40% organics at McKelvey Creek landfill (Selkirk College study). Market-driven choice for processing technology – level of sorting will depend on front end sorting.	From inventory exercise, ranked concerns/values from project perspective are water quality, economic development, worker safety, environmental stewardship, and global concerns. From personal perspective ranked concerns/values are environmental stewardship, water quality, wildlife/human conflict, air quality and economic development.	Organics recovery may cost more per year initially but creates many benefits downstream.
Service level	Approx. \$40/hhld/yr for weekly garbage collection.	Compost collection and production in outlying areas – don't want to exclude but don't want excessive costs or poor quality control that gives central product a bad name. Will workers be removing plastic bags at compost plant? Will people line kitchen catchers with plastic bags? Education will not reach at least 10% of the people. People will expect good quality product from their sorting efforts – can we meet	Shredding and compacting organics in rural locations and trucking to central facility. Marketing of all compost products only if all material processed through central plant for quality control. Plan for plastic bags in processing operations. Line kitchen catchers with biodegradable liners i.e. newspapers, paper bags. Central composting may not work for all sources – personal responsibility still key in outlying areas, and

Composting Paradigm Project – A Central Kootenay and Kootenay Boundary Zero Waste Initiative

		this expectation?	responsibility still needed for front-end sorting.
Ownership/ Operation	Regions might accept an offer from a private company if the price was right.	Service reliability and predictability of costs. Are there potential problems with toxics in the feedstock that in turn raise legal issues for owner/ operator?	Public ownership will protect the public from sudden increases in tipping fees or disruption in service due to bankruptcy. Private operation preferred. RFP for private operators – compare \$\$ with public operations.
Cost Recovery	Some people won't use the service because they compost in their backyards. 20 new jobs created by composting – from stateside research based on industry-specific surveys. Closure costs for landfills decreased by 50% - avoided costs. After 30 -40 years of operating without organics, landfills will not produce methane and leachate. Some economic savings for reduced operations at landfill but not significant. Operating costs may be \$700,000/yr, capital recovery \$300,000/yr. May have 25,000 tonnes of compost produced – bulk sale price is \$7/tonne = \$175,000 revenue. Quality of compost is regulated by provincial government. Celgar material currently considered “industrial	Will Celgar pay tipping fees that reflect the value the company receives by removal of its wastes? Want an effective, equitable, sustainable cost recovery formula. Where does the job generation rate come from – how is this calculated? Not convinced jobs aren't simply shifted from garbage collection and landfill operation vs real, new jobs. High product quality needs to be a key design principle. What is the amount that should be invested now to cover new landfill costs? How much are landfill closure costs reduced by removing organics? Product quality may have to be traded off versus % recovered from community. Impacts of volumes dropping at landfill on jobs, revenues. Process must be able to run without Celgar's material to be sustainable. Factoring in compost as a final cover use is not economical since Celgar organics are free for this use	Tipping fees could be different for Celgar versus residents i.e. residents pay per containers and the collector pays tipping fee at the compost facility. Maximize income from collection fees, tipping fees, and compost sales, and then cover rest with taxes. Service may work best if it focuses on collecting from businesses farther than residents. The large amount of clean material from Celgar will help keep product quality high. Good quality product can be sold locally and help with local land revitalization. Direct impact analysis of org rec vs landfilling is part of study. Show new job #s , wages, jobs lost, wages lost as net economic impacts. Include future landfill costs in the economic analysis – future landfill cost is an avoided cost. Study will present scenarios showing

	waste” by province – Celgar is trying to get this classification changed.	at present – why spend money to process at plant?	operations with and without Celgar feedstock. Celgar biosolids need to be explained thoroughly in report (appendix?).
Supporting education and policy	<p>Level of education varies between two regions. Currently RDCK mostly riding on coat tails of RDKB. Supporting policies vary between two regions. Education is expensive – good to be efficient and not reinvent the wheel.</p> <p>No bans in RDCK at present, RDKB has banned paper products. Nelson’s recycling materials are very clean – good front end sorting.</p> <p>Material bans are an effective education tool.</p>	<p>Collection of materials for centralized processing flies in the face of personal responsibility message promoted through RDKB backyard composting etc. programs. Is there a conflict – do public education messages need to change? Education across two regions will not be easy i.e. agreeing on bag limits.</p> <p>Bans create an enforcement problem for haulers and local government.</p> <p>Different tipping fees for garbage and compstables leads to problems with people dumping in cheapest place.</p> <p>Backyard composting could reduce volume of organics for collection and effect economics of project.</p>	<p>Share costs of education programs between two regions.</p> <p>Can have a voluntary ban – focus on education not enforcement. Clear bags make enforcement easy.</p> <p>Door to door education about what is compostable – could be a summer student project.</p> <p>Standardize tipping fees. Will need aggressive ramp-up education program in years leading up to collection – don’t wait until program starts.</p> <p>Run scenario with varying levels of residential organics.</p> <p>Get hauler cooperation in following regional rules for collecting organics.</p>

Final Decisions/Next Steps:

1. Make sure perspective of hospital, schools, food-based businesses and municipalities are considered – follow up may be necessary.
2. Incorporate results of surveys, workbooks and interviews into this report.
3. Extend scope of study assumptions/ calculations to the time when a new landfill would have been needed.
4. Provide options for cost recovery in report – not a detailed formula-based recommendation.
5. List assumptions used in calculations in report. Include as much detail as possible in appendices or in a separate “research” report. Make sure all numbers add up or if they don’t explain why not.

Meeting ended at 8:45 pm.