

Solid Waste Management – Infrastructure Projects Community Engagement Committee

MINUTES

JUNE 22, 2015

2:00 PM – 4:15 PM

ORO MEDONTE SEVERN BOARDROOM

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| MEETING CALLED BY | Project Team |
| TYPE OF MEETING | Community Engagement Committee |
| NOTE TAKER | Stephanie Mack |
| ATTENDEES | Debbie Korolnek (County – Chair), James Nightingale (County), Rob McCullough (County), Ray Millar (Public Member), Marie Kavanagh (Bradford West Gwillimbury), Susan Antler (Public Member), Christopher Baines (Public Member) Blair Shoniker, Senior Environmental Planner (Conestoga-Rovers & Associates) Regrets: Andy Campbell (Innisfil), David Barber (First Nations) |

Agenda topics

VARIOUS ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

DK

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcome • "housekeeping" items |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DK reviewed agenda with group, no items added • introduced Blair Shoniker – Senior Environmental Planner with Conestoga-Rovers & Associates – will be presenting information on public consultation |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE

RM

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • siting report – Part 1 – to County Council – endorsement of siting methodology and criteria • Requests for Expressions of Interest for willing vendor sites, MLS search • list of candidate sites |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RM provided an update on the projects – CEC last met in January – CEC provided link to Item CCW 15-229 • Council endorsement of siting methodology and criteria in March • following that, began search for willing vendor sites – MLS search, RFEI process • compost and mulch giveaway in May – over 2,100 customers, flyers provided with information on the OPF project • 505 candidate sites – 302 County sites, 203 willing vendor sites • evaluation will occur over the summer, list is with Conestoga-Rovers & Associates |

UPCOMING MILESTONES

RM

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentation of short list of sites – timeline • preparation for release of sites • fall public consultation |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • anticipate that second siting report will be presented to Committee of the Whole on August 11, sites released on August 4 when agenda is made public • discussion on short-listed willing vendor sites from MLS search – relaying information to these property owners • reviewed timing – provision of information packages to member municipalities, intention of sending letters to residents with invitations to public consultation • currently working with County PF&P on Option to Purchase Agreement • MK – note that mid-July notification to member municipalities – consideration of vacation schedules • RM outlined upcoming organics survey, purpose is to determine why residents aren't using their green bin • discussion on collection of organics – promotion and education, food waste reduction, upcoming Solid Waste Management Strategy update, and the decreasing capture of organics • timing of fall consultation – 30 days notice from August 25 Council meeting at minimum – consultation will occur likely in October, CB mentioned potential impact of fall Federal election |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>DISCUSSION</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion on different formats for public consultation sessions • examples from CRA experience • advantages/disadvantages of each • moving forward to fall sessions – recommendations on facilitating these sessions, number, location, notification | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS outlined different formats for public consultation – 3 main ways to hold these sessions • presentation and Q&A, open house format, and workshops • benefits of presentation and Q&A format – importance of a good facilitator, consistent messaging, opportunity for participants to voice concerns • drawbacks – difficult for less vocal participants to provide feedback, no flexibility in time, polarization of views • potential for a “hybrid” option – combination of drop-in and presentation/Q&A • benefits of an open house – allows participants to talk with experts directly, natural conversations, potential for enhanced interactive stations, drop-in format allows for flexibility • drawbacks – potential for inconsistent messaging, public may expect presentation, difficult to write down conversations and feedback for the project record • BS provided examples on how to bring the potential sites to the public – computer screens, mapping, interactive stations • workshops or “kitchen table” meetings – more intimate meetings, flip charts, discussions with small groups – participants can learn from each other, opportunity to receive direct feedback, round table discussions • drawbacks – requires facilitators for each table, can be intimidating for less vocal, participants must stay for duration of workshop • overview of deliberative forum workshop, discussion of pros and cons and of project and pursuit of common ground • CEC consensus – recommendation that a combination of both an open house with presentation/Q&A would be best – provide opportunity for discussion with experts but formal presentation/Q&A to publically present questions • workshops would likely be valuable following direction on the preferred site – “relationship building” • discussion on the number of meetings that would be prudent and where they should be held • CEC consensus – one meeting in the municipality where the short-listed site is located, additional central session(s) at the Museum as an alternative for residents • discussed possible venues for the sessions – should attempt to hold meetings at a “neutral” location if multiple sites are in the same town/township • noted that the number of meetings and the venues are dependent on the location of the sites • RMI – provide opportunity for questions to be submitted ahead of time so that all can have answers, can be intimidating for some to ask questions in a public forum • RMI – advertise and have the ability to submit questions prior to meeting, questions can also be submitted at the meeting • provide opportunity for live questions following the presentation • common questions can be addressed in the presentation • SA – what is the public input that is being sought? • CEC consensus – siting is to be a fact-based process, have communities provide local knowledge on the endorsed criteria, public input is required and valuable • CEC consensus – recommendation that facilitator of the public meeting should be independent, non-political with no perceived conflict of interest • CEC consensus – political leadership will be valuable to this process – open the meeting, introduce team, and present benefits | | |
| <p>ACTION ITEMS</p> | <p>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</p> | <p>DEADLINE</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEC recommendation on format of public consultation and facilitator to be incorporated into fall public consultation plan | <p>Project Team</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further discussion on incorporating public input | <p>Project Team</p> | |

DRAFT "FAST FACTS" INFORMATION SHEETS

RM

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion of content of information sheets • distribution • recommendations from CEC | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEC reviewed the DRAFT information sheets and provided feedback to the Project Team • this information will be put on the internet, on project webpages, provided to member municipalities, and front-line County staff – consistent messaging and overview of project benefits • delete the word "potential" • CEC recommendation – insert some content on no new landfills – the OPF project is the result of Council's direction on no new landfills, commitment to diversion • reordered potential benefits as per recommendation – emphasis on a local solution to manage our own waste, benefits to soil | | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporate CEC recommendations and finalize Fast Facts information sheets | Project Team | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send final version to CEC for information | SLM | |

TIMING FOR NEXT CEC MEETING

DK

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussion on timing of next meeting • late August/early September – review communication material for fall sessions | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • next meeting will be scheduled for late August – following August 25 meeting, beginning of September • doodle.com poll was effective, will send new poll • not week of August 30, week of September 8 would work best for the group | | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send doodle.com poll and make arrangements for next meeting | SLM | |

CLOSING REMARKS

DK

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| DISCUSSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunity for closing comments, etc. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no other items for discussion, meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm | | |