

Speaking Points from Gord Baird

CRD Board Meeting – March 13th 2019; Agenda Items 10 and 11

We need to be cognoscente that when staff first began looking at these topics, it was before the CRD had declared a Climate Emergency, before the IPCC delivered the blistering report on the need to be zero carbon by 2050, and before the recently released Clean BC Plan. It does demonstrate the rapid pace of change we are seeing in science and policy, and it signals that we **must** be nimble to adapt.

Landfill Biogas for Methane - AGENDA Item 10

Economic lens

The staff report notes the payback of the \$23.7 million facility to be 40 years (2060), but scientific consensus makes it abundantly clear that we have to be zero carbon by 2050. This is a 10 year gap.

- Are there implications of this becoming a stranded asset?
- Should feasibility be assessed over 30 years rather than 40?
- If fossil fuel industry shuts down, who will manage the methane delivery infrastructure?
- Does the economic ROI analysis consider the carbon pricing?

Electrification of Society lens

With the push for high efficiency heat pumps, electric vehicles and integrated electrical grids, there will be a sustained demand for electricity. Programs to replace methane burning mechanical systems very similar to the push we saw for removing oil tanks will expand. The landfill still has value as part of the backup battery/generation system.

Waste Reduction lens

With a vision towards creating a circular economy we see reduction of waste streams as the prime target. This is expressed most recently in the Clean BC plan where 95% of all organic wastes from agricultural, industrial and municipal sources will be reduced.

- If the CRD is relying on feedstocks to generate biogas to turn into methane, will the region be willing to curtail wastes?
- If waste feedstocks continually decreased through policy mandates, has staff considered the economics of a declining methane production curve of the landfill?
- How do you lead cultural change if you demonstrate the opposite?

Organics Processing – AGENDA Item 11

There is no social license for the old way of composting. We know its failings.

In the face of a climate emergency there is also no social license:

- to convert food to methane,
- to support infrastructure that is reliant on fossil fuels,

- to forgo the opportunity of nutrient recycling in lieu of the creation of phytotoxic anaerobic digestate waste.

Of the 8 proposals, the report doesn't support any related to recycling.

There seems to be a lack of information shared about modern technologies using closed cell, aerobic and thermophilic composting processing, which ensure:

- no odour,
- no leachate,
- no dust,
- no access to vermin, and
- are designed to be in close proximity to neighbourhoods,
- are highly adaptive to varying feedstock volumes and types, and
- are adaptive and resilient to cultural change.

For this, I argue there is a social license, and therefore deserves a more fulsome discussion of those proposals that fit these criteria.

Being nimble does not fancy infrastructure, it requires creative solutions.

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gord Baird', written over a horizontal line.

Gord Baird