

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

1.	<p>Do you think the Advisory Committee membership, as defined in the Terms of Reference, has an appropriate balance of skills, experiences and backgrounds?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Advisory Committee membership is well balanced in terms of skills, experiences, and backgrounds. It would be good to encourage all members to articulate the perspectives of their stakeholder group more clearly. I think we would benefit from more First Nations voices. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>10</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No</p> <p>0</p>
2.	<p>Do you think Advisory Committee meetings are properly focused on items identified by the SWAC Terms of Reference?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We appear to be suffering from mission drift at this point with repeated attempts to move the agenda back to items outside of scope. I have attended only one meeting but most of the conversation dealt with the wording of this survey. Self-assessment is not listed in the Terms of Reference. I can't really answer this accurately as I joined the committee recently and only attended one meeting We spend a lot of time on housekeeping issues. I think we can get off topic slightly from the big picture and end up arguing/becoming a little bit pedantic (sometimes), but overall the meetings have good focus, and we touch on the relevant points. The Terms of Reference state that the Advisory Committee "includes advising the Environmental Services Committee regarding the following (a) providing input on major solid waste management matters, (b) serving as the advisory committee to the Steering Committee (Environmental Services Committee) on the development of Revision 3 of the SWMP, (c) acting as plan monitoring advisory committee for the new SWMP, once approved." As outlined below, the focus of the Advisory Committee has been mainly on (b), with relatively little work having been requested or initiated on (a). Activity (c) will only become relevant once the SWMP is approved. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>4</p>	<p>No</p> <p>2</p>

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

3.	Do you believe Advisory Committee meetings allow sufficient time to discuss the business at hand?	Yes	Somewhat	No
	6	4	1	
	<p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We appear to be suffering from mission drift at this point with repeated attempts to move the agenda back to items outside of scope. • yes if the agenda is specific and the group do not get off topic • It seemed at times that the presentations of the policy by the consultants lacked an implicit invitation to get involved in discussion. They were tedious and long and did not really invite comment in their content. I may have had this reaction as a person used to vigorous discussion about ideas with input in advance of policy. And I also have little experience with this sort of presentation. It seemed mind numbing though, I expect, it was well done. • Sometimes feel like it is a large committee and not enough time to discuss issues in an in-depth manner. It is such a large group and hard to keep the thread of the discussion going. • If the Advisory Committee would meet monthly, each time with a well-defined agenda, there would be enough time to do more comprehensive work. Unfortunately, monthly meetings were frequently not convened. Specifically, there were no meetings in late 2019 and early 2020, Sep 2020 and Dec 2020. In my view, there was inadequate discussion of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the draft SWMP achieving its main objectives, in particular, reaching the annual landfill target of 250 kg per capital. While the actions proposed in the draft SWMP will undoubtedly result in reductions in the waste destined for landfilling, the extent is largely unknown. The reductions expected from each action (a total of 69), strategy (a total of 15), and strategy area (a total of 3) should be quantified more thoroughly. ii. the solid wastes (in terms of composition and total quantity) that will have to be managed in future years, as the CRD population grows and its economic activities change. The projections should extend to the year 2100, even though the specific end date of the draft SWMP is the year 2030. The reason for having projections beyond 2030 is that the draft SWMP must align with the overarching strategy of balancing waste generation and waste management in the long term and within the capabilities of the Hartland Landfill and other CRD entities. iii. the future of the Hartland Landfill site. This is a key issue not only for residents and businesses in the area near the Landfill, but the entire CRD. The draft SWMP does not set out options, 			

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<p>recommendations, and implications pertaining to the Hartland Landfill. The SWMP should do so.</p> <p>iv. the fate of diverted wastes, notably plastics, metals, and construction wastes, most of which are expected to be ultimately processed outside the CRD. It is presently unclear what options the CRD has if some of the external entities are unwilling or unable to take CRD wastes, even if they have been properly preprocessed or separated in the CRD.</p> <p>v. the disposition of composted wastes. Specifically, does the CRD have the potential to use the composted wastes within the CRD or do they have to be exported on a major scale, thereby creating challenges like those stated in (iv) above?</p> <p>vi. innovative options, especially options of a technical nature, to address the solid waste challenges in the CRD so that the annual landfill target of 250 kg per capita can be reached with some certainty by the year 2030 and make further reductions possible beyond 2030.</p> <p>vii. the options regarding landfill gas utilization. As a result, the strategic implications of the options do not appear to be adequately understood from an overall environmental perspective. It is therefore unclear whether the correct decision is being made.</p> <p>Items (i) to (vi) pertain to the draft SWMP. I view the draft SWMP as a work in progress and open to significant enhancement.</p>			
4.	<p>Do you think Advisory Committee meetings allow for candid, constructive discussion and critical questioning?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be a division of opinion that has developed, again around specific items that are outside of scope but clearly of concern to parties with an interest in local issues around the Landfill. I understand both the frustration and the concern but it is currently blocking the process of developing a constructive plan for the wider CRD community to enable the region to move forward and start actioning items. Individual municipalities are now filling the gaps where a regional plan is not in place that is sufficiently up-to-date and relevant to recent changes. • But you have to be patient if you want to raise a topic for discussion, i.e. submit a Notice of Motion in meeting and obtain approval in the next. • only based on one meeting • As the group matured and there was more comfort in participating in the discussion I think candid, constructive discussion occurred. Initially the presentations were not provocative enough to 'incite' such discussion. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>7</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>4</p>	<p>No</p> <p>0</p>

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think CRD staff are amazing and listen and do not get defensive, even when actions are being critiqued. The chair does a good job and sets a respectful tone. • The Advisory Committee has a good, collaborative, and respectful working style. This is attributable to the leadership and fairness of its Chairs as well as the collaboration and shared common purpose of its members. There are no adversarial factions or strident members. <p>Advisory Committee deliberations are largely in the nature of information exchange; this is valuable. However, focused discussions aimed at bringing forward innovative solutions to waste management problems are largely missing. Standard solutions are presented (principally by consultants and staff), reflecting early workings of the Advisory Committee, but it is unclear that these solutions will achieve the desired level of success (see item 3 i above). The lack of discussion on future implications for the Hartland Landfill and its landfill gas (see items 3 iii to vii above) is noteworthy.</p> <p>Advisory Committee members regularly question and provide suggestions to staff and consultants but, in my view, with limited results. As an example, I point to the information material that was provided for the first set of public consultations in late 2019. Several important suggestions were made by members of the Advisory Committee, but not implemented. While the staff and consultants were under no obligation to act on the suggestions made, it appears from the public feedback received that adoption of the suggestions would have reduced, at a minimum, important uncertainties expressed by some respondents. No specific advice was sought from the Advisory Committee on consultation materials to be used for the second set of public consultations that are currently underway.</p> <p>The current draft of the SWMP was discussed by the Advisory Committee on several occasions, using a section-by-section approach. This was essential and important. However, no discussion has occurred on the overall feasibility and practicality of the draft SWMP, thereby gaining some certainty that the desired goals and targets can be achieved.</p> <p>In a memorandum (dated Nov 5, 2020) to the SWAC Chair and Senior Manager (Environmental Resource Management, Parks & Environmental Services Department), I raised several points regarding the draft SWMP and the second set of public consultations. No response has been received to date and the regular meeting of the Advisory</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	Committee scheduled for Dec 4, 2020, where these points could have been discussed, was cancelled.			
5.	<p>Do you find that pre-meeting materials clearly identify the significant issues, trends or developments for Advisory Committee discussion?</p> <p>If No or Somewhat, please comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes the pre-materials are sent without much notice, but for the most part I really appreciate these materials and think they aid discussion and developments for the committee. The materials provided to the Advisory Committee tend to be voluminous, often without identifying specific issues to be addressed. Where appropriate, alternatives to issues should be presented in advance of meetings so that they can be considered by Advisory Committee members and then discussed in meetings. Agendas would benefit from being more specific, posing issues and/or questions to be discussed. SWAC members should be encouraged to share, in particular, the perspectives of their stakeholders. For example, very little has been learnt thus far about the ability of recyclers in the CRD to increase their capacity and the conditions under which these increases can be achieved. Similarly, little has been learnt about what the regional universities, colleges, and other organizations with research, development, and innovation capabilities can contribute to addressing issues identified in the draft SWMP. The pre-meeting materials and meeting agendas should be created so that they challenge the Advisory Committee members to contribute to the solution of solid waste management problems, especially those problems for which good solutions presently do not exist. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>9</p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>2</p>	<p>No</p> <p>0</p>
6.	<p>Using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=poor, 5=excellent), how would you rate overall Advisory Committee performance to date? Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feel a bit new to the process to be able to rate performance. 4 – I think we push the Environmental Board and CRD Board to “do better” and challenge them/keep them on their toes, and also we learn things in the process of our discussions which is valuable. 4 – Initial stages progressed quickly with good understanding of the issues and sufficient momentum. Recent changes due to COVID delays and membership turnover has begun to erode that progress. 4 – The Committee successfully identified “what” needs to be done. More work is needed in establishing “how” it needs to be done, by “whom” and by “when”. 4 - I rate it as a 4 (couldn't figure out how to mark this otherwise). There are representatives present who have the expertise to comment so that they illuminate what is being asked of the committee, thus inviting others to join the discussion. 			

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 - Only based on one meeting • 2.5 - As stated already, the Advisory Committee works harmoniously and collaboratively. This is very positive. In collaboration with CRD staff and its consultants, the Advisory Committee can assist with the development of a SWMP that will lead to major reductions in wastes directed to the Hartland Landfill, while also reflecting the principles of sustainability and the circular economy more generally. However, these objectives cannot be achieved without major innovations. The application of current best practices, as used elsewhere in Canada and abroad, are likely insufficient. New approaches need to be developed. The CRD can do this and example possibilities should be identified in the SWMP. In my view, the Advisory Committee is working below its potential, but this can change. I give its performance to date a rating of 2.5. • 2 - The Advisory committee has performed well in my experience, however the meetings of the last several months have been mostly focussed on procedure. Perhaps there is misunderstanding by some committee members as to an “advisory” v a “decision” role.
7.	<p>Do you have suggestions for improving the way in which the Advisory Committee functions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members may need more background to bring them up to speed with the process and progress to date before coming in to the meetings. Some expectations need to be set in advance to avoid moving out of the terms of reference. • Let me attend a few more meetings and I will have something for you next time. • There needs to be a time limit for each person, and very specific discussion items directly related to the draft document so that the meeting does not get hijacked by discussion of other items. • Give some thought to gathering input around agenda and minutes in advance of the meeting and summarize at the meeting so that this review can go quicker • I think it is helpful if we have a team who sticks around, as a lot of the discussions are cumulative – it would be nice to get new people up to speed/have a way to have all the information in one place perhaps an understanding of where each member is coming from and how that informs our recommendations. • Less presentation and more discussion. Small group discussions are good but the opportunity to share the results is sometimes cut off. Good discussion sparks more discussion and the small group ideas might not get enough time for reaction and further digestion. Presentations such as those by the consultants tend to stifle my ability to make coherent comments. I am never quite sure what is being asked of us as reaction until others make their comments. I expect this is as a result of not being in such large, bureaucratic venues. • Not sure what changes are possible given the structures / parameters of CRD. • I think staff/chair are doing an excellent job. • The Advisory Committee would benefit, in my view, by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving its agendas, with issues and questions clearly identified in advance of meetings and supported by accompanying documentation with potential options stated. - consulting Advisory Committee members on agenda items in advance of future meetings. - requesting consultants and staff to provide their presentation materials in advance and in more concise forms, with key questions / issues highlighted. Important suggestions from Advisory Committee members should be minuted. It is understood that not all suggestions will be followed. However, when there are significant deviations, the rationale should be provided.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - holding regular meetings and dealing with issues more expeditiously. For example, it took well over half a year and several meetings to come to a decision on undertaking this self-evaluation. - ensuring coordination and cross-fertilization of ideas with the work of other entities in the CRD. For example, the City of Victoria has recently released an important document called 'Zero Waste Victoria'. This document contains valuable information and ideas, many of which parallel the work of CRD consultants and staff as well as of SWAC. The connections between the work of the City of Victoria and the CRD are unclear. 'Zero Waste Victoria' is a well-constructed document that will be of considerable value as the SWMP is finalized. <p>Another opportunity for collaboration with the City of Victoria is the development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).</p>
8.	<p>Since joining the Advisory Committee, please state the important advice that the Advisory Committee has provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe we have developed a reasonable plan with targets that have the option to be updated as things change in the region and the wider community. • I liked the recommendation to the Environmental Services Committee to set an aggressive target of cutting per capita waste production, despite it being rejected. • I think the Advisory Committee has worked well with CRD staff. I think a sound Solid Waste Plan has been created. I think the process was well thought out and informed me enough to make good decisions and recommendations • none so far but this is only based on one meeting • Recommendation to strengthen the landfill reduction target, which I think will encourage stronger waste reduction practices. • This question is somewhat ambiguous. Are you referring to information given by the CRD to the members or other information and reactions put forward by other members of the committee? And are you interested in the presentation materials from the consultants or the summation of the reactions of the committee? The policy presentations have been overwhelming, but, I suspect, when boiled down are really much more to the point. Other than those two reactions, I would say that we are to give our ideas of waste reduction but that many of these ideas are not able to be implemented because of policy or legislative restraints. That the goals that many of us would like to achieve are out of reach because of this and the conservative expectations of a government bureaucracy. But that our thoughts are welcome. • We challenge the Boards to be more ambitious with their targets and also to word things more clearly to encourage transparency with the document before it goes out to the public. I think a lot of us are still learning – so getting feedback/information from the CRD members that are on the Board is very helpful. • I have learned a great deal about the CRD solid waste planning and initiatives and have a better understanding of the role of the extended producer responsibility programs in the bigger picture. • To have CRD be a leader in waste reduction, and to be more ambitious with the plan. • Short list of potential strategy options for the SWMP update. • I have served on the Advisory Committee since April 2018. Since then, the following 'advice' has been provided to the Environmental Services Committee:

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the target for annual landfill waste to 125 kg per capita in the CRD by 2030. This advice was not accepted by the Environmental Services Committee and the CRD Board. However, the notion of exceeding the current annual target of 250 kg per capita is generally viewed favourably. - A draft SWMP has been created, with input from SWAC members, and commented on by SWAC. The draft SWMP describes a large number of strategies and associated actions (see 3 i). The draft plan was accepted for public consultations, the second round of which is currently occurring. The draft SWMP is subject to public input as well as further consideration by the Advisory Committee. <p>The Advisory Committee has discussed two options for landfill gas utilization, i.e., 'Green Electricity' and 'Green Gas – Renewable Natural Gas (RNG)'. However, to my knowledge, SWAC has not given explicit advice to the Environmental Services Committee, expressed in the form a motion or otherwise regarding the preferred option. It is unclear that the 'Green Gas' option, which is currently being pursued by the CRD, is the superior option since it rests heavily on certain assumptions.</p>
9.	<p>Do you think that the suggestions provided to CRD staff and consultants are being used effectively?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member's recommendations were appropriately considered when developing the draft report for consultation. Regarding the consultation process I do think there were some suggestions made that were not appropriately considered that could have made the process more inclusive and robust. Overall I believe the consultants have been valuable and have developed a reasonable plan to move the region forward. • Yes, even if they are not acted upon, the advice does provide influence. • I think that the broad base of representation provides alternative points of view to CRD staff and consultants, and that these points of view are given consideration. • That remains to be seen. The policy that has been proposed as a result of the committee input take the suggestions to a certain level but cannot take them as far as the aspirations of many of the public who actually consider these matters. There is a middle road which, I suspect, a governing body feels it has to take. However, there comes a time when there has to be a push to overcome the legislated barriers to achieving waste reduction (e.g. ensuring that ICI comes under the PPP legislation and that C and D be worked into building code bylaws so that materials can be reused.). There comes a time when actions need to be very bold. • I think this is complicated because a lot of the suggestions have financial and time frame changes associated – so I think while they consider our suggestions they aren't always able to make the changes right away. I hope as time goes on we see them being incorporated in a creative way that doesn't cause major delays on the actions/major financial setbacks. • Yes, staff and consultants have been both good presenters and "good listeners" • I question a bit about use of the consultants. I came to the process late, but I think it should be more iterative. It seems like there is little room to be engaged in a meaningful manner with consultants' reports, which I find stick within narrow and acceptable standards, and are not very inspired. Everything certainly seems efficient, the next step is underway before the first one has

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION FEEDBACK

	<p>had feedback but I don't think that is necessarily a good thing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It appears to me that the CRD staff and consultants are under significant time and resource constraints to follow-up suggestions by members of the Advisory Committee.• The encouragement of Advisory Committee members for staff and consultants to think more creatively about solving problems and public consultations has had limited success. I recognize that many solid waste management problems do not have standard solutions that require only adaptation to meet CRD conditions. Finding such solutions (or, at a minimum, potential pathways leading to solutions) would be a valuable undertaking for the Advisory Committee, CRD staff, and consultants. The opportunities to do so continue to exist since the SWMP is presently in draft form and remains to be finalized.• Yes• Yes
--	---