#### **REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO**

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TUESDAY, APRIL 08, 2014 7:00 PM

#### (RDN Board Chambers)

#### ADDENDUM

PAGE

#### LATE DELEGATIONS (Requires Motion)

- 2 **Dennis Dalla-Vicenza,** re Support of the Island Corridor Foundation railroad and Support for a non-confidence motion.
- 3 Jack Peake, re E&N Railway Corridor, and Island Corridor Foundation.
- 4 **Michael Addiscott and Megan Olsen,** re Support for the Island Corridor Foundation Creating a Trail Corridor on the Current Rail Link.

#### **COMMUNICATIONS / CORRESPONDENCE**

- 5 Graham Bruce, Island Corridor Foundation, re ICF-RDN Meeting.
- 6-7 **BC Chamber of Commerce,** re MMBC: Update to Chamber Members.
- 8-9 **Peter McCully**, The Parksville-Qualicum Beach News, re Support of MMBC.
- 10-11 **Christianne Wilhelmson, Georgia Strait Alliance,** re Opposition to Waste-to-Energy Incinerator in the Nanaimo region.
- 12-20 **Correspondence, March April 2014,** re Waste-to-Energy Incinerator in the Nanaimo region.

# Re: Support of the Island Corridor Foundation railroad and Support for a non-confidence motion

From: Dennis Dalla-Vicenza Sent: Monday, April 07, 2014 1:31 PM Subject: Delegation Request

I would like to be added as a representative of a small delegation who would like five minutes of RDN time to express our support of the railroad but also our support for the non-confidence motion.

kind regards Dennis Dalla-Vicenza Port Alberni or thereabouts

#### Re: E&N Railway Corridor, and Island Corridor Foundation

Sent: Monday, April 07, 2014 5:26 PM Subject: Re: delegation

The purpose of requesting delegation status is to share my concerns over the future of the E&N Railway corridor and the manner in which the Island Corridor is functioning. Jack

Sent: Monday, April 07, 2014 3:58 PM To: O'Halloran, Matt Subject: delegation

I would appreciate the opportunity to appear as a late delegation at your Board meeting tomorrow Tuesday April 8th. Please advise. Jack Peake

# Re: Support for the Island Corridor Foundation Creating a Trail Corridor on the Current Rail Link

From: Michael Addiscott Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2014 8:23 AM Subject: ICF proposal

Please accept this request from Megan Olsen and myself, Michael Addiscott, to speak on behalf of strong public opinion in favour of the ICF creating a trail corridor on the route of the current rail link from Victoria go Courtenay.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Addiscott

7 April 2014

Regional District of Nanaimo 830 West Island Highway Parksville, BC V9P 2X4 Attn: Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer

VIA Email

Dear Paul Thorkelsson,

Re: ICF - RDN Meeting

The Board of the Island Corridor Foundation has agreed to host a meeting with the Board of the Regional District of Nanaimo to discuss rail service.

In preparation for the meeting could you please submit issues that the RDN has specific interest in that we might ensure we have the necessary information available.

Due to the distances ICF Board members and the CEO of Southern Rail travel it would be best if possible to coordinate the meeting with the regular ICF monthly meeting.

Janice Roberts, the ICF Administrative Office Manager will be in touch with Linda Burgoyne to arrange the meeting.

Yours truly,

Salum Beeco

Graham Bruce Chief Executive Officer Island Corridor Foundation



On May 19, Multi Material BC (MMBC)'s stewardship program for packaging and printed paper (PPP) will go into effect.

The BC Chamber of Commerce does not endorse MMBC or this program and, since summer 2013, has actively worked to mitigate program impacts on B.C. businesses.

We're proud of what we've achieved so far. As a result of our network's hard work on this file, the B.C. government has exempted from this regulation any business that meets one or more of these criteria:

- Any business with less than \$1 million in gross annual sales;
- Any business that annually produces less than 1 tonne of packaging and printed paper; and
- Any business with a single point of sale, with the exception of franchises, chains and businesses operating under a banner.

This translates into approximately 27,000 producer businesses being excluded from the program. This means that, as a result of Chamber network advocacy, only 2,000 to 3,000 of B.C.'s nearly 400,000 businesses will be captured under the program – less than 1%.

But while those numbers are down significantly, we have identified further areas of concern with this program.

Firstly, we're concerned that local governments, who will save significant dollars under the MMBC program – and who played a significant role in bringing about this program, through policy passed at the Union of B.C. Municipalities convention – have not, by and large, committed to passing savings back to taxpayers.

Taxpayers need to start calling for this - and the Chamber network has an opportunity to lead this.

Secondly, we've become aware that MMBC may not be exempting small B.C. franchise locations under the first two exemptions, potentially creating hardship for this sector.

Thirdly, certain industry sectors, such as the newspaper and printing industries, are just now coming to our network for assistance in mitigating potential hardship under the current MMBC program.

So there is more work to be done.

What is not realistic is delaying or scrapping the MMBC program; that train has already left the station. MMBC has already signed significant numbers of contracts with local governments. Any disruption to the program would result in a hefty bill for B.C. taxpayers. Moreover, B.C., like its counterparts across the country, is firmly committed to extended producer responsibility (EPR) programs – so these programs are here to stay.

But here's what we think can be achieved:

- More local governments returning MMBC savings to their taxpayers or explaining why not;
- Ensuring that the spirit of the exemptions, with regards franchises, is carried out; and



• For business sectors still facing undue hardship under this program, there may be opportunities to achieve some mitigation.

#### So what are we doing?

We will work with our Chambers to push for local government accountability on what's happening with MMBC savings in communities throughout B.C.

We will work to ensure that the franchise sector is treated fairly under the program exemptions.

And we commit to work with any business sectors within our membership that face undue hardship under the MMBC program towards finding realistic solutions that we can assist in advocating to government. We have already entered into proactive dialogue with the newspaper industry and will report back to our membership on outcomes.



April, 2014

Attention: Chairman Joe Stanhope – Regional District of Nanaimo

RE: Support of MMBC

#### Hi Joe

*The Parksville Qualicum Beach News* is asking that the RDN write a letter to the Premier requesting MMBC honour their recently withdrawn agreement with the newspaper industry and ask for postponement of the implementation of the MMBC agreement until meaningful discussions between all levels of government and the business community can be held on this issue.

The estimated cost to BC newspapers under the MMBC plan is approximately \$10 million a year.

In early February we (The Newspaper Industry) wrote to Premier Clark requesting a meeting to discuss the challenges facing the industry and the negative impact that the plan would have on the newspaper industry in BC. To date, we have not been able to confirm a meeting.

The newspaper industry in BC is challenged. Even without the imposition of millions of dollars in recycling fees, we have had to close newspapers and reduce editorial staff. The most recent example is the closing of the Kamloops Daily News. If we are forced to pay millions in fees, every newspaper in the province would be impacted. Some would close, others would merge and all would have to reduce coverage. This is bad for the province and for local communities and businesses.

BC is the only jurisdiction in the world where newspapers are facing these onerous fees. All other jurisdictions have recognized the unique position of newspapers. There regulations are about packaging. We are not a package, but a product. In Europe and the US where such regimes have been put in place, they only apply to packaging. In Canada, where there are stewardship regulations, Ontario, and Nova Scotia allow newspapers to make their full contribution in advertising and in Manitoba the government pays newspapers' fees from sales tax revenue collected on sales of newspaper. (In Quebec, because of soaring costs, newspapers advertising contribution has been capped, but is still the largest component.)



The burden is even greater for newspapers because the fees will not apply to our competitors in the advertising market such as radio, TV or online. We therefore cannot pass on the costs to our readers or advertisers but will have to absorb them internally and unfortunately that can only come out of editorial budgets.

We want to be part of the solution and we want a "Made in BC" solution. We also need government leadership. Government showed some of that leadership when they announced minimum thresholds, which excluded 95% of BC businesses. We need the Premier to show the same leadership to protect the newspaper industry, BC communities and the environment.

The fundamental issue is that this is not good for BC residents.

The new system is going to be more expensive for consumers, who will have to absorb the \$110 million in extra fees and costs of products. There is not going to be a reduction in municipal taxes and the bureaucracy being created to manage the system is huge. The system that MMBC is developing is very costly and will impact jobs and growth in the province. <u>The</u> proposed MMBC fees are over four times higher than they are in Ontario for the same products.

The old system worked well, there was local control, it addressed local priorities and was fundamentally about environmental stewardship.

We need the government to show some leadership, at the very least requiring MMBC to live up to its commitment to the newspaper industry. If the Premier is not willing to scrap the plan, we would also ask the Premier to have her minister delay the implementation and bring together business, municipal and environmental leaders to develop a plan that works both economically and environmentally for BC.

Thanks.

Peter

Peter McCully Publisher | Parksville Qualicum Beach News One of BC's Best Newspapers – 2010, 2001 & 2012 Ph: 250.905.0018 http://www.pqbnews.com



Georgia Strait Alliance

#607-207 W. Hastings St, Vancouver, BC, V6B 1H7 Phone: 604 633 0530

April 3, 2014

#201-195 Commercial St, Nanaimo, BC, V9R 5G5

Phone: 250 753 3459 | Fax: 250 753 2567

Main Office:

Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) Board 6300 Hammond Bay Road Nanaimo, BC V9T 6N2

To Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) Board of Directors:

For 23 years, Georgia Strait Alliance has been a <u>powerful voice for citizens</u> who want to protect and restore the marine environment of Georgia Strait, our incredibly rich but vulnerable inland sea. Today, we are proud to represent over 1200 voting members working to find solutions to threats to the health of the Strait and to its communities, where 75% of British Columbians live, work and play.

We're writing to you today because we want to add our voice opposing any efforts to bring a waste-to-energy (WTE) incinerator to the Nanaimo region and ask you to stand firm on your July 23, 2013 decision against such an incinerator within the RDN.

The long-term goal of every community is to reduce, reuse and recycle and recover resource from the waste stream - and even better, not to create that waste in the first place. Choosing to incinerate waste rather than focusing further efforts to remove residuals from the waste stream and further invest in reuse and recycling efforts is a poor long-term choice.

What does this proposal mean? If built, this plant will mean transporting garbage between communities and will undermine the great strides made in many local communities over the past 20 years to create a zero waste stream through waste reduction, recycling and composting programs. Nanaimo is a community that is a prime example of this commitment - with municipal, non-profit and business investment.

Waste-to-energy facilities convert garbage from landfills to other forms of pollution including carbon dioxide emissions and carcinogenic fine particulates that will affect local air quality as well as the land, water and human health - as carcinogenic fine particulates enter the body through the lungs. Incinerators emit more carbon dioxide per unit of electricity generated than coal-fired power plants.

Once a waste to energy incinerator is built it needs to be fed - plastics being its best fuel to produce energy. Although Denmark originally needed incinerators for the energy produced from them, <u>after incinerating waste for years this country is now moving away from incineration</u> - they realized that they need to produce or import more garbage to keep the incinerators burning. Denmark is now looking to decrease their carbon emissions, save energy and go back to recycling.

We urge the Regional District of Nanaimo to send a message to Metro Vancouver by rejecting this proposal and asking them to commit to an aggressive waste reduction, waste diversion and recycling program instead of choosing waste-to-energy incineration anywhere in the Georgia Strait region.

Sincerely,

(. W.12

Christianne Wilhelmson Executive Director Georgia Strait Alliance

From:	Lynn Burrows <lynnburrows@shaw.ca></lynnburrows@shaw.ca>
Sent:	Tuesday, March 25, 2014 9:11 PM
То:	corpsrv
Subject:	potential Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point

**RDN** Directors,

I applaud your 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN. Even incinerating our own "waste" would likely not be in the best interests of local residents due to the toxins released in this process.

Thank you for your kind and thoughtful attention to this issue.

Yours truly,

Lynn Burrows (#15 – 9 Buttertubs Drive, Nanaimo, BC, V9R 3X8.)

From:	Janet Hicks King <dialogue@dialogue.ca></dialogue@dialogue.ca>
Sent:	Wednesday, March 26, 2014 9:12 AM
То:	Joe Stanhope; Diane Brennan; alecmcpherson2011@gmail.com; Maureen Young; George Holme; Julian Fell; Bill Veenhof; Marc Lefebvre; Dave Willie; Jack de Jong; John
	Ruttan; Bill Bestwick; Diana Johnstone; Jim Kipp; George Anderson; Ted Greves; Nanaimo Mayor & Council; corpsrv
Subject:	Further to my email of February 20, 2014, please grasp the long-term negative impacts of an incinerator at Duke Point - AND SAY NO THANK-YOU!

## To: Regional District of Nanaimo, Chair and Directors

6300 Hammond Bay Road, Nanaimo, BC V9T 6N2

## And Nanaimo Mayor and Council Members

455 Wallace St., Nanaimo, BC, V9R 5J6

## Dear RDN Chair, Mayor, Directors and Council Members,

Please do the right thing for the people, prosperity and health of our communities and environment.

Say NO to handling garbage from other municipalities: 370,000 tons of garbage per year!!!!! It doesn't just 'evaporate' in the incinerator!!

Please visit the website - <u>www.burningissuesnanaimo.ca</u> - where much reliable information is presented regarding the negative short- and long-term impacts from a mass-burn incinerator, as is being proposed for Duke Point.

Sincerely, Janet Hicks King 6227 Groveland Dr. Nanaimo, BC V9V 1B1

From:	Linda George <lgbiostem@gmail.com> on behalf of Linda George <lgeorge@biostem.ca></lgeorge@biostem.ca></lgbiostem@gmail.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, April 02, 2014 10:08 AM
То:	mail@michaelvann.com; John Ruttan; George Anderson; Diane Brennan; Bill Bestwick;
	Ted Greves; Diana Johnstone; Jim Kipp; Bill McKay; Fred Pattje; sustainability; Building,
	Email; Planning Email; ENV Services, Email; corpsrv
Subject:	Incinerator. List of 20 Articles published in Vancouver Newspapers

Dear Nanamio Mayor and Council,

Linked is a List of 20 articles published in Vancouver newspapers:

http://www.vancouverobserver.com/news/smoke-series-puts-spotlight-metro-vancouvers-480-million-incineration-plan

Note the issue, in the articles, of Incinerators struggling to be cost efficient.

As history indicates, to balance the books, an incinerator operator will need increasing amounts of waste to be floated into Nanamio Harbour.

Cities and towns near and far will be tempted to send their garbage our way.

Nanaimo's potential future holds - Flotillas of unsightly stinky garbage barges, awaiting processing.

Please, let Vancouver deal with their own garbage issues in their own backyard!

...it is unfair that RDN citizens risk inheriting Vancouver's unhealthy uneconomical burden – we are not secondary citizens.

Please, say "no" to the persistent incinerator proponents on April 14<sup>th</sup>.

Regards,

Linda George

From:	Rachel Dubois <rl_dubois@hotmail.com></rl_dubois@hotmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, April 03, 2014 8:35 PM
To:	corpsrv
Subject:	Incinerator at Duke Point
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Completed

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN.

I also encourage you to decline any requests for in-camera meetings about this important issue and ensure that any discussions on the part of the RDN regarding incineration remain public and transparent.

Looking forward to your reply,

Rachel Dubois, rl\_dubois@hotmail.com

April 3, 2014

From:	Jeff Woodruff <marinind@shaw.ca></marinind@shaw.ca>
Sent:	Thursday, April 03, 2014 8:55 PM
To:	corpsrv
Subject:	Fw: Incinerator at Duke Point
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Completed

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN.

I also encourage you to decline any requests for in-camera meetings about this important issue and ensure that any discussions on the part of the RDN regarding incineration remain public and transparent.

Looking forward to your reply,

Jeff Woodruff, marinind@shaw.ca

April 3, 2014

From:	Lisa Butler <butler.lisa.miss@gmail.com></butler.lisa.miss@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, April 03, 2014 10:39 PM
To:	corpsrv
Subject:	Duke Point Incenerator
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Completed

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN.

*I also encourage you to decline any requests for in-camera meetings about this important issue and ensure that any discussions on the part of the RDN regarding incineration remain public and transparent.* 

Looking forward to your reply,

Lisa Butler Gabriola Resident

--

Lisa

From:	Renate <islandhome8@yahoo.com></islandhome8@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Friday, April 04, 2014 5:38 PM
To:	corpsrv
Subject:	Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo

April 4, 2014

Hello,

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN.

*I also encourage you to decline any requests for in-camera meetings about this important issue and ensure that any discussions on the part of the RDN regarding incineration remain public and transparent.* 

I love living here with the beautiful scenery and clean air. Please don't allow this issue to spoil the paradise that we live in.

Looking forward to your reply,

Renate Wilson

islandhome8@yahoo.com

From:	Sarah Davies <sarahcdavies@hotmail.com></sarahcdavies@hotmail.com>
Sent:	Saturday, April 05, 2014 7:35 AM
То:	corpsrv
Subject:	Duke Pt. Incinerator

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN, and that you continue to stand firmly in refusing to entertain importing garbage from another regional district (Metro Vancouver) which has a 20% lower diversion rate for municipal waste than the RDN.

*I also encourage you to decline any requests for in-camera meetings about this important issue and ensure that any discussions on the part of the RDN regarding incineration remain public and transparent.* 

Sarah Davies

From:	Ilze Raudzins <ilzer@telus.net></ilzer@telus.net>
Sent:	Monday, April 07, 2014 12:10 PM
То:	corpsrv
Subject:	incinerator

#### **Regional District of Nanaimo directors**:

Although I do not live in the Nanaimo area, but on one of the northern Gulf Islands, I feel strongly that an incinerator anywhere on Vancouver Island is harmful to the environment and all Islanders. Burning garbage discourages recycling and the move to Zero Waste, and increases air pollution and CO2 emissions.

I applaud the 2013 decision to oppose the potential location of Metro Vancouver's Waste-to-Energy incinerator at Duke Point in Nanaimo. I am pleased that the directors of the Regional District of Nanaimo have considered the negative impact the annual burning of 370,000 tonnes of lower mainland waste would have on the health and economic well-being of citizens in the RDN.

I encourage you to stand firm in refusing to have this potential health and economic disaster in your area.

Looking forward to your reply,

**Ilze Raudzins**