



# ADOPTED

## North Pender Island Local Trust Committee Minutes of a Special Meeting

- Date:** August 10, 2016  
**Location:** Pender Island Royal Canadian Legion  
1344 MacKinnon Road, North Pender Island, BC
- Members Present:** George Grams, Chair  
Dianne Barber, Local Trustee  
Derek Masselink, Local Trustee
- Staff Present:** Dr. Shannon Cowan, Facilitator  
Justine Starke, Island Planner  
Shannon Brayford, Recorder
- Others Present:** Approximately twenty-four (24) members of the public.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grams called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and announced that the meeting was being recorded. He read a statement providing an overview of the rationale for recording the meeting, the uses of the recording, and the regulations regarding defamatory comments.

Chair Grams welcomed the public, made introductions, and acknowledged that the meeting was being held in traditional territory of the Coast Salish First Nations.

### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

By general consent, the agenda was approved as presented.

### 3. BUSINESS ITEMS

#### 3.1 Welcome and Introductions

##### 3.1.1 Background to the Problem

Planner Starke provided an overview of the project and the goals of the Waste Management Workshops. She introduced Dr. Shannon Cowan and invited her to facilitate the workshop.

### 3.1.2 Waste Management Integrated Decision-Making Process Overview

Dr. Cowan offered an introduction, including the following points:

- Her experience and expertise.
- The workshop's agenda.
- Guidelines for participation.
- Overview of the process.

A discussion was held regarding whether a waste transfer facility is needed at all.

### 3.2 **Step 1: Defining Decision Criteria**

Dr. Cowan invited attendees to participate in a Values Brainstorm session. She introduced the list of values created by the former Waste and Resource Management Commission (North Pender Island Special Advisory Planning Commission) and asked that participants add additional values, explaining that any and all values should be added at this stage, and the values may be refined or traded off in later stages of the process.

In addition to the facility-related values already on the list, the following values were added:

- That one single site houses all of North and South Pender Islands' waste and resource management needs.
- "Crushing" processes should not include bulky items as those processes are not economically or environmentally beneficial for the Penders.
- A facility that maximizes the reuse and recycling of materials, and minimizes waste.
- On-site sale of items that can be reused.
- Educational component.
- Operated at the highest environmental standard.

In addition to the location-related values already on the list, the following values were added:

- The facility be accessible to all operators.
- The facility be large enough to accommodate all eight best management practices and also provide for future expandability.
- That this use is the highest and best use of the land that is selected.
- Minimize distance to ferry.
- Minimize light pollution.
- Fire protection with access to water on-site and a fire break.

A discussion was held regarding excess noise. It was noted that sound is regulated through the Capital Regional District noise bylaw and is captured under the best management process.

A break was held from 11:05 am – 11:18 am.

Dr. Cowan explained the next phase in the process. She proceeded through the list of criteria regarding the location selection and invited attendees to participate in defining those items that had not yet been defined.

In addition to a review of each criteria item, the following items were discussed and refined.

#### Distance

A discussion was held regarding desirable distances and how to best define those distances. The following remarks were made:

- “Close” is 5-8 km.
- “Close” is up to 10 km.
- For a drop-off site, “close” should be less than 3 km.
- If “close” relates to reduction of excess consumption of fossil fuels, then it should be proximity to sites that residents visit in their regular course of business.

#### Proximity to Adjacent Sites

A discussion was held regarding how to amend the criteria and there was general consensus that this criterion should remain without a distance value as it is site- and facility-specific.

#### Remoteness

A discussion was held regarding how to define “remoteness” and “density”. There was general consensus that this criterion should read, “not adjacent to dense development”, thus allowing it to be site- and facility-specific.

#### Proximity to the Ferry

A discussion was held regarding whether this item should be included as its own criterion. There was general consensus that this item should remain in the matrix, noting that its importance will vary depending on the facility being considered.

#### Avoid Sites with Agricultural Potential

A discussion was held regarding whether to include this criterion and how to measure it. There was general consensus that the criterion should remain and recommended measurement strategies included “Cleared Arable Land Area”, “Inclusion in the Agricultural Land Review”, and the “Agricultural capability of the soil index.”

Dr. Cowan proceeded through the list of criteria regarding the site selection and invited attendees to participate in defining those items that had not yet been defined.

In addition to a review of each criterion, the following items were discussed and refined.

A discussion was held regarding whether criteria items should be removed when they are also included in the Best Management Practices or whether they should be included under both lists.

Vegetative Buffer

There was general consensus to replace this criterion with “Space for size requirements needed for Best Management Practices”.

Establish Minimum Size

A discussion was held and there was general consensus that this will be facility-specific and will be determined for each facility type.

### 3.3 Step 2: Facility Characteristics Preference Poll

Electronic voting devices were distributed and Dr. Cowan provided an overview of the process. The following questions were asked and the answers were recorded as follows:

- Is public drop-off important to you? Yes 67%, No 13%, Indifferent 21%.
- Is operator residential pick-up service important to you? Yes 58%, No 33%, Indifferent 8%.
- Is acceptance of bulky solid waste important to you? Yes 79%, No 4%, 17%.
- Should residential recycling be combined at a solid waste facility? Yes 58%, No 13%, Indifferent 29%.
- Is drop-off of organics important to you? Yes 38%, No 50%, Indifferent 13%.
- For Facility “A”, “close to” should be: 5 km (17%), 10 km (39%), 15 km (43%).
- For Facility “B”, “close to” should be: 5 km (13%), 10 km (33%), 15 km (54%).
- For Facility “C”, “close to” should be: 5 km (18%), 10 km (27%), 15 km (55%).
- For Facility “D”, “close to” should be: 5 km (13%), 10 km (25%), 15 km (63%).
- For Facility “E”, “close to” should be: 5 km (54%), 10 km (25%), 15 km (21%).
- For Criterion #3 remoteness “density” is best defined for Facility “A” to be: Average lot size <5 acres (46%), Average lot size <2 acres (25%), Average lot size <1 acre (29%).
- For Criterion #3 remoteness “density” is best defined for Facility “B” to be: Average lot size <5 acres (35%), Average lot size <2 acres (30%), Average lot size <1 acre (35%).
- For Criterion #3 remoteness “density” is best defined for Facility “C” to be: Average lot size <5 acres (33%), Average lot size <2 acres (25%), Average lot size <1 acre (42%).

- For Criterion #3 remoteness “density” is best defined for Facility “D” to be: Average lot size <5 acres (50%), Average lot size <2 acres (8%), Average lot size <1 acre (42%).
- For Criterion #3 remoteness “density” is best defined for Facility “E” to be: Average lot size <5 acres 17%), Average lot size <2 acres (17%), Average lot size <1 acre (65%).
- Should the facility offer the capacity for sale of reusables? Yes 54%, No 13%, Indifferent 33%.
- Should the facility offer educational capacity built-in? Yes 54%, No 13%, Indifferent 33%.
- My first or preferred facility model is, Facility “A” (42%), Facility “B” (38%), Facility “C” (13%), Facility “D” (4%), Facility “E” (4%).
- My second choice for a facility model is, Facility “A” (38%), Facility “B” (38%), Facility “C” (8%), Facility “D” (8%), Facility “E” (8%).
- My third choice for a facility model is, Facility “A” (13%), Facility “B” (13%), Facility “C” (50%), Facility “D” (8%), Facility “E” (17%).
- My fourth choice for a facility model is, Facility “A” (13%), Facility “B” (4%), Facility “C” (13%), Facility “D” (54%), Facility “E” (17%).
- My last choice for a facility model is, Facility “A” (13%), Facility “B” (4%), Facility “C” (4%), Facility “D” (17%), Facility “E” (63%).
- Facility “A” should be: Close to Magic Lake (4%), Close to the Driftwood Centre (35%), Remote from neighbourhoods (13%), Close to Recycling Centre (48%)
- Facility “B” should be: Close to Magic Lake (0%), Close to the Driftwood Centre (38%), Remote from neighbourhoods (13%), Close to Recycling Centre (50%)
- Facility “C” should be: Close to Magic Lake (4%), Close to the Driftwood Centre (29%), Remote from neighbourhoods (17%), Close to Recycling Centre (50%)
- Facility “D” should be: Close to Magic Lake (0%), Close to the Driftwood Centre (25%), Remote from neighbourhoods (33%), Close to Recycling Centre (42%)
- Facility “E” should be: Close to Magic Lake (48%), Close to the Driftwood Centre (26%), Remote from neighbourhoods (4%), Close to Recycling Centre (22%)
- It is important to me that Facility “A” is >100m from neighbours. No (13%), Somewhat (33%), Yes (54%).
- It is important to me that Facility “B” is >100m from neighbours. No (14%), Somewhat (27%), Yes (59%).
- It is important to me that Facility “C” is >100m from neighbours. No (13%), Somewhat (30%), Yes (57%).
- It is important to me that Facility “D” is >100m from neighbours. No (17%), Somewhat (30%), Yes (52%).
- It is important to me that Facility “E” is >100m from neighbours. No (39%), Somewhat (38%), Yes (33%).
- It is important to me that Facility “A” is adjacent to industrial zones. No (38%), Somewhat (13%), Yes (50%).

- It is important to me that Facility “B” is adjacent to industrial zones. No (26%), Somewhat (9%), Yes (65%).
- It is important to me that Facility “C” is adjacent to industrial zones. No (29%), Somewhat (8%), Yes (63%).
- It is important to me that Facility “D” is adjacent to industrial zones. No (36%), Somewhat (5%), Yes (59%).
- It is important to me that Facility “E” is adjacent to industrial zones. No (54%), Somewhat (33%), Yes (13%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “A”, there is a cleared surface footprint on the site. No (25%), Somewhat (33%), Yes (42%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “B”, there is a cleared surface footprint on the site. No (21%), Somewhat (29%), Yes (50%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “C”, there is a cleared surface footprint on the site. No (25%), Somewhat (33%), Yes (42%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “D”, there is a cleared surface footprint on the site. No (38%), Somewhat (29%), Yes (33%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “E”, there is a cleared surface footprint on the site. No (38%), Somewhat (33%), Yes (28%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “A”, there is the space for expansion. No (4%), Somewhat (35%), Yes (61%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “B”, there is the space for expansion. No (4%), Somewhat (30%), Yes (65%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “C”, there is the space for expansion. No (4%), Somewhat (50%), Yes (46%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “D”, there is the space for expansion. No (22%), Somewhat (43%), Yes (35%).
- It is important to me that, for Facility “E”, there is the space for expansion. No (39%), Somewhat (43%), Yes (17%).

### **3.4 Step 3: Ranking Decision Criteria & Discussion of Ranking Results**

A discussion was held regarding how to rank criteria against other criteria, and how to compare those rankings using a decision matrix. There was general consensus that the majority ranking for each criterion that was not ranked in Step 2 (above) would be achieved through a Survey Monkey survey that would be sent, by email, with the workshop report. Dr. Cowan also noted that this same survey would include a ranking question regarding the importance of assessing a site’s agricultural potential.

It was noted that “Proximity to ferry”, “Sufficient size for required use”, and “Proximity to culturally relevant sites” need to be added to both the criteria matrix and the distributed survey.

Dr. Cowan presented an option for assigning values to each criterion within a matrix.

### **3.5 Step 4: Brainstorming New Site Options**

Dr. Cowan asked participants to review the current inventory of site options and it was noted that these sites are a reflection of properties that are appropriately zoned or have applied for appropriate zoning, and that the list does not reflect actual owner interest.

Dr. Cowan invited participants to present additional options and several were provided and recorded. It was noted that Planner Starke would be contacting potential site property owners prior to the next workshop.

### **3.6 Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on October 6, 2016.

## **4. ADJOURNMENT**

**By general consent** the meeting was adjourned at 3:21 pm.

---

George Grams, Chair

Certified Correct:

---

Shannon Brayford, Recorder