

Meeting Minutes



Meeting	Downtown Waste Working Group – Meeting 3
Date	21/06/2023
Location	Margaret MacKinnon Community Room, City Hall
Time	2:30 pm -4:30 pm
Present	<p>Project team: Robertson Reid (City of Guelph (CoG) – Solid Waste Resources), Kelly Guthrie (CoG – Strategic Communications and Community Engagement), Nicole Beuglet (Dillon Consulting)</p> <p>Working Group: Mark Filo, Maria Finoro, Lauryn Conlon, Jude Keefe, Dorothe Fair, Doug Minett, Harry Oussoren, Stacey Hare*, Abby Spielmacher (CoG - Transit), Rory Templeton (CoG – Development Planning), Heather Connell (CoG – Solid Waste Resources), Nicole Kupferschmidt (CoG – Tourism & Destination Development), Jamie Zettle (CoG – Parking), Andrew Miller (CoG - Engineering and Transportation), Stacey Laughlin (CoG – Downtown Revitalization), Karlyn Dion (CoG – Solid Waste Resources), Carter McCrae (CoG – Solid Waste Resources), Kyle Gagne (CoG – Public Works), Dustin Gronc (CoG – Community Safety)</p> <p>*not participating in CoG capacity</p>
Regrets	Kevin Polach, Betsy Varghese (Dillon Consulting), Dan Atkins (CoG – Library), Sean Fox (CoG – Public Works), Josh McDonnell (CoG – Solid Waste Resources), David Wooder (CoG – Solid Waste Resources), Christine Chapman (CoG – Economic Development), Chad Scott (CoG – Solid Waste Resources)

Discussion Items

1. Welcome, introduction to the project: 2:30 p.m.
City provided a survey for all participants to fill out regarding 5 solutions derived from information found in meeting #2.
2. Welcome, National Indigenous Peoples Day discussion and acknowledgement: 2:40 p.m.

City discussed thoughts about National Indigenous People's as well as historical events that have lead us to today.

3. Approval of meeting #2 minutes and results: 2:45 p.m.

When asked, all participants were satisfied with minutes. Participants were shown the results of meeting #2 and project timeline to inform work taking place during meeting #3. Results included:

- The most valued evaluation criteria for participants; that criterion being user-friendly, aesthetically pleasing, convenient, and unobtrusive.
- The evaluation of longlist options favoured and unfavoured by participants; most favoured were communal underground bins and above-ground bins, least favoured were individual enclosures and direct collection.

4. Review of survey results: 2:55 p.m.

Survey results would be presented and described to participants. Proposed options for waste collection methods were ranked for preferred and are noted:

- Exclusive underground bins
- Underground bins combined with current cart collection services
- Above-ground bins combined with current cart collection services
- Expanded use of carts
- Doorstep collection combined with above-ground bins

Observations noted from survey results are summarized below:

- Above-ground bins favourability and preference decreased from the second most preferred option to least favourable and preferred option.
- Doorstep collection favourability and preference increased from last option to the third most preferred and favourable option.
- Both options that included underground bins continued to be the two most preferred options.

The City emphasized that no decisions made today are permanent as more engagement from the public and City staff is required. Additionally, recommendations for options will be a process rather than a product and the solutions recommended will look different than what is being discussed during this meeting.

5. Discussion – shortlist selection and refinement: 3:10 p.m.

City showed three scenarios for potential waste collection points on a map; then asked participants how they could enhance performance of the key criteria and how concerns with leading ideas can be addressed. Participants noted:

- That prioritization of what's best for the downtown and the public is more important than anyone's individual business. Therefore, aesthetically pleasing, and unobtrusiveness are ranked high.
- Mixed opinions around the meaning of user-friendly and the idea of exclusive solutions or a combination of solutions. Exclusive solutions offer simplicity through standardization, resulting in increase in user-friendliness. While a combination of solutions offers flexibility for stakeholders and thus increases what others see as user-friendliness.
- Questions of growth and if increasing population will result in more frequent rates of collection or increased capacity in regard to options excluding underground.
- Displeasure showed by majority of participants regarding above-ground bins being out front of businesses and on streets. If above-ground bins are the only possible option then participants want them in alleyways, behind businesses or in public/private lots.
- Direct collection is more accepted if there are multiple collection times within a day and notifications of upcoming arrival. But there is still a concern around what to do with waste until then. One participant noted that this was a previous mode of waste collection and that it wasn't effective; although it was noted that it's feasible for most businesses to find temporary storage for waste if collection is frequent.
- Concerns of future tenants not being able to comply with particular waste collection solutions. For example: someone who struggles to walk must travel 50m carrying garbage to a communal bin. For this reason, another solution with minimal travelling may be a necessary combination.
- Concerns regarding public waste if the downtown were to follow through with an option like communal underground bins. City explained that small litter bins would be implemented throughout the downtown that would prevent commercial waste through small openings.
- Above-ground bins carry the same issues that public space containers have, which doesn't resolve very many problems in the downtown.

When participants were shown images of what communal underground bins could potentially look like. The common concern was how the pictures presented did not accurately reflect how the bins would look and impact the Guelph downtown. The pictures presented had much more space for public walking and did not include patios, benches, trees, etc. Participants recommended that The City creates simple renderings of how underground bins would look on downtown streets, have a physical example of the underground bins surface

level portion to place on the downtown streetscape or photoshop a bin onto a picture of the downtown streets.

Participants collectively agreed that options 1, 4, and 5 were the most ideal choices to be combined and or implemented together as they all make feasible combinations and have distinctive user experience. When The City asked participants to raise their hands in favour of prioritizing options 1, 4, and 5, a majority agreed (~12 votes) to focus attention on the three stated solutions.

The overall message The City received was that communal underground bins are most preferred, and that most participants want flexibility resulting in underground bins being paired with another option.

6. Public engagement summaries and techniques: 4:00 p.m.

Participants were asked to determine what questions The City should take to the public to help settle discussions, who should The City talk to, and what the best way to approach them. Participants noted:

Who to engage:

Residents and landlords should be approached as residents renting are often short-term and new residents may not understand or like the future waste landscape. Similarly, landlords who are not typically living in Guelph should be consulted as they may have similar concerns and are more likely to be responsible for waste management for the property. Business Associations should be contacted as well; this will take place soon.

How to engage:

Participants noted that when engaging the different groups, The City should frame solutions as distinct user experiences. As well, if the groups first option cannot be implemented, what is their second choice. Participants also noted that surveys would be a possible strategy for engagement.

Summarize next steps: 4:15 p.m.

Participants were informed of continuous preliminary design refinement, public engagement processes taking place between July and August, when meeting #4 will take place, and Committee of the Whole and City Council on November 6th and 28th respectively.

Closing remarks and thanks: 4:20 p.m.

The City instructed participants to keep a look out for an email for minutes as well as to email The City with any further questions or comments.