

# CEAT Transition Report

## Citizens and Solid Waste -- One Toronto Experiment: (March 2, 2006 – December 31, 2007)



A Report by the Community Environmental Assessment Team (CEAT) as the group divides into two streams to work on the City's "reduction and diversion goals" and "long term residual waste" challenges.

### Table of Contents

Overview and Summary .....	3
What was CEAT? .....	4
How were CEAT members chosen? .....	5
How did CEAT come to exist? .....	6
What did CEAT do?.....	9
How did CEAT do it? .....	13
What did CEAT accomplish? .....	16
What's next? .....	19
CEAT Members' reflections.....	21

### Overview and Summary

Toronto City Council appointed a Community Environmental Assessment Team (CEAT -- pronounced "SEE-at") of 22 members to assist the City in managing its residual solid waste (garbage) requirements in February, 2006. (Residual solid waste is defined as the solid waste that the City of Toronto is responsible for collecting and disposing of after all reduction, reuse and recycling has been completed) At the time, the City was beginning an Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Province of Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act to find a long-term solution to its residual solid waste management needs.

CEAT was made up entirely of citizens of the City of Toronto. Its role was to advise and assist with the substance and process needed to complete the provincial EA requirements. CEAT's mandate included working with staff and consultants on the EA requirements, including public consultation, as well as participating in procurement processes for project consultants. CEAT had a direct report to City Council via a standing presentation to Council's Works Committee.

CEAT members were chosen through a public process administered by the City Clerk's office. In summary, a Nominating Panel of four City Councillors with experience as Chairs or Vice-Chairs of Works Committee selected nominees for ratification by City Council. Selection criteria included some history of involvement with

Ontario EA processes; analytical, time-management and interpersonal skills; commitment to public service and ethical standards; and flexibility and availability for the then-anticipated 5-year EA process to be completed.

Toronto had been struggling with its solid waste management options for years, often in a kind of crisis atmosphere resulting from a complex mix of political and technical issues. CEAT was the latest of a series of advisory groups established by the City of Toronto to assist. Each of these groups was building on the accomplishments of those who went before. CEAT's mandate was to assist with the siting of a new facility(ies) for the long-term management of Toronto's residual solid waste through an Environmental Assessment process compliant with provincial EA Act requirements. CEAT's role differed significantly from those of its predecessors because it reported independently and directly to the Works Committee of City Council, and it was made up entirely of citizens.

CEAT met regularly (about once every two weeks) during its first year. The group worked collaboratively with City staff and consultants to advance the Terms of Reference for the EA, with a particular focus on public consultation activities. Three rounds of public consultation were completed within the City of Toronto between October 2006 and April 2007. By their conclusion, a near-final draft of the Terms of Reference for the EA had been written.

Over this timeframe, however, two events changed the context for the EA significantly. One was the decision in principle by Toronto City Council in September of 2006 to purchase a sanitary landfill (Green Lane) in the vicinity of London, Ontario; that purchase was finalized in March of 2007. The other was a new regulation by the Province of Ontario (Ministry of Environment) with respect to the EA requirements for solid waste management facilities which came into effect in March 2007, as well. These two events resulted in the decision by the City (with which CEAT agreed) to suspend its EA activities under the Provincial process and proceed with its own EA-type process for the more limited and specific facility(ies) then anticipated for the processing of the City's residual mixed solid waste.

As a result, CEAT's activities were wrapped up at the end of 2007. Two successor Working Groups were formed to focus on the City's residual solid waste plan and 3R's (reduction and diversion), respectively. Both groups were designed on the CEAT model. Overall, CEAT can perhaps be best remembered as a concrete demonstration that multi-stakeholder collaborative decision making processes, while slower moving and often cumbersome, can produce good decisions and that citizens are integral partners in creating better solutions.

## **What was CEAT?**

In February 2006, Toronto City Council appointed a Community Environmental Assessment Team (or CEAT -- pronounced "SEE-at") to assist the City in managing its "residual solid waste". At the time, the City was beginning an Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Province of Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act to find a long-term solution to its residual solid waste management needs. CEAT's role was focused on the substance and process needed to complete those provincial EA requirements.

Specifically, CEAT's mandate was, under the strategic direction of City Council, to:

- (i) "Participate with staff and project consultants in the development of the Terms of Reference, the consultation plan, and the Environmental Assessment that will be prepared on behalf of the City;
- (ii) "have a standing presentation to every regular meeting of Works Committee to provide for regular and direct communication with Works Committee; and
- (iii) "Participate, to the extent allowed by City policies, in procurement processes for project consultants."

Complete details of CEAT's mandate are available here:

[http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/pdf/schedule\\_1\\_mandate\\_for\\_agreement\\_2006-02-14.pdf](http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/pdf/schedule_1_mandate_for_agreement_2006-02-14.pdf)

### How were CEAT members chosen?

A Nominating Panel of four City Councillors with experience as Chairs or Vice-Chairs of Works Committee selected nominees for ratification by City Council.

Membership was limited to residents of the City of Toronto. The Chair and Vice-Chair of CEAT were also nominated by the Nominating Panel.

***“... working in a group and trying to accomplish something by working in a team is important.” Hanna Ziada***

The appointment of CEAT members was carried out under a process administered by the City Clerk's office. In summary, prospective members were required to:

- Attend an information meeting explaining the process
- Complete an application form that included agreeing to specific conditions, and
- Attend an interview (short-listed candidates)

The specific conditions of CEAT membership included maintaining an attendance record in good standing; entering into an agreement with the City covering confidentiality, honoraria, conflict of interest and similar issues; and provisions for replacement or removal of members subject to City Council approval.

***“...interest in the public brought me to Solid Waste because I believe that is what is going to decide how society will handle issues (waste) in the future. I feel that it is important to look long term because it is an unending, ongoing issue.” Nesamoni Lysander's***

A template of the Agreement between the City and individual CEAT members is available here: [http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/pdf/member\\_agreement1\\_2006-04-27.pdf](http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/pdf/member_agreement1_2006-04-27.pdf)

Most significantly, perhaps, CEAT membership was then envisioned to include a commitment to the entire duration of the EA project. The whole EA process comprised the Terms of Reference for the document, associated public consultation, and completion of the EA itself, including the regulatory review and approvals process. That was important because, at that time, the whole EA process was expected to take on the order of five years to complete.

***“I had never been involved in an EA, and felt privileged to learn about the process and work with everyone. It was a wonderful learning experience. I have a degree in chemistry so it helped me to understand the technical terms being used. Also as a teacher, we teach children about recycling so I was familiar with those issues. I also felt that it helped knowing about the different communities in Toronto and their needs. It is important to know how families are living and that their situation affects their attitude toward solid waste.” Mohammed Jeewa***

The criteria for selecting CEAT members were:

- (i) expertise or past involvement in environmental/scientific/technology issues, Ontario's environmental assessment process, community engagement, public consultation, consensus building, land development, health or education;
- (ii) ability to organize and analyze information, including technical information;

- (iii) commitment to public service and to a high standard of ethics;
- (iv) good interpersonal skills, including the ability to work in a team;
- (v) excellent listening skills, open-mindedness (no biases with respect to the outcome of the EA process), sound judgement and tact;
- (vi) the ability to work under time pressures; and
- (vii) Flexible work schedule.

CEAT selection criteria did not include explicit diversity criteria, nor as a special purpose body, was CEAT explicitly intended to be representative of all citizens.

At its meeting of January 31-February 2, 2006, Toronto City Council appointed twenty-two Toronto citizens, including the Chair and Vice-Chair, to form CEAT. Its first meeting was held on March 2, 2006. Notable characteristics of the group of people selected for CEAT included:

- its direct reflection of the selection criteria (see above),
- its diversity of experience, and
- its age and gender balance.

A list of some of the CEAT members, including brief biographies of each is here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/members.htm>

***“...membership should be on the basis of willingness to work and learn and in the public interest and that attendance and commitment needs to be strong.”***  
***Karen Buck***

## How did CEAT come to exist?

Toronto and solid waste have had a long learning history with each other. Like many cities that have grown up in the consumer based society we continually have been playing “catch-up” in finding and implementing sustainable and environmentally sound ways of dealing with the growing amount of solid waste that we generate.

Our situation is further compounded by the fact that unlike some other countries we have three levels of government that all have a part to play in legislating everything from product packaging, environmental challenges and financially sustainable solutions to dealing with all of the issues surrounding the generation, reduction, reuse, recycling and disposal of solid waste.

Solid waste management facilities and their Environmental Assessment requirements have been high profile and challenging issues in Ontario for decades.

Before 1983 all of Toronto's solid waste was either dumped in one of many Toronto based landfills or incinerated without energy recovery. During 1965, incineration peaked with 85% of Toronto's solid waste being incinerated. All of the old Toronto based landfills (more than 130 in number) are now closed.

In 1983, Toronto's last incinerator was closed and the Keele Valley landfill in Vaughan was opened (without an environmental assessment – provincially exempted) to take Toronto and

York's solid waste. This was subsequently closed in December 2001.

During that time, a flurry of activities was initiated and the "political hot garbage" bounced back and forth.

In Toronto we had the "Solid Waste Environmental Assessment Plan" (SWEAP - 1986) - identifying long-term landfill sites in York Region and the "Solid Waste Interim Steering Committee" (SWISC - 1988) looking for temporary sites outside Greater Toronto Area.

In 1990 the newly elected provincial NDP (Bob Rae) party stopped both SWEAP and SWISC activities and formed the Interim Waste Authority (IWA). The IWA made recommendations for siting of fifty seven landfills in Ontario, and by 1994 there were environment assessments started on sites to service the greater Toronto area.

In 1995 the newly elected provincial Conservative (Mike Harris) party dismantled the IWA and put the responsibility of solid waste management planning and execution back onto the municipalities' hands.

In 1996 Toronto put together the Solid Waste Environmental Assessment for Long-term Disposal (SWEAD). SWEAD was to look at the options available from private industry, including partnerships, landfills and energy from waste facilities. This was to be conducted under the Environment Assessment and Consultation Improvement Act.

In 1998 Toronto initiated the Solid Waste Management - Marketplace Engagement Program (SWM-MEP) to replace and build on the work of SWEAD. The main difference between the two programmes is that SWM-MEP was not to be carried out within the formal Environmental Assessment planning process, due to time constraints and the urgent need to find a place to dispose of Toronto's garbage. (Keele Valley landfill was to close in 2001.)

In 1999, Toronto changed (SWM-MEP) to Toronto's Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management (TIRM) Process and changed the mission to the following:

- *"The City of Toronto's Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process will be designed to be flexible enough to incorporate new, environmentally sustainable technologies that will move the city towards the ultimate goal of "zero waste." That is, a strategy based on maximizing diversion." (Reference: Toronto City Council Meeting; April 13-15, 1999)*

This resulted in the Adam's Mine experience in Kirkland Lake and the eventual decision to separate City of Toronto waste into two streams. They were residential solid waste and industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) solid waste with Toronto choosing to be responsible for residential solid waste and ICI being handled by the private sector.

In 1998, Toronto initiated exports of some solid waste to the Arbor Hills Landfill in Michigan (1998-2002).

For the City of Toronto, the planned closure of its Keele Valley sanitary landfill site, located in

the City of Vaughan, in 2001 focused attention on what came to be considered a garbage 'crisis.' Keele Valley was the City's sole remaining active landfill site for the disposal of its residual solid waste.

In January of 2001, the City established a Waste Diversion Task Force 2010 and charged it with reducing Toronto household garbage going to landfill to zero (100% diversion) by the year 2010. The Task Force, comprised entirely of all Toronto City Councillors, consulted widely and reported to Toronto City Council in June 2001. It recommended a comprehensive solid waste diversion plan for achieving a 'made in Toronto' solution to Toronto's solid waste management challenges.

Complete details on the Task Force are available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/taskforce2010/index.htm>

Export to Republic's Carleton Farms Landfill began in 2001, and all of Toronto's residual solid waste was exported to Michigan as of Jan. 1, 2003, a practice that raised the political profile of Toronto's solid waste management challenges. The increasingly determined international opposition to Toronto's and four other Ontario cities' waste management activities and the spectre of the potential closure of the border to such shipments increased the 'crisis' atmosphere.

This issue was finally challenged by the Michigan state government, and in a deal with Ontario's current provincial Liberal (Dalton

McGuinty) government and the four other Ontario cities shipping to Carleton Farms, Toronto will stop its shipments to Michigan by the end of 2010.

In February 2003, the City of Toronto Works Committee approved the membership of the New and Emerging Technologies, Policies and Practices Advisory Group (NETP&P). The group was made up of four experts (1 chair), seven volunteer citizens (1 chair), and five official observers from GTA boards and stakeholders; its role was strictly advisory to City staff (Solid Waste Management Services).

NETP&P's mandate was to review and provide advice on the adoption of new and emerging technologies policies and practices needed to help manage the city's residual solid waste remaining after the implementation of the diversion options outlined in the Task Force 2010 (TF2010) report, some of which were then being implemented.

Three strategic issues arising from TF2010 report were:

- Is 100% diversion from landfill achievable?
- is the 60/40 split reasonable by 2010, and
- Next steps.

NETP&P held 57 meetings over 22 months and passed more than 30 recommendations and resolutions.

# Toronto CEAT

Community Environmental Assessment Team

## CEAT Transition Report

Complete details of NETP&P's activities and outcomes are archived here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/wes/techservices/involved/swm/net/index.htm>

This Advisory group helped open the way for citizen participation; however, it did have to separate itself from some political issues that would have disrupted the outcome of the final report. In December 2004, NETP&P's final report made three overall recommendations on 'next steps.' One was to implement its recommendations and those of City staff with particular emphasis on aggressively implementing new diversion programs. Another was to establish immediately a Waste Diversion Working Group, reporting directly to the Works Committee "to oversee the planning, design, implementation, promotion and monitoring of source-based diversion programs." This recommendation was adopted Nov 20, 2008 as the 3RWG. The third was for the City "to move ahead expeditiously with a full environmental assessment including the formation of a public advisory committee to direct the EA process with transparency. This committee should report directly to Works Committee." It was this third recommendation by NETP&P that was ultimately adopted by City Council and provided the basis for CEAT's activities and roles, as outlined above.

City Council agreed in June 2005 to adopt a "citizen participation model" for this EA work, based on the NET recommendation, a review of a similar approach adopted in Halifax, NS, and a review and recommendation by the City's

Roundtable on the Environment. The June 2005 report is available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2005/agendas/council/cc050614/wks6rpt/cl001.pdf>

In September of 2005, the public information meetings for potential CEAT members were held, leading up to the first meeting of CEAT itself in early March of 2006.

Overall, then, CEAT was the latest of a series of advisory groups established by the City of Toronto to assist with its waste management challenges. Each of these groups was building on the accomplishments of those who went before. CEAT's mandate was to carry forward one aspect of the City's residual waste challenge, i.e., the siting of a new facility(ies) for the long-term management of Toronto's residual waste through an Environmental Assessment process compliant with provincial EA Act requirements. CEAT's role also differed significantly from those of its predecessors because:

- it reported independently and directly to the Works Committee of City Council, and
- it was made up entirely of citizens.

### **What did CEAT do?**

From its first meeting in March 2006, CEAT members felt the time pressures of trying to complete a full Environmental Assessment as practiced in Ontario on such a complex

# Toronto CEAT

Community Environmental Assessment Team

## CEAT Transition Report

undertaking within a reasonable timeframe. Public pressures to close the Michigan border to Toronto's residual solid waste were continuing. The possibility that Toronto's contracts with its landfill supplier in Michigan, scheduled to expire at the end of 2010, might not be renewed, was much discussed.

One response to these pressures was an aggressive and challenging series of CEAT-related meetings. Full meetings of CEAT (held in public and minuted) settled into an every-other-week routine. Once sub-committees were established and operating (more details in the next section of this report), they met in the alternative weeks between full CEAT meetings.

In the first few months, CEAT meetings featured presentations and discussions around two general themes. One focus was to understand the overall objectives, nature, implementation and details of EA practice in Ontario. By the time CEAT was formed, the City had already contracted a consortium of specialist consultants to advise City staff on EA requirements, practice and procedure. CEAT worked closely with these consultants throughout its term.

In addition, however, CEAT decided early in its mandate to invite other experts, including academics, practitioners and Ontario Ministry of Environment representatives, to provide the Committee with independent advice on EA matters. CEAT was privileged to hear from a distinguished list of experienced people in those early days. Their advice was greatly

appreciated and very useful in helping to guide CEAT's work.

The other theme of the early CEAT meetings was working to understand the institutional setting and context within which we were operating. A committee comprised solely of citizens, with independent reporting status to City Council through the Works Committee, was a new venture for the City. Its creation was not without some anxiety, if not controversy, amongst City politicians and staff, especially given the sensitive and controversial nature of the solid waste management topic.

CEAT members felt the need to understand this setting in detail. The process of finalizing members' individual contractual agreements with the City provided some insight into the workings of City processes. In addition, however, invited speakers included people from the City Clerk's Office, the City's Integrity Commissioner, and the City's Corporate Access and Privacy office to advise on procedures, conduct and ethical issues that might impinge on CEAT's work. Once again, the assistance and advice of these people was most useful and greatly appreciated.

By the summer of 2006, CEAT began to focus almost exclusively on its role in assisting City staff with the public consultations on the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Environmental Assessment. At that time, the overall schedule for the Terms of Reference was expected to include three rounds of public consultation culminating in a draft ToR ready for presentation

# Toronto CEAT

Community Environmental Assessment Team

## CEAT Transition Report

to the Ontario Ministry of Environment in the summer of 2007.

On September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006, however, CEAT members were as surprised as many others attending to the vagaries of Toronto's solid waste management challenges to read in the press that the City was contemplating an agreement in principle to purchase a sanitary landfill site. City Council was to meet in the next few days to take its decision. The site was called Green Lane, located in the vicinity of London, Ontario, and was privately owned. Most significantly, during the summer of 2006, Green Lane had received approvals from the Ontario Ministry of Environment for a significant expansion of its capacity. The approved capacity, carefully managed, could accommodate Toronto's residual solid waste management needs for some years, if not decades, into the future. Clearly, the need for a full Environmental Assessment on companion or successor facilities for management of the City's residual solid waste would be questionable, at best, should the Green Lane purchase proceed.

As it happened, CEAT had a meeting scheduled for September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006. At that meeting, CEAT passed a motion to re-examine its own mandate (under authority ceded to it under its original mandate) in the light of the Green Lane news. An Ad Hoc sub-committee was struck to investigate, consider further and report back to the full CEAT on its conclusions. In the meantime, it was concluded that the first round of public consultations on the ToR, already in

the advanced stages of being implemented, should proceed as planned.

Thus, CEAT members participated actively in both the planning for and implementation of the first round of public consultations within the City of Toronto on the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Assessment. These meetings ran from September 2006 through January 2007 adding more demands to an already crowded agenda for volunteer citizens' time.

One outcome of the first round of public consultations was a CEAT initiative, in conjunction with City staff, to incorporate a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) and a framework for a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) into the Environmental Assessment process then being carried out. The Privacy Impact Assessment is a process used to measure compliance with applicable laws such as the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA); it was to be carried out by the City's Corporate Access and Privacy Office. The Health Impact Assessment framework arose out of a letter from Toronto's Medical Officer of Health in response to CEAT's first round of consultations; the framework was to be developed by Toronto Public Health staff with consulting support and oversight by a Public Advisory Committee which included members of CEAT.

The details of these two initiatives are provided in CEAT's January 3, 2007 submission to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee available here:

# Toronto CEAT

Community Environmental Assessment Team

## CEAT Transition Report

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-610.pdf>

The CEAT recommendations were approved by Public Works and Infrastructure and Toronto City Council for implementation.

The second round of consultations in late February and early March 2007, though more focused and abbreviated by comparison to the first round, still involved significant commitments of CEAT members' time. The third round, during the week of April 3, 2007, was more focused, still, based on a draft of the Terms of Reference for the EA that had been released on March 19<sup>th</sup>.

Another unexpected event occurred in October, 2006 when the Ontario Ministry of the Environment posted in draft form for public comment a new regulation for solid waste management in Ontario. In summary, the new regulation proposed with respect to the incineration of non-hazardous waste to require a full Environmental Assessment only for waste incineration facilities that did not include energy from waste component. Otherwise, the new regulation proposed a more limited screening procedure based broadly on a similar regulation put in place for the electricity sector in Ontario earlier in the decade. Thus, another option to have been examined in Toronto's search for a long-term waste management facility(ies) would likely no longer require a full Environmental Assessment process such as that for which CEAT was formed. Ontario's new regulation (O.Reg. 101/07) was finalized and went into effect on March 23, 2007.

By the spring of 2007, then, the 'landscape' for EA requirements associated with Toronto's need for future solid waste management facilities had changed dramatically from the one that prevailed when CEAT was formed. (The purchase of the Green Lane landfill was completed in March of 2007, as well.) The talk of a Toronto garbage 'crisis' had largely vanished. A full EA seemed less and less likely to be required, at least in the near-to-medium term, given the new Ontario regulation and the newly available landfill capacity at Green Lane. CEAT, then working diligently with City staff and consultants on finalizing the draft ToR for such an EA, was beginning to have serious concerns about the need or utility for such an EA (and thus the ToR) in any reasonably foreseeable timeframe. Discussions about its mandate and future began to occur in earnest.

### How did CEAT do it?

The regular functioning of CEAT was largely dictated by its mandate and the City of Toronto's guidance for the operations of its Boards, Agencies and Commissions (even though CEAT was not a Board, Agency or Commission of the City but a special purpose citizen group advising Council through the Works Committee). In summary, meetings were generally open to the public (although in camera sessions are permitted in certain restricted circumstances); minutes of meetings were formally taken for approval by CEAT; meeting schedules, agendas and approved minutes were posted on the City's website. They are available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/meetings.htm>

Early in its life, CEAT established sub-committees to facilitate its work. The final sub-committees' mandates were:

- Project Administration
- Research and Development
- Education and Communication
- Ad Hoc (mandate review)

Each sub-committee had a chair; minutes were kept informally and not posted on the web. All recommendations from the sub-committees were forwarded to the full CEAT for action. The detailed Terms of Reference for these sub-committees are here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/sub-comm.htm>

Later in its life, CEAT decided to reduce the number of sub-committees to make its work

more efficient and reduce the, by then, challenging time commitments for the continuing involvement of volunteer citizens.

CEAT's mandate included participation in the selection of consultants and other professionals hired to advise City staff on the EA process. As noted above, a consortium of specialist technical consultants had already been hired by the City before CEAT was formed. CEAT members did participate, however, in the City's process for the selection of a legal adviser/consultant.

Early in its life, CEAT's Chair established its unique internet presence, including a dedicated website and email access for CEAT members who wanted to use it. The website was a static or 'brochure' site of several pages explaining the group and its purposes. CEAT's ongoing web presence is via the City of Toronto site and its web archives.

One key focus for CEAT throughout its life was consultations with the public(s) interested in or potentially affected by Toronto's plans for residual solid waste management over the long term. CEAT's mandate included a provision that:

"CEAT shall hold some meetings or information sessions outside of the City's municipal boundaries to facilitate input and feedback from stakeholders in jurisdictions potentially affected by the siting of a facility to manage residual waste from Toronto or to facilitate input and feedback."

In response to this, the Education and Communication sub-committee worked closely with City staff, including those from Waste Management Services and Public Consultation,

# Toronto CEAT

Community Environmental Assessment Team

## CEAT Transition Report

to develop a Terms of Reference for facilitating such consultations outside the City's boundaries. It was circulated to potential bidders in mid-2006. In the event, it was decided not to proceed with that portion of the work at the time due to a number of technical and resource challenges. As a result, the focus going forward was on consultations within the boundaries of the City of Toronto.

Those consultations were facilitated by the Public Consultation unit of City staff, an experienced and capable group for such work. As noted above, three rounds of consultation were held: the first including 12 sessions spread out over several weeks; the second of four sessions within a period of two weeks; and the third of four sessions concentrated in a one-week period. Details of the activities and outcomes of all these consultations are here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/ea.htm>

CEAT members participated in these consultations in a number of ways. One role for CEAT in the consultations was to work with City staff and the consultants to prepare materials such as display boards, presentations and background materials for the sessions. CEAT members also participated actively and regularly in the sessions, including as presenters, facilitators and recorders in break-out groups, and more generally in being available and responsive to queries and input from attendees at the sessions.

Overall, attendance at the various consultation sessions was modest. Turnout ranged from a

handful of people to dozens depending upon the location and timing. A concerted attempt was made to advertise the third round of consultations more broadly, but again, turnout was not extraordinary. One reason for the apparent lack of interest could have been that the discussions were basically focused on the early, and fairly technical, stages of the EA process. Should the process have started to discuss specific sites for individual facilities, attention and concerns may have become more prominent, as typically happens during comparable EA consultations in Ontario. Another possible explanation could be the Green Lane purchase which, from the first announcement of its possibility, resulted in a general reduction in the crisis atmosphere around Toronto's solid waste management future.

Some CEAT members felt that the consultation process itself could be more pro-active by reaching out to citizens in different ways and places. A number of suggestions were put forward for consideration in future (see below for more details).

One consistent and clear message from all the consultation sessions was that concerned citizens of Toronto continue to support and advocate for increased attention to the reduction and diversion of waste from the residual. Time and again, we found ourselves explaining that, technically and officially, CEAT was not 'about' 3 R's diversion; its mandate was to assist in managing the *residual* that remained after reduction and diversion activities had occurred.

Nevertheless, many of the citizens who did take the time and make the effort to attend the consultation sessions had a clear message and concern: more reduction and diversion is needed.

Overall, many CEAT members felt that the consultation sessions were among the most useful and fulfilling of their activities with CEAT. The direct contact with citizens and reflection of their issues within the EA process was at the core of our mandate. The concern that the consultation process could work better towards that end was palpable, and continues for many CEAT members. Overall, CEAT extends its thanks to those who attended the consultations or provided their input in other ways; we appreciate your help.

One more general response to the question of 'How did CEAT do it,' can be summarized in one word: collaboratively. From the very first meeting CEAT members felt, and articulated, the fact that, despite our independent reporting relationship to the Works Committee and City Council, our input would not result in the desired outcomes without active collaboration with others. These others included each other, City staff, project consultants and advisers, as well as the citizens we were tasked to represent in the process.

CEAT extended this spirit of collaboration to its own activities. Members were, from the beginning, courteous and respectful of other members. Several early CEAT meetings ran considerably overtime in attempts to achieve

consensus or near-consensus amongst diverse views before taking the final decision (or vote).

Early in its life, CEAT drafted a series of guiding principles that were designed to integrate sustainability through enhanced public participation and leadership. The guiding principles formed the backbone of how CEAT worked as a team and conducted its collaborations with other stakeholders.

Given that Toronto had been through a number of waste management initiatives in the past -- and the multiplicity of perspectives on how to manage residual waste, many based on differing philosophies -- CEAT took care to ensure that all perspectives and contributions would receive careful consideration. Every member of CEAT participated in the development of its guiding principles, and as such, would each have the same assurances.

As familiarity with fellow members increased and awareness and needs for more efficient decision-making became more widespread, there seemed to be greater comfort with votes on motions that could be (and were) defeated. But the collaborative mindset and respect for the views of others persisted throughout. One CEAT member (who joined part way through our mandate with a group of members who came on board to replace the natural attenuation over the first year) characterized the group as one of the most humble he had ever encountered and as an example for others. Whether or not that be true, there was a tolerance for diverse views and a willingness to listen carefully and attentively to

the views of others which likely contributed significantly to the general lack of adversarial tone or intent, despite sometimes considerable and significant differences of opinion.

### What did CEAT accomplish?

Overall, CEAT accomplished a number of its original sub-objectives before its prime objective, the completion of a full Environmental Assessment compliant with Province of Ontario requirements, was leap-frogged by changes in the Provincial regulations and the City's purchase of a sanitary landfill with many years, if not decades, of approved capacity available.

***“CEAT enabled greater examination and therefore space for more analysis on the Waste Management file. At times, it offered a second opinion on some matters (such as constructing the Terms of Reference, offering ideas on public consultations).”  
Mohammed Jeewa***

The subsidiary objectives completed during the 22 months of CEAT's life included:

- Organizing itself to cooperate with City staff, consultants and the general public to advance the EA by
  - Working to understand CEAT's functioning in the City context
  - Setting up sub-committees that met regularly
  - Holding regular CEAT meetings
- Active participation with all the players to address Ontario's EA requirements, including
  - Seeking independent advice from experts, practitioners and the Ministry of Environment

- Working with City staff and consultants in reviewing and revising draft documentation
- Involvement in three rounds of public consultations leading up to the near-final draft of the Terms of Reference for the EA
- Work with City staff and consultants to ensure that health impact and privacy assessments were incorporated into the EA process
- Recognition of and timely response to the changed circumstances that resulted in the originally envisaged EA no longer being required in the short-to-medium term
- Working with City staff to devise a 'go-forward' strategy and the details of its implementation for the 'next steps' in the process (see following section of this report on "What's next?" for details).

***“... willingness to be collaborative and work as a group to solve a problem was important and recognizing that it is always a feedback system where everyone is impacted by what other people bring to the table.”  
Karen Buck***

CEAT members, in reflecting back on what CEAT accomplished, have also considered what worked less well than they might have hoped or anticipated. At least several members felt that the public consultations were less successful than they might have been, both in terms of turnout by the public and in terms of the feedback and understanding evoked. Suggestions for the future included more pro-active outreach in public settings such as shopping malls, at City Hall, or at conventions or other places of attraction; making the

consultations more interactive and educational; offering more options for citizens to provide input; and advertising the consultations in more accessible or public locations such as on city newsletters, City recreation centres, spaces on TTC vehicles/ property etc.

***“My experience as an EA practitioner was enhanced by being a member ... I heartily recommend that my consulting colleagues adopt this alternate role at least once in their careers. It helps one develop a holistic approach to the environmental assessment process.” Kathleen Reil***

Another disappointment for some was CEAT's lack of an accessible and interactive internet presence which might have assisted in its outreach to other segments of the citizenry than were accessed by posting of agendas and minutes on the City website.

One unexpected result of CEAT's activities was its nomination by a graduate studies class at the University of Toronto as a 'client' for its Workshop in Planning Practice. The theme of the Workshop was waste diversion and two of the Workshops recommendations were:

- A Green Pages section in the Toronto phone book, and
- Community Waste Ambassadors to carry the message to people.

A brief summary of the Workshop's conclusions appeared in the book "GreenTOpia: Towards a Sustainable Toronto" edited by Alana Wilcox, Christina Palassio and Jonny Dovercourt (Coach House Books, 2007). Details of the group's findings are available as presentations to the January 31, 2007 meeting of CEAT at the following link:

<http://www.toronto.ca/garbage/ceat/meetings.htm>

At a broader level, given its unique mandate and somewhat controversial origins, CEAT members generally felt that the effort was a success. For the first time in Ontario, a committee of citizens, municipal staff, elected officials and consultants were brought together to form a team to solve a garbage problem facing the largest municipality in Canada. Members of the team each had different levels of expectations, experiences and frames of reference. We were all tasked to solve a garbage situation in a manner that had not been tried before.

What was perhaps the biggest contribution and difference was the ongoing and intensive involvement of 22 citizens who provided their insight, knowledge and experience. Citizens were involved in this collaborative initiative from the inception. As a result, we moved the traditional model of citizen involvement beyond that of being merely advisory. CEAT's role was entrenched within the bureaucracy by having direct access and reporting to Toronto's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee.

Although modeled after the Halifax experience with citizen participation, CEAT was working within the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act and Environmental process. While there have been many citizen advisory committees or public advisory committees formed within the Ontario Environmental Assessment process, CEAT was involved in an arrangement that was designed to facilitate collaborative decision

making and to ensure public representation in all related activities.

**“CEAT was a real life application of a collaborative decision-making approach.... In terms of innovation, health and environmental factors drove the CEAT process. CEAT attempted to also adopt a tandem technology and site assessment approach - the Y methodology. This is in contrast with a traditional environmental assessment approach of "alternatives to" and "alternative methods".” Kathleen Reil**

Members of CEAT worked with other team members to:

- ensure privacy and confidentiality issues were maintained
- develop public consultation materials
- design public consultation sessions
- participate in public consultations
- respond to public queries
- liaise with the media
- expand the traditional environmental assessment technical assessment framework to include a holistic health impact assessment
- demonstrate that citizens had knowledge and experience that was integrated in a public decision making process

**“...found this experience very rewarding and interesting. It brought a new perspective on how things work. .... We ended up with a commitment from the group and the City to a process that could achieve the overall objectives of an EA process within the new project context. The framework outlines an EA-type process that, if it works, will be a significant step forward.... it emerged from the dynamic of all the things that worked well or less well during CEAT’s time. The group as a whole had to figure out how to respond**

**to the new landfill purchase and the changed regulatory requirements.”**

**Lee Doran**

CEAT can perhaps be best remembered as a concrete demonstration that multi-stakeholder collaborative decision making processes, while slower moving and often cumbersome, can produce good decisions and that citizens are integral partners in creating better solutions.

**“...A reward for me came in the participation at public consultations when speaking to the public; when I saw a light go on over a topic that they didn’t know about. When they began to change and look at it from a different perspective, this forum was rewarding, including the politics. ... I respect the way that all the members of this team practiced active listening and participation. It was also important that they were able to have contrary points of view. ...I recommended that the new groups should occasionally share what they are doing within the two groups because they’re very important on the impacts that they have on one another.**

**Philip Knox**

### What's next?

**“... a commonality of experience among group is necessary. It is also valuable to have a range of experiences in education and work. I feel that issues were not missed, and that it is very important to have diversity at the table. Maintaining independent reporting relationships with the City sub committee gives the CEAT members a sense of value and increases their morale as a group who is making a difference. Jennifer Agnolin**

At its June 6, 2007 meeting, CEAT members agreed unanimously in principle with City staff recommendations on the way forward. There were two major components to the new approach:

- a Residual Waste Planning Study to carry on the work begun under the Provincial EA process (now suspended) to site and operate new residual waste management facility(ies); and
- the activities outlined in “Proposed Initiatives and Financing Model to get to 70% Solid Waste Diversion by 2010” to implement the City's efforts to achieve 70% diversion by 2010.

Two citizens' groups based on the CEAT model were formed initially by the splitting of former CEAT members into two Working Groups:

- Residual Waste Working Group, and
- 3Rs Working Group.

As it could have taken another year to start up new memberships for these groups, it was important to set them up initially with existing engaged members to work from.

In addition, an “Integrated Solid Waste Stakeholder Group” was created; it “will be a discussion forum attended by staff and the chairs and vice chairs of the city's various solid waste working groups for the purposes of sharing information.”

CEAT's letter of support for this approach is available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-5155.pdf>

Toronto City Council passed the motions adopting this approach at its meeting of November 19 and 20, 2007. CEAT was dissolved at the end of 2007 and the new Working Groups begin on January 1, 2008.

The Residual Waste Working Group (RWWG) has 8 members, initially comprised of eight former CEAT members. It will be representative of the broader community; meet about once per month; provide regular feedback on all aspects of the residual waste study; participate in public consultation events; submit an annual report to Public Works and Infrastructure jointly with Solid Waste Management Services; and have its chair and/or vice chair participate on the Integrated Solid Waste Stakeholder Group. The detailed Terms of Reference for the Residual Waste Working Group are available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-7849.pdf>

The RWWG will provide input and advice to staff and the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (independent report) on the

implementation of the Residual Waste Planning Study. The Study envisages a made in Toronto decision making process, i.e., decision making moves from the Province of Ontario's process mandated under the Environmental Assessment Act (now suspended) to the City. It also allows the City to move forward more quickly with its residual waste processing projects.

The City has set out its approach to an EA type of process which includes a parallel process for siting and technology choice (versus the decision making in a serial process, one after another, typically adopted for the Provincial process). It also includes numerous opportunities for public consultation and feedback along the way. Development of the City process included consultation with CEAT and other stakeholders during the work on the Provincial EA process. Elements of its concept and approach were tested by the City during its recent successful attempt to site new Source Separated Organics processing facilities within the City.

Additional details on this City approach are provided in Attachment A to the Residual Waste Planning Study Terms of Reference which are here:  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-5154.pdf>

The 3Rs Working Group includes up to 15 community members and City staff (non-voting); initial community membership is eleven former CEAT members. The

purpose of the 3Rs Working Group is to provide input and advice to staff and the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (independent report) on the design and implementation of policies and practices to help achieve the goal of 70% diversion from landfill including:

- exploring ways and means of effectively implementing ten of the eleven 3Rs initiatives (advice on the eleventh, the residual waste processing initiative, will come from RWWG) and achieving the overall waste reduction and diversion targets described in Appendix A of the Getting to 70 report;
- providing input to the City's promotion, education and outreach programmes for source reduction, reuse, and recycling initiatives; and
- planning and participating in public consultation, promotion or education activities related to the implementation of the reduction, reuse, and recycling initiatives.

The detailed Terms of Reference for the 3 Rs Working Group is available here:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-7855.pdf>

Overall, then, citizen input and advice on Toronto's solid waste management activities continues through these two Working Groups, based on the CEAT model, going forward.

### CEAT Members' reflections

CEAT met as formal group for the last time on November 14, 2007. The main item on the agenda was to discuss and consider the approach to and contents of this report.

One of the questions that was discussed at the meetings was:

***What aspects of CEAT did you find a) most challenging, and b) most rewarding?***

Name	Most Challenging	Most Rewarding
<b>Hanna Ziada</b>	All the sessions where the committee tried to accomplish specific wording with a large groups of people. It becomes difficult when there are more than 3 or 4 people.	Facilitating the public consultation round tables because she learned a lot from the citizens and enjoyed discussing the questions. It was also rewarding to review the questions and what worked and what didn't. Stakeholder consultations were very applicable to all roles.
<b>Karen Buck</b>	Has been involved in EA processes before that were lacking in actually getting to a solution that would be made in the public good. The EA process was very flawed in bringing the public into the process in a fair way.	The ability to see that the ToR was going to be broad-based and that the people being impacted were brought into the EA process for consultation. To her, this was both challenging and rewarding at the same time.
<b>Nesamoni Lysander</b>	Understanding how democracy works. This was not a salary group of people. We spent a lot of time thinking and talking.	Observing people from different backgrounds coming together to work without any arguments was most comforting. The value, knowledge and experience of this group was rewarding. It was the most humble group of people that he has ever known. In spite of high education, it was very remarkable that people can live in harmony. The life of this group and its function has some of the most highly qualified people meeting with them. Post-grads, high ranking legal experts, highly sophisticated professionals working in the City. It was never a confrontational experience. All the differences were brought together because the environmental situation has no social differences amongst society and that is the beauty of watching CEAT in action. Staff patience is important.
<b>Heather Ducharme</b>	From an EA side, she found that the unfocused ToR process was long. It took a long time to figure out what they were here for. The group didn't know what the City expected of them: trying to put the challenge of a focused ToR or a strategic planning and policy. Produced a ToR that she is not sure is useful. She found the experience to be intellectually, politically and personally challenging. The formality of the group was also challenging. She sometimes felt alienated, because there was no relationship building in the group. She didn't like the first meeting. Thought it was supposed to be informal but it wasn't.	It was rewarding because there was a democracy in action, as painful and messy and tedious as it can be. It was real as opposed to writing a paper that may not be read. She saw that an attempt at doing something important together and continuing it was being made and enforced. The three groups (CEAT, 3RWG & RWWG) are rewarding and getting them formed was a fruition of something.
<b>Jennifer Agnolin</b>	She felt that the time commitment, number of meetings and sub-committee meetings were challenging, as well as working under very specific deadlines.	Both rewarding and somewhat challenging was having three different groups come together (City, CEAT and the public). Having the three viewpoints coming together and

		working together to develop one product and form relationships.
<b>Mohammed Jeewa</b>	It was challenging at the beginning when the issue of recycling came up yet we were limited to talking about residual waste. Also, not being sure about what decisions we would be making (i.e. choosing venue, etc.)	The most rewarding was transforming into two groups in order to continue what we started.
<b>Jon Neuert</b>	What was both challenging and rewarding was the changing nature of the focus of the effort and the dexterity brought by the group. It was adept and rewarding but challenging to stay focused and trying to get the sense of accomplishment was constantly being eroded.	
<b>Edward Lee</b>	To call the public consultation challenging is an understatement; it was more depressing than challenging.	It was a privilege to go with City staff on a facility visit in US, had to settle down to an appropriate time and situation. Learned a lot from the observations. Has the highest respect for staff as professionals and their knowledge and dedication. The rewards started at the beginning of the CEAT formation when they had spent time inviting in-house (City) and outside speakers. Being an ordinary citizen with some enthusiasm and learning from individuals with compassion. The participation and contributions of individuals and how they can make a difference in knowing that something substantial is being accomplished.
<b>Tanya Atkinson</b>	1- working under regulations and not knowing what would happen; 2-working with different people (backgrounds and understanding of environmental process), keeping up attendance and the same understanding of the issues (going back when some people missed meetings)	Working with people with different backgrounds and accepting and understanding different points of view.

The answers to the questions were as diverse, wide-ranging and engaging as the members themselves.

In summary,

The experiences learned in the CEAT experiment proved, to many members, what many of us already felt. That all citizens have a wealth of passion, experience and multitude of great ideas to help City politicians and staff with the decisions and work that needs to be done in coming up with long term solutions that affect the ongoing health, growth and sustainability of working and living in Toronto.

We wish to thank the many individuals that came and spoke to our group to give us their ideas both from the private and public sectors. We would specifically like to thank the members of the City both staff and politicians that took a risk on getting citizens more involved in these challenging issues. We especially appreciated our community partners including those in the academic community who supported the work of CEAT in many ways and the community members at large who attended our sessions.

As the members of CEAT move forward into the two new groups of the 3R's and Residual Waste Working Groups, we look forward to continue this collaboration work even closer with the public in finding long term solutions for Toronto's solid waste. We know that the public is anxious and willing to help find these solutions and we are glad that there are so many prepared to volunteer their time and ideas towards those ends.