

Questions and Comments from Workshop Participants in response to early sections of the Transition Plan

	Question	Answer
1.	Can Steinbach stay in the shared cost model and not transition to full EPR?	<p>MMSM is responding to a request from the Minister of Conservation and Climate to develop a plan to transition Manitoba’s packaging and printed paper recycling program from the current shared responsibility model to full EPR. The Transition Plan outlines a proposed approach which would see all eligible communities transition to full EPR by 2026 at which time the shared cost model would be terminated. Given this, communities cannot elect to remain in the shared cost model.</p> <p>Communities that choose not to transition to full EPR by the end of the three-year transition period would no longer be eligible for MMSM funding.</p>
2.	Can you please confirm that 2026 is the year when all communities will have transitioned to full EPR?	<p>The timeline for the transition provided in the draft plan is dependent upon a number of factors including the Minister’s approval of the plan and the amendment of the Packaging and Paper Stewardship Regulation by June 2022. If these actions are taken by that time, MMSM expects all communities to have transitioned to full EPR by December 31, 2026.</p>
3.	Please clarify if multi-family dwellings, apartments, and some or all institutional/commercial will not be part of this program? Eastman Recycling currently picks up at all apartments and commercial locations in Steinbach. Although the commercial spots are not part of our contract agreement, all residential locations (including all apartments) in Steinbach are part of our contract. Would this be something customized per community or municipality for the agreements MMSM will make?	<p>With respect to multi-family dwellings, MMSM is proposing a definition of multi-family dwellings as those buildings with 8 or more units. The Transition Plan proposes that during Phase 2 of the 6 phased approach, MMSM will work with communities to understand the extent to which multi-family buildings are part of the current transfer payment model. Once it has developed this understanding it will propose a plan for including these buildings in MMSM’s full EPR program.</p>

<p>4.</p>	<p>With respect to the design of catchment areas, please provide more information about how this will be done? There is concern about how they were grouped regarding the three-years rolling averages. As some municipalities may be ready to transition quicker than others, I am not sure geography should be the only criteria as capacity varies across the province.</p>	<p>Thank you for that feedback. We understood from our discussions during the workshops that MMSM needs to give consideration to those communities that are ready to transition and have the capacity to transition. This will be included in the plan. We also heard during these discussions that community representatives support an approach that allows for the efficient movement of materials in a way that creates scale to advance cost-efficiency and improve environmental performance. That said, MMSM recognizes that not all communities within a defined catchment can transition at the same time. Once a catchment is defined, the detailed implementation plan will identify the transition date for each community in the catchment and will also consider the natural termination and renewals of contracts for those communities that ‘opt-out’ of participating in service delivery.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Given the complexity of the transition being proposed, MMSM may want to consider capacity and resource supports for municipalities and First Nation communities currently not participating in the MMSM program to support the proposed December 31, 2021 deadline. An avenue that provides flexibility in this deadline may warrant further exploration to enable more time for these communities to express their interest in being included in the transition plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback and suggestion. MMSM will be working closely with Indigenous Services Canada to undertake a targeted and proactive effort to reach Indigenous communities to ensure they understand the opportunity to indicate their interest in being part of the MMSM full EPR program. In order to adequately plan and budget for the transition, MMSM needs to have a clear picture of all the eligible and interested communities transitioning to full EPR. Therefore, MMSM would prefer to develop an effective outreach plan to reach remote, northern and Indigenous communities during plan development rather than extend the December 31, 2021 deadline.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>A working group may be of benefit to guide the development of the Master Services Agreement and the independent CMS review as it may assist in addressing community questions and concerns prior to Phase 3 and streamline the process of approaching local councils.</p>	<p>Thank you for that input. It is MMSM’s intent to engage with municipal and Indigenous community representatives throughout the development and implementation of the Transition Plan. We agree that a working group made up of individuals who have the time, interest, and expertise to provide feedback on the Master Services Agreement and the CMS work will be important in ensuring that local councils and Chief and Councils have the information they need to make a decision on delivering services on behalf of MMSM.</p>

<p>7.</p>	<p>The WMR has used a catchment approach in developing its regional Waste Quadrant Working Groups (WQWG) as part of its solid waste work. WQWG catchment areas were determined based on geography, proximity to solid waste infrastructure and hauling routes. This was found to be an effective way to consider the coordination of services</p>	<p>We agree with you that using a catchment area approach to the transition of communities to full EPR will be effective and are glad to hear that WMR has had success with this approach as well. We heard from workshop participants that they agree using catchment areas will enable MMSM to optimize material flow, improve cost-effectiveness, and reduce the environmental impact. As outlined at the workshop, it is our intent to consider each community in the context of several catchment design criteria including physical geography, volumes of PPP available, existing infrastructure, and proximity of that community to other communities that have declared their intent to transition.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Request further clarity on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shared cost model program end date for eligible communities who decide not to participate in the transition to full EPR. 2. Program options available to eligible communities who decide not to participate in the transition to full EPR. 3. Master Services Agreement scope – inclusion of municipal and First Nations owned/operated buildings/facilities in collection services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Transition Plan as currently drafted would see the shared cost model program ending December 31, 2026. This timeline however is dependent upon a number of factors including the Minister’s approval of the Plan and the amendment of the Packaging and Paper Stewardship Regulation by June 2022. 2. Those communities that choose not to participate in the full EPR program would cease to receive funding from MMSM once all eligible communities have transitioned to full EPR. At that time the current shared cost model will be wound down and communities that have not transitioned will receive no further funding from MMSM. 3. Those municipal and First Nations communities that choose to participate in the delivery of services on behalf of MMSM should be able to utilize their current infrastructure including buildings, collection containers, and facilities. For those communities that choose not to deliver collection services on behalf of MMSM, MMSM will procure collection services on their behalf and the continued utilization of existing infrastructure will be determined through the commercial agreements between MMSM and the service provider.