



INVITES YOU TO A PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS  
THE FUTURE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT IN  
HEAD, CLARA & MARIA

ON FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, 2011 AT 2:00 PM  
AT THE STONECLIFFE COMMUNITY CENTRE

Council has some tough decisions to make and would like your input. Council would like to take a proactive approach and make some tough decisions in implementing a plan that will take HCM into the future in a healthy and sustainable way. Hopefully the decisions to be made this summer will affect the evolution of our waste management strategy for years to come.

Think back a few years...

- ◆ Coca Cola was .99/2 litre bottle;
- ◆ Stats Can's basket of goods cost \$97.80 (\$116.50 now);
- ◆ A loaf of bread was \$1.38 in 2002;
- ◆ In 2005 gas cost \$.90 per litre;
- ◆ HCM had three waste disposal sites;
- ◆ Everything was collected and dumped in "the hole";
- ◆ In 2003 HCM Environment expenses were \$64,480;

**What will the next 10 years bring?** The cost of waste management has increased from \$64,500 in 2003 to nearly \$100,000 in 2010; budgeted for over \$140,000 in 2011. Our Stonecliffe site is estimated to have an estimated remaining life of 10 years at the current rate of fill; Bissett Creek has 17 years; Deux Rivières has closed. Past HCM Councils have made some tough decisions concerning reserves for waste management in the past, and this one needs to make some more now. Knowing the facts presented in this report, perhaps you can appreciate the position that this Council is in. Council and staff invite you to take some time to acquaint yourself with the situation, come out and help resolve some of these current issues.

Feel free to stop by the municipal office, call or email for additional information; or, call your local Council member.

### Did you know?

- ◆ In a lifetime, the average North American will throw away 600 times his or her adult weight in garbage. A 68 kg adult will leave a legacy of 40,825 kg of trash. (*Natural Resources Canada*)
- ◆ Plastic products contribute 7% by weight and 30% by volume to municipal solid waste. (*Recycling Council of Ontario*)
- ◆ Across Canada it costs more than \$1.5 billion per year to dispose of garbage. (*Destination Conservation*)
- ◆ Presently, 80% of municipal and industrial solid waste in Canada is disposed of by landfilling processes, with the remainder disposed through recycling, resource recovery and incineration. (*Government of Canada*)
- ◆ Landfills sites account for about 38% of Canada's total methane emissions. (*Environment Canada*)
- ◆ North America has 8% of the world's population, consumes 1/3 of the world's resources and produces almost half of the world's non-organic garbage (*RRS*)
- ◆ 70% of landfilled waste could be either reused or recycled (*RRS*)
- ◆ In North America, approximately 20% of our paper, plastic, glass and metal goods are currently made from recycled material. Experts believe that 50% could be easily achieved (*Courtesy of Raven Recycling Society (RRS), 100 Galena Road, Whitehorse, Yukon, Y1A 2W6*)

### Public Meeting Purpose:

#### Creation of an overall Waste Management Strategy/Plan

1. Consider ways to increase the volume of blue box material being collected and encourage recycling.
2. To increase diversion through other methods.
3. Decrease the amount of material going to landfill.
4. Decrease the costs of our Waste management processes.
5. Extend the life of existing landfill.
6. Extend the time before which we need to look for new sites and/or extend our current sites;
7. A result of these actions will allow us to increase the percentage of funding received by Stewardship Ontario through the Blue Box Funding Program thereby reducing the costs of our overall diversion;
8. A further result of this process will be an overall comprehensive document which will be easier to understand and provide direction to more effectively manage all of our waste management components.

**Goal:** To divert as much material as possible from disposal sites to extend the operating lives of existing sites in a cost effective manner to reduce overall costs to ratepayers.

**Secondary Goal:** To increase the material being diverted through the Blue Box program to increase payments from Waste Diversion Ontario and to meet diversion targets as set by the province.

**Meeting Goal:** To obtain public input prior to deciding on tools and strategies to meet Council's goal.

The “dumps” of the past have evolved to “waste management programs” which include recycling, reuse, composting, diversion, and landfilling. The province has a goal to reduce the amount of material being landfilled by 60%. As municipalities exist at the pleasure of the provincial government, we are bound to follow legislated mandates or risk fines and/or reduced funding from the province.

In order to obtain optimum refunds from Waste Diversion Ontario for our recycling program, the municipality must have a comprehensive blue box plan in place. To plan for the future, Council feels it is important to have a Waste Management Plan. Before making decisions that will affect you, Council is seeking your input. Council is asking for your constructive comments to help create a forward looking plan that the majority of the population can live with. We know that not everyone will be happy with the outcome, however; Council wants to hear your concerns and requests your input to come up with a viable solution that will benefit the majority of residents.

Upon the conclusion of the public meeting, Council will make decisions based on the following areas which will become a new Waste Management By-Law. This overall plan and by-law will solidify various decisions already made by Council through past decision. This new document will consolidate all aspects of waste management and will provide a centralized repository of information.

Please come out and make your views known so that this document can take a shape that residents can live with while protecting the future of our municipal landfill and the natural beauty of our municipality.

#### Historical costs of Waste Management

| Year | Actual Costs                           | Required Closure Costs (Reserves) | Required Post Closure Costs (Reserves) | Total estimated life of all sites in Years |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2004 | \$72,084                               | \$86,643.75                       | \$230,000                              | 60   |
| 2005 | \$85,532                               |                                   |  |  |
| 2006 | \$61,041                               | \$140,310                         | \$230,000                              | 55   |
| 2007 | \$167,645 (Deux Rivieres Site Closure) | \$140,310                         | \$220,000                              | 39   |
| 2008 | \$142,667                              | \$109,160                         | \$215,000                              | 26   |
| 2009 | \$95,918                               | \$109,160                         | \$215,000                              | 25   |
| 2010 | \$97,842                               |                                   |  |  |
| 2011 | \$141,495 (budgeted)                   | \$109,160                         | \$172,500                              | 26.5                                       |

**Closure Costs** reflect the costs of final closure of the site once it has reached capacity including compacting, covering and seeding (in current dollars).

**Post-Closure Costs** reflect the anticipated costs of monitoring and reporting on the site for the 10 year period after closure (in current dollars).

**Total Remaining Life of All Sites** equals the estimated life of the current disposal sites based on an estimate of annual waste land-filled. *The change from 2004 to 2011 should have been approximately 20 years to account for the closure of Deux Rivieres' site during that period and transferring that waste to Bissett Creek. In reality, at the rate that we have been dumping material, we have lost 33.5 years of life instead of the 20. We can not continue to landfill material at this rate and expect that we will have our sites remaining for the years ahead.*

## History in HCM

Gone are the days of simply digging a hole and dumping. In the 1970s, Ontario passed two main pieces of legislation that would be built upon and would change the way municipalities handled their waste; the *Environmental Protection Act* (EPA) 1971 and the Ontario *Environmental Assessment Act* (EAA) 1975. The EPA addresses the design and operation of landfill, incinerators, composting plants and other waste management facility. The EAA regulates the types, locations and sites of these facilities. Together these statutes and their corresponding regulations, enforced by a system of fines and penalties for non-compliance, dictate what we can and can not do as it relates to solid waste.

As seen above, in 2004 Head, Clara and Maria had 3 landfill sites with an estimated combined 60 years of life remaining. A short 7 years later and we are now down to two sites, with a combined total of 26.5 estimated years remaining. At this rate, by the time the next 7 years pass, we will have little or no existing capacity in our sites. At this time, we do not know what the alternatives and options for waste management will be 7 years from now. Environmental legislation changes frequently resulting in many unknowns and increased management costs.

As much as we cannot know what the future will hold; what we can be certain of is change. Influenced by global politics and practises the province continues to make changes and we can not know how the framework for waste management will look in 2021.

We do know that our neighbours in Quebec a few short years ago were told that they could no longer have open pits but were instead requested to form concrete cells in which to store waste so that zero leaching occurred. By 2011, our neighbours in Swisha are no longer allowed to have a disposal site. The province has ruled that local open pit dumps must close and that no matter where it's going; the amount of garbage needs to be reduced. They now have to truck their garbage to engineered sites approved by the province, in Montreal.

*"But they can't do that...."* Yes, they can and they did. We don't know what might happen here. What we do know is that it is costly to maintain disposal sites and waste management as per the provincial guidelines. Reduction is key.

Non-compliance by the Municipality will result in fines and a halt to transfers from the province (Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund in the amount of \$175,000 annually is at stake).

So...What are our alternatives? Create guidelines and enact by-laws to assist the municipality in increasing diversion. What are the alternatives to residents who don't want to follow the new rules? The roadside? Someone's backyard? The bush?

This has all been done in the past and is exactly what's landed us where we are today. From a provincial perspective, fines and penalties can and will be laid. Each municipality can also impose by-laws and fines to force those who would not comply with legislation to otherwise do so. Fines can be imposed with the unpaid fines eventually being added to your property tax bill. When the tax bills are not paid, your home could go up for tax sale. "They" can do a lot.

What this Council is looking for are responsible solutions so that *we/they* don't have to resort to these means to force people to divert material from our landfill site. Council is required by legislation to follow the ever increasing guidelines as determined by the province. Spot checks are performed on our sites by the MOE who then issue warnings and amendments. If we do not operate as per our Certificates of Approval, the MOE can lay charges and fine us. Non-compliance could lead to the closure of our sites. So...

Council requires a discussion and decision in many of the following areas in order to properly address the issues and create an overall plan and is requesting your input.



The Ministry of the Environment has set a diversion target rate of 60%. This means that 60% of waste generated in each area is to be diverted from landfill to other sources. Our program with its limited participants, sparse population and great distances will never meet 60% diversion. What it can and should do is aim for 60% diversion, by encouraging recycling for all users be they residential, seasonal, commercial or industrial.

The following chart shows the number of bags of garbage collected on a yearly and monthly basis since 2005. Recycling stats since 2008 are also included.

| Garbage<br>Bags<br>Disposed | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| January                     | 896    | 754    | 755    | 658    | 405    | 535    |
| February                    | 820    | 685    | 581    | 611    | 434    | 383    |
| March                       | 1140   | 788    | 688    | 834    | 461    | 476    |
| April                       | 973    | 798    | 674    | 1106   | 526    | 572    |
| May                         | 974    | 1120   | 1081   | 1567   | 900    | 1035   |
| June                        | 1157   | 1028   | 1214   | 2015   | 1091   | 1209   |
| July                        | 1178   | 989    | 2189   | 1091   | 1431   | 1846   |
| August                      | 1142   | 3598   | 2080   | 893    | 1750   | 1981   |
| September                   | 986    | 1774   | 1268   | 571    | 1007   | 758    |
| October                     | 1018   | 1804   | 967    | 491    | 934    | 660    |
| November                    | 757    | 1399   | 620    | 530    | 496    | 348    |
| December                    | 869    | 1061   | 546    | 770    | 514    | 806    |
| Totals                      | 11,910 | 15,798 | 12,663 | 11,327 | 11,958 | 12,619 |
| Recycling<br># of bags      |        |        |        | 4,475  | 3,539  | 5,073  |
| tonnes recycled             |        |        |        | 25.09  | 24.83  | 38.08  |

Notes:

- ◆ Over the years statistic keeping has improved.
- ◆ In 2005 - commercial operators had keys - waste was not accounted for.
- ◆ July 31/08 - locks changed, all commercial waste now included in stats.
- ◆ February 1, 2007 Recycling program initiated - decreased volume to landfill.



The above data show that although our recycling is increasing, so is the amount of material going to landfill. What needs to occur is a focused approach to improving our overall waste management process including:

- ◆ recycling – blue box and other diversion;
- ◆ garbage disposal,
- ◆ site maintenance and management,
- ◆ contracts and

- ◆ possible participation in various other programs (organics, WEE, tires etc.) with a goal to increased diversion at decreased costs.

BACKGROUND: Recommendations from a report created by Jp2g using Waste Diversion Ontario's (WDO) Continuous Improvement Fund (CIF) dollars explains Jp2g's suggestions for plan improvement. Our goal is to improve on this plan making our program as efficient as possible. Increasing Blue Box funding will reduce the amount of money coming from ratepayers' pockets to pay for waste management.

Currently HCM pays \$97,842.08 a year for Environmental Expenses which breaks down to approximately \$25,000 for recycling and over \$70,000 for garbage based on 2010 numbers.

#### ANNUAL WASTE MANAGEMENT BUDGET NUMBERS

|                                | 2010                | 2011 budget          | 2011 year to date  |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Environment - Salaries         | 17,888.16           | \$ 18,000.00         | \$ 9,951.25        |
| Disposal Site Truck Expenses   | 4,302.33            | \$ 5,000.00          | \$1,783.51         |
| Environment - Excavation       | 12,467.50           | \$ 20,000.00         | 2,530.00           |
| Environment Expenses           | 2,282.90            | \$ 2,000.00          | 5,574.08           |
| Environmental Mileage          | 0.00                | \$ -                 | 0                  |
| Disposal Site Monitoring       | 27,953.89           | \$ 50,745.00         | 6,518.17           |
| Disposal Site Study            | 8,013.38            | \$ 7,000.00          | 9,017.55           |
| Environmental Concerns         | 0.00                |                      | 0                  |
| Share of Garage Costs          | 0.00                |                      | 0                  |
| Landfill Closure Site Expenses | 0.00                |                      | 0                  |
| Environment Capital            | 1,000.00            | \$ 10,750.00         | 0                  |
| Recycling                      | 23,933.92           | \$ 25,000.00         | 11,895.96          |
| Household Hazardous Waste      | 0.00                | \$ 3,000.00          | 0                  |
| <b>TOTAL WASTE MANAGEMENT</b>  | <b>\$ 97,842.08</b> | <b>\$ 141,495.00</b> | <b>\$47,270.53</b> |

These totals are paid directly from taxation with some small exceptions for tipping fees collected from contractors and commercial users. They are offset by those tipping fees and revenues paid to us by Stewardship Ontario for our recycling efforts.

All residents currently have the ability to dispose of an unlimited amount of material with no fee other than taxes. Those who do not dispose of much, allow space for those who dispose of a large amount of material yet pay the same fee. Those who recycle nearly 90% of their weekly waste supplement those who don't recycle at all.

### Overall Waste Management Plan Discussion Topics and Options for Discussion

**Jp2g's recent report outlined the following as steps that Council should take to encourage recycling:**

"The Priority Initiatives identified through this assessment include:

1. Public Education and Promotion Programs
2. User Pay Program
3. Training Key Program Staff

The Future Initiatives identified through this assessment include:

4. Multi-Municipal Collection and Processing
5. Standardized Service Levels and Collaborative Haulage Contracting
6. Optimization of Collection Operations
7. Tipping Fee Increase

The primary goal of the updated WRS is to increase the blue box material capture rate of recyclables in the waste stream by 20% over the next five (5) years. The goal will be sought through initiating a Promotion and Education (P & E) Program to inform municipal residents. Under the condition that the P & E plan does not reaching the aforementioned goal, additional priority initiatives should be implemented.”

In addition the following is an overview of various options available. Council should implement some of these; they would like your opinion on which ones.

There are a large number of options to be considered. Here are a few.

- Implementation of Tipping Fees for everyone including campground operators.
- Bag Tags; a certain number free, a charge per bag after.
- Reduce garbage collection to bi- weekly and increase recyclable collection to weekly.
- Deterrents for those who litter. When it is located, embarrass the guilty party: post it in the paper and/or newsletter; return it to them; send a letter advising that we are aware of the issue; fine them.
- Can implement fines for leaving garbage at the gate.
- Consequences might include refusal to provide curbside services for that individual.
- Usage of Clear Plastic Bags for Garbage – if a large volume of recyclable materials, they are left at the curb or fined. Bag tag or tipping fees can increase if the garbage is full of recyclables or decreased if “clean”.
- Don't recycle glass as it costs more to transport than its worth. Calvin Township collects glass in a separate area and then uses it to cover waste.
- Purchase a used compactor, with a vehicle that no longer works, permanently locate it at the Stonecliffe site. Use it to fill and compact waste for a week or two or until it's full and only then, unload it to a cell and cover it. Will reduce mess, and the need for weekly cover.
- Can collect and compost organics on a concrete base. Would require equipment to windrow and turn material. Could recoup costs by selling composted material?

**1. Partial user pay system which might include bag tags over a certain base amount, tipping fees for all users, or any combination of the above.**

(Most residents who recycle have claimed that the amount of material that they now put out for disposal is limited, often less than one bag every two weeks. **This would not have any effect on those already recycling but will encourage those who are not making their best efforts at recycling to improve. Without it, we will only affect minimal change.**)



“User pay waste programs got their start in 1991 in eastern Ontario. Since then, new programs have been added each year. Presently there are some 145 municipalities with some form of user pay or pay as you throw (PAYT) in Ontario. These include all areas of the province, ranging from large urban municipalities to small rural ones. There are programs for curbside waste collection as well as those based at landfills, and each program is as unique as the municipality it serves. There are approximately 1.8 million households in Ontario that now pay directly to dispose of at least some of their waste. This is nearly 45% of the households in the province. “(Municipal Waste Association)

User pay ensures that those who are using the system are the ones paying for it. Those who are recycling and participating in the program would not be affected significantly.

- a. Bags or bag tags;
  - i. Limit the number of bags to be collected or deposited;
    - 1. different number of bags for commercial/institutional users;
  - ii. Set fee for tag;
  - iii. Provide a certain number of “free” tags
  - iv. Will be a cost involved;
  - v. Enforce the current ruling of only two bags of garbage per week per household. This can be encouraged through the bag tag program.
  - vi. Amnesty days around holidays etc. to compensate for unusual or seasonal situations.

Neighbouring municipalities charge tipping fees to their residents and their municipalities are not dump sites.

- b. Tipping Fees
  - i. for all material to disposal sites
  - ii. for limited types of materials
  - iii. for all users
  - iv. for a certain segment of users
  - v. for material in excess of that collected
  - vi. there are no fees for recyclables – unlimited bags of recyclables collected
- c. Need to plan for FREON removal. Until now we have collected all materials regardless of their state. According to our Certificate of Approval (CofA) we must insist that white goods not be collected until/unless refrigerants have been professionally removed;
  - i. provide name and contact for service to private residences;
  - ii. Arrange to have someone come up quarterly to extract from all white goods at site and have Council pay for it. Currently we are accepting these materials. It is contrary to our CofA.
  - iii. Charge a fee for materials which include Freon or other gases that require professional removal.

## 2. Recycling

- a. Provision of free blue boxes/containers for home storage; this can be a component of an advertising campaign, possibly paid for through CIF.
- b. Decrease the garbage collection to once every two weeks;
- c. Increase recycling collection to weekly;
- d. Alternate collection weeks – garbage one week, recycling another (Mackey/Stonecliffe only, Bissett/Deux Rivieres to remain the same as its working) – possibly using our vehicle to reduce expenses; **OR** both collected each week by our vehicle. Could maintain same collection schedule as current, simply change to both garbage and recycling on regular collection days. Would require contractor buy-in.

- i. Savings of 130 payroll hours per year; (currently these are contract hours)
- ii. 2,163.2 fewer kilometres per year;
- iii. Better control of materials and processes using only municipal staff;
- e. Limit access to disposal sites to recycler.

### 3. Increased promotion and education.

- a. Need to set a budget annually for this task. Can be minimal but should be a concerted effort.
- b. Brochures;
- c. Fridge Magnets;
- d. Signage at landfill;
- e. Website improvements;
  - i. FAQ section;
- f. Dedicated program directed at commercial campgrounds; Signs, posters, flyers;

### 4. Collection containers.

- a. Using transparent bags for all waste.
- b. This will enable the garbage collector to view materials in garbage and refuse those bags that contain recyclable materials and/or Household Hazardous Waste;
- c. Use of spot audits to determine amount of recyclable materials in garbage bags; Attendant randomly searches bags to determine what recycling material is being deposited. Ability to fine individuals or refuse their material would be required or it wouldn't work.
- d. Currently policy limits the number and weight of bags of garbage collected and insists that recyclables are placed in clear plastic bags. Is this satisfactory?

### 5. Fines.

- a. A littering/disposal by-law needs to be implemented and enforced allowing fines to be laid for illegally dumping material and for setting tipping fees for certain materials.
- b. Fines
  - i. At \$50? \$100? \$200? plus costs for first infraction; escalate penalties;
  - ii. Higher fines for corporations/businesses;
- c. Promotion and Education
  - i. A copy of the new by-law is to be sent to each resident as newsletters are distributed so that each resident has the opportunity to completely understand the new document.
- d. Free fall and/or spring collection of large items;
- e. Free fall and/or spring collection of yard waste;

### 6. Collection

- a. Should the municipality collect our own recycling material?
  - i. CofA for collection and transportation? – According to Jp2g our Cof A on the truck will cover transport of material to Ottawa Valley Waste Recovery Centre (OVWRC).
  - ii. Costs of vehicle use? Could collect from Mackey – dump in container at Stonecliffe site; then from Stonecliffe. Materials would fit in same vehicle. Costs would change if Andre no longer interested in collecting materials and we had to transport to OVWRC.
  - iii. Extra staffing or is this something that could be combined with current hours of road super and maintenance worker?
- b. Will OVWRC accept waste from us? Yes.
  - i. At what cost? \$40/tonne
  - ii. Materials and condition of materials will need to be changed. Will not take as many materials as BAG Recycling but may be more reliable.
- c. Should recyclables be collected curbside or depot only?

- d. What materials are to be collected roadside? – Waste and recycling; yard and brush: organics?

#### **7. Recycling Contract**

- a. Need to use CIF example to obtain increased funding even though it is obviously created for a much larger program;
- b. Require accurate statistics on amount of material diverted to better report to WDO and obtain increased funding.
- c. Should we research options with OVWRC?
- d. Attempt to solidify a contract with BAG Recycling?
- e. Or continue without a contract?

#### **8. Municipal Hazardous and Special Waste (MHSW)**

- a. Amended CofA; Cost of amendment to certificate is minimal – I have advised Kevin to begin the process to amend our CofA to store MHSW materials on site between events!
- b. Will allow the municipality to hold/store MHSW materials on municipal property until annual event is held;
- c. Hold more frequent events;
- d. Change the timing of collection events.
- e. Have to enforce not depositing these materials with waste – enforcing the use of clear bags will assist in this process;

#### **9. Disposal Sites**

- a. Maintenance of sites; consider alternatives to keep costs low while meeting our CofA obligations.
- b. How do we decrease the costs of cover after daily use?
- c. Bill planning to use an internal fence around open cell to keep materials from blowing but won't help with frequency of cover.
- d. Environmental reporting – currently contracted; Look to tendering that contract.
- e. Access to site – should it be limited? Extend fences to reduce possibility of trespass?

#### **10. Tires**

- a. Need to complete registration process for reimbursement program; - in process.
- b. Staff is working on this issue.

#### **11. Scrap metal**

- a. Determine end market; this is not a challenge as there is money in scrap metal.
- b. Not considered a Blue Box item so does not count towards WDO funding.

#### **12. Waste Electronics (WEE)**

- a. Other collection options;
- b. Our location, provided too costly for collection through current program;
- c. Can we store this material and have it delivered elsewhere?
- d. BAG collects a large amount of this.

#### **13. Organics**

- a. Do we collect them and create a composting location on site?
- b. Promote composting and composters; there are programs whereby municipalities purchase bins and sell to ratepayer's at a reduced rate – providing a composting workshop so people understand how to successfully compost at home.
- c. Yard waste;
- d. Kitchen waste;

#### **14. Industrial, Commercial and Institutional**

- a. Need to solidify rules for these sectors even though we currently have limited numbers; too often we attempt after the fact to provide a solution. We require a proactive stance.
- b. Pipeline, highway construction, tree planting, mine;
- c. Costs, materials accepted? – If waste is produced in our municipality, we need to be able to dispose of it?

#### 15. Operational changes

- a. Record the volume of material from tourist operators and camps to determine how much they are contributing to our landfill and recycling.
  - i. Can they improve their recycling programs?
  - ii. Should fees be put in place specifically for these sectors?
- b. Purchase a stationary compactor to reduce the number of times per week/month we need to contract for cover and also to better compact material to extend the life of our sites.
  - i. Calvin Township has done this; the material sits in the machine for weeks before it needs to be dumped. The compactor was purchased after the vehicle it was located on was too old to be safe to run anymore. I'm sure there are others out there.
- c. Purchase equipment to be operated by our staff to compact material and apply light cover in between times Pat is required to attend site and do a major clean up and create new cells.

Financial Implications/Budget Impact: Could be considerable. There are various options that need to be decided. User Pay would require those who use (or abuse) the service to be responsible for increased costs. All residents should not be paying for those who overuse or abuse the privilege of disposing materials at municipal sites – especially those from outside our area.

Resources and Others Consulted: Ottawa Valley Waste Recovery Centre, Kevin Mooder – Jp2g,

#### Resources:

- ◆ Tipping Fees - <http://www.townshipsofheadclaramaria.ca/reports%20to%20council%202010/Report%20to%20Council%20-%20Tipping%20Fees%20and%20Recycling%20Apr-23-10.pdf>
- ◆ [http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/126/126\\_report.pdf](http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/126/126_report.pdf);
- ◆ [http://www.lacieq2s.ca/public/law/user\\_fees.htm](http://www.lacieq2s.ca/public/law/user_fees.htm);
- ◆ [http://www.muniscope.ca/\\_files/file.php?fileid=filekciMAbQPYC&filename=file\\_user\\_pay\\_sytems.pdf](http://www.muniscope.ca/_files/file.php?fileid=filekciMAbQPYC&filename=file_user_pay_sytems.pdf);
- ◆ [http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/191/191\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/191/191_final_report.pdf);
- ◆ [http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/177/177\\_report.pdf](http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/177/177_report.pdf);
- ◆ [http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/312/312\\_report.pdf](http://www.stewardshipontario.ca/bluebox/pdf/eefund/reports/312/312_report.pdf);

The Following are charts/stats collected from various reports as made available through Stewardship Ontario and Waste Diversion Ontario and may be located in the above noted documents.

# Amount of Recycling Collected for P.E.I. and Relevant Programs and Regulations

| Province-wide Programs and Regulations Introduced  | Year | Recycling Collected (Tonnes) |
|--|------|------------------------------|
| Mandatory recycling and curbside collection of recycling was extended province-wide.   | 2000 | 7205                         |
| Baseline year.   | 2001 | 7161                         |
| Transition year - the following programs were introduced:<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌚ Mandatory source separation, which extended from recycling to also include organics.</li> <li>⌚ Clear bag requirements to enable the enforcement of the mandatory program.</li> <li>⌚ Curbside collection of organics.</li> </ul> <p>The last region made the transition to clear bag requirements in November 2002.</p> | 2002 | 7892                         |
| A 100% increase in recycling tonnage for 2003 compared to the baseline year.   | 2003 | 14 415                       |
| The following recycling tonnages are a conservative estimate because unlike garbage, not all recycling from the business sector is counted. There has been a trend over this time for businesses to market recyclables on their own.   | 2004 | 15 014                       |
|  | 2005 | 15 036                       |
|  | 2006 | 14 410                       |

## Sample of Enforcement: Clear Bag for Garbage Requirements

All residents are provided a minimum of six months notice about the new requirements.

### Enforcement

#### **Stage I Enforcement – (one month to three months for example)**

Any resident that has a non-compliant bag at the curb side will be given a friendly reminder (ex. notice in mailbox) by staff about the new requirements. The bags will still be accepted but residents will be informed about how they were not in compliance, so they can change for when enforcement starts.

**Please note:** Some places break this into two stages where they send friendly reminders in the first stage for people that have non-clear bags, and then friendly reminders in the second stage to people that do not comply with any of the overall requirements (ex. such as recyclables in garbage bag).

#### **Stage II Enforcement**

The program requirements will be fully enforced. Any non-compliant garbage bags (ex. a clear bag that contains recyclables, or a non-clear bag) will be left at curbside. As a rule of thumb to help the drivers monitor for contamination, any clear bag with more than 2 obvious banned items will be left at curb side with a sticker/notice indicating the infraction.

### Variances

Variations to the program may be permitted for requesting facilities or households depending on circumstances. Variations will be dealt with on a case by case basis.

If a request is made, the following protocol will be followed:

- ◆ A convincing reason as to why a variance is needed would be heard

If it is deemed that a variance may be required:

- ◆ A visit would be conducted by the municipality to ensure that they are fully participating in recycling and composting programs
- ◆ A form will be filled out for each case
- ◆ Consideration for a variance would be undertaken
- ◆ Final decision will be at the municipality's discretion
- ◆ If a variance is permitted, the hauler from the area will be notified of the civic address and details of the variance (how many black bags will be allowed).

*Acknowledgement: The variance sample was provided by Amy Hillyard, Regional Coordinator, Yarmouth and Digby Counties.*