

Type of Decision									
Meeting Date	Friday, Oct. 7, 2011				Report Date	Tuesday, October 4, 2011			
Decision Required	X	Yes		No	Priority	X	High		Low
Direction	x	Information Only			Type of Meeting	X	Open		Closed
REPORT TITLE									
Waste Management Report Public Session 07/10/11/401									

Subject: Additional information concerning Waste Management.

BACKGROUND/EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

1. The purpose of this public meeting is to share information with residents and to obtain input in the final version of the waste management by-law.
2. The purpose of the by-law and the goals that Council intend to meet are:
  - a. Reduce the amount of material going to landfill.
  - b. Extend the life of landfill sites.
  - c. Ensure that prohibited materials such as recyclables and household hazardous waste does not enter our landfill.
  - d. Ensure that users of the system are the ones paying for the associated costs.
3. The options chosen by Council to meet those goals include:
  - a. Make recycling mandatory.
  - b. Require that all material is put in clear bags. A "privacy bag" is allowed to be included inside each larger bag.
  - c. Implement tipping fees for all users.
  - d. Allow 2 free bags of garbage per property per week.
  - e. Implement a fee of \$1 per bag over the free limit for 2012 and \$2 per bag in 2013 once people have had time to get used to the program.
  - f. Provide for Amnesty Days following major holidays to allow for those instances where there would normally be an increase in waste.
  - g. Allow the disposal site attendant to refuse bags which contain prohibited materials.
  - h. Make littering or dumping of material outside of designated areas an offense.
  - i. Allow a period of 5 months for full integration of the program using educational reminders for non-compliance for the first part of the program until full enforcement comes into effect By April of 2012.
4. Council has been informed by many residents who participate fully in the recycling program that they only have 1 small bag of waste to dispose of each week. Even so, all taxes go towards the total costs of operation of the landfill, even if the individual is not using it. Implementing a pay for use program including tipping fees for all residents will ensure that the users of the landfill are those responsible for the costs. Correspondingly, taxes allocated for that purpose will decrease.
  - a. If Council can obtain \$20,000 per year in tipping fees from the users of the landfill, it can deduct \$20,000 from the taxes needed to be collected.
  - b. Bags deposited for 2010 total approximately 12,500. At \$1/bag that would amount to \$12,500 in revenue to offset the costs of waste management however; that

number does include the number of “free” bags that were deposited as well. Actual revenues would be subsequently lower. The “tax grab” argument has no merit.

5. Concerns from the commercial operators have been heard as have those of individual ratepayers. I have obtained feedback on both sides on the following points:
  - a. The task of having campers separate waste will be too onerous. From the residents: If residents can do it, and if most campers have to do it now at their homes, why will it be so difficult to recycle at their trailer?
  - b. It is understood that complying with this by-law as drafted is not an option for our commercial operators, saying that it is an unfair tax. From the resident: Is it fair the private property owner pays for their use?
  - c. We have private property within this township, with two residents, who pay the same taxes as some of our commercial operators. The argument that commercial operators paying more taxes does not hold true.
  - d. It was expressed by at least one commercial operator that they contribute a tremendous amount to the community and should receive a benefit for that. Some private residents don't see that benefit.
  - e. Staff have expressed concern with the amount of recyclables being received from one campground operator. We are not commenting on their efforts, simply that the volume coming out of that campground is extremely low compared to others.
  - f. Operators are concerned with the costs they will have to pay. From the resident perspective: As with any other business, if the cost of a product or service increases, should that increase not be passed to the users of the system?
6. In the past, Council has held three Household Hazardous Waste Days with at most 6 visitors per event. Where is everyone else depositing their hazardous waste? Clear bags will help prevent it from going to landfill.
7. Office staff have only received one complaint in response to the circulation of the Waste Management Draft By-law and one letter in support. They have been circulated for your consideration. Other than this, no one else has made any attempt to formally submit information for consideration.
8. This by-law did not appear overnight. The process began in 2006 when consideration for the recycling program began. At this time Council began letting people know that change was coming. Gradual changes were made over the years. In the fall of 2010 the process of creating this by-law began in earnest at the direction of Council. Opportunities were given to members of the public to attend public meetings. Requests were made to send in concerns or suggestions for implementation. The initial report to Council was presented April 6, 2010.
9. In 2011 this by-law was discussed at the following meetings of Council:
  - a. March 18, 2011
  - b. April 1, 2011
  - c. July 15, 2011
  - d. August 12, 2011
  - e. September 9, 2011. Providing ample opportunity for public input.
10. After all options were detailed in a paper delivered to each household, there was a public meeting held on August 12, 2011. There was a definite consensus of the meeting attendees that something needed to be done to increase the material being diverted from our landfill. There were no comments made in regards to the specific options listed in that paper that Council was considering.

11. This by-law will not become enforceable overnight. The plan was to implement the by-law in October. Advertise the changes immediately with the program to begin in January giving people 3 months to prepare, to ask questions and to receive answers. In January, clear bags are to be used; only come February would enforcement begin. OOPS notices would be used for non-conforming bags during that period but the bags would be picked up. On the first of March 2012, compliance would begin for prohibited materials. 100% enforcement would not begin until April 2012 giving residents 6 months to learn the program before there would be penalties.
12. At Council's direction, staff was left to draft a document for their consideration. Council was provided with a draft document for further input prior to the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Modifications were made at that time with Council's amendments being returned to them via email on September 12<sup>th</sup>.
13. Much time has been spent creating this document, something that has been shaped over the past 2 years or more. In preparation, staff have relied on the experience of hundreds of individuals from across this province (and some from further abroad) in the form of reports completed by experts in the field and organized by Waste Diversion Ontario through the Continuous Improvement Fund. Clear bags have been proven to work as shown in the materials distributed. Due to their size, a few of the three main sources of information have been printed and distributed here for your review and are entitled:
  - a. Analysis of User Pay System Costs in Ontario - E&E Project 191; - *The AMRC also gratefully acknowledges the support, assistance and insight provided by members of the project team and study municipalities. These are: Valerie Harvey, City of Brockville; Bhajan Sarker, Town of Marathon; Greg Preston, City of Orillia; Clayton Sampson, County of Oxford; Katie Alward, City of Stratford, and Jeffery Fletcher, Town of the Blue Mountains, Kim Kidd Kitagawa, Region of Waterloo. Thanks should also go to Tracy Quann Strasser at the City of Barrie for her efforts to retrieve ten year old records.*
  - b. User-Pay Systems for Solid Waste Management in Canadian Municipalities; by Glenn Munroe
  - c. Clear Bag Requirements for Garbage: A Better Practice of Innovative Recycling Program Compliance? Report on the Clear Garbage Bag Program in Centre Hastings and Madoc Township - E & E Fund Project Number 312; - Prepared by: Allison Ross, Independent Consultant, Belleville, Ontario
  - d. The Use of Clear Bags for Garbage as a Waste Diversion Strategy: Background Research on Clear Garbage Bag Programs across North America – E & E Funded Project Number 177; - Prepared by: Allison Ross, Special Projects Coordinator, Quinte Waste Solutions in conjunction with 14 municipalities in Canada and 16 municipalities in the United States.
14. The Town of Mattawa implemented the use of clear/transparent bags for all waste over 4 years ago. The program applies to residences as well as commercial operators including Sid Turcotte Park who have complied with this initiative. Although there were some growing pains, this example from one of our neighbours proves that this system works. (Please see comments from a discussion with the owners of Turcotte Park below.)
15. Madawaska Valley also implemented a clear bag system and a fee of \$1 per bag – again working with businesses and campground operators as well. This system too is working.
16. Clear bags allow for the disposal site attendant to ensure that recyclables and hazardous waste are not being deposited in our landfill. To allow for privacy, each bag may contain one “grocery store sized” non-transparent bag. It is hoped that this bag will be used for its intended purpose, to protect people's privacy but as with every system, it is not perfect and there is a chance that prohibited materials may be hidden within.

17. Of the local municipalities who have implemented a user pay system, the system has been applied across the board. If the material being accepted is household type waste, the fee applies. KHR and Bonnechere Valley have allowed an optional bulk fee to be used for commercial containers.

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Tipping Fees – if yes, schedule attached</b>	<b>Bag limits/fees</b>
Mattawa	Yes	<b>Clear bags</b>
Killaloe, Haggarty and Richards	Yes	\$1/bag – Commercial either \$1/bag or \$7/m <sup>3</sup> bulk fee
McNabb Braeside	Yes	\$2.00/bag
Bonnechere Valley	Yes	\$1.50 per bag – Special rate for commercial - \$15/m <sup>3</sup>
Arnprior	Yes	\$122/year and \$2.50 /extra bag tag
Madawaska Valley	Yes	<b>Clear bags - \$1/bag</b>
Whitewater	Yes	\$3/bag – everyone
Greater Madawaska	Yes	
Horton	Yes	2 free additional \$1
Admaston Bromley	Yes	
Renfrew	Yes	6 bags or less collected; anything more businesses must hire their own collector.
Pembroke, Petawawa, Laurentian Valley, North Algona Wilberforce	Yes – Ottawa Valley Waste Recovery	

18. It is up to Council to make policies and procedures for the benefit of the majority of the members of the municipality. The way that Council business is conducted is through our Procedure By-Law which allows for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> reading to bring the issue/document to the table. The following is from the municipal Procedure By-law... “Every by-law shall be introduced and shall have three readings prior to its being passed as follows:

- a. The third reading of a by-law shall permit amendment and debate. At this reading the by-law may be referred by resolution to a committee of Council for further review or clarification, or deferred to a later meeting of Council, or tabled, or approved or defeated.
- b. The third reading will normally be delayed until the next regular meeting following that in which the by-law was introduced, where it will be accompanied by a motion to pass the by-law.
- c. By-laws however, may receive all three readings at one Council meeting.

19. Participation in recycling by this municipality is not mandated by the province due to its size. It is a decision of this Council to implement a municipal wide recycling program. It is voluntary and is an attempt to slow the filling of its disposal sites. Recycling is one method of reducing the amount of material going to landfill to help extend the life of our sites. There are other options including individual or municipal wide composting programs.

20. 2010 Environment expenses totalled \$96,000. Of that recycling is only costing us \$25,000 per year while the remainder of waste management is costing \$ 73,842; a ratio of 3:1. We are spending about 25% of our total waste management costs on recycling, the remainder goes to landfill. These are the costs we are attempting to spread across the users of the system and not simply the tax base. If you reduce the amount of material being land filled, we can reduce the amount we need to pay for disposal sites. No matter how much material

is recycled, municipal costs will not increase except due to annual cost of living calculations and possible increases at contract renegotiation. The contractor receives revenue from the material that he diverts from our land fill. The more we give him, the more money he makes, not costing us anything more.

- a. Landfill operational costs directly associated with volume include the costs of applied cover, compacting, covering the filled cells, creating new cells, moving the bear fencing as the cells fill up and eventually purchasing additional land and licensing new sites. This can be reduced by the volume of material that we are accepting at our landfill.
  - b. The more garbage received, the sooner the cell needs to be covered and the sooner the cell needs to be compacted and moved. For 2010 the costs specifically attributed to cover, cell compaction and moving bear fencing totalled \$13,855. In 2011 these costs total \$13,815 to the end of September. With decreased volume come a decreased number of cells and a longer life for each of our sites.
  - c. Costs we need to anticipate in the future include closure and post closure costs totalling \$196,788; MOE application for expansion or new site estimated at \$15,000 - \$20,000 per site depending on the particular circumstances; purchase of land for expansion or location of new site \$? (too many variables to estimate). These are the costs that we are attempting to postpone for as long as necessary by increasing diversion.
  - d. Overhead costs are those related to licensing, environmental monitoring, attendant wages, and disposal site vehicle; no matter the volume these costs are constant. Whether we have 1 bag or 1000 bags we still have to meet those costs.
21. A recent ad from AMO and included with this report states "*If the consumers and businesses who create waste don't pay, property taxpayers are left holding the bag – and paying the bill.*" We all need to do our part, paying for waste is a cost of doing business and should be passed on to the generator. In the ad they are targeting the consumer and the producers of the product (the steward). In our case, we need to target the consumer who in this case turns out to be the resident and/or the camper.
22. The draft by-law is a compilation of issues, strategies and solutions that have worked elsewhere. This document is the "best" that we could create with the information and circumstances that we have right now. It may need amendment and may receive it over time. That is a result of growth, education, growing pains. No one is saying that it is the final voice on the subject. Council is asking for public input prior to adopting the final version to help make this document a truly effective working document that will provide a benefit for the current and future needs of the residents of this municipality.
23. Council is considering forming a committee for further consideration of this by-law before implementation. There is evidence that this program will work. Perhaps a better use of resources would be to adopt the by-law as it currently stands and form a committee to review the results after 3, 6 and 9 months to allow for changes to be implemented to solve real and not simply perceived problems. Although it is a by-law, it is not written in stone and can be changed.
24. A discussion was had with the operators of Sid Turcotte Park in Mattawa on Thursday, October 6, 2011 where the clear bag rule was implemented over 4 years ago. When asked for her opinion on challenges that they experienced when this change was implemented in enforcing it to their campers the owner responded with "we didn't have any?"

- a. When pressed and asked for further details she replied that they don't have a problem, that people simply comply. They do have some campers who use white kitchen catchers but do not seem to have any other problems. The Town of Mattawa accepts these as they are small and obviously do not hide large volumes of prohibited material.
- b. When asked if they hand people clear bags to use – she stated no.
- c. When asked if they had a shed or bin so that people could just dump their material - she stated that no – if you did that then people would simply dump everything in there, that some campground operators run their operation's like that but they are only looking for trouble.
- d. Their system is to place small bins throughout the park and have them dumped 2-3 times per day during the summer months; during the shoulder season, less often. She explained that in effect, this practise is actually a screening of the material that people dump. They do not have the opportunity to dump large volumes of material, only what will fit inside the smaller bins. She explained that it is easy to see who is not complying and they simply speak with them and ask them to change their habits.
- e. When I explained the concerns of our operators – the need to police the garbage and continually sort it she did concede that in the beginning there would be growing pains however with a concerted effort by everybody involved, including the Town workers who leave materials that are unacceptable at the curb side; the program can and does work.

25. The purpose of this public meeting is to receive comments and opinions from members of the public to make this by-law a workable document. No matter the decision, Council cannot please everybody.

26. Could we now please open the floor to members of the public to suggest the specific changes that they feel are needed? While still meeting Council's objectives.