

## **Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process - Request for Proposals for Proven Diversion Services**

*(City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)*

### **The Works Committee:**

- (1) recommends the adoption of the report dated October 26, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services; and**
- (2) further recommends that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to undertake the following activities:**
  - (i) for the purpose of assisting Council in the decision on the award in the Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process (TIRM) diversion Request for Proposals (RFP) process, conduct a comparative analysis of an in-house solid waste diversion solution using the technology and system components proposed by Toronto Civic Employees' Union - CUPE Local 416, to be completed at the time of the proposal closing in the TIRM process;**
  - (ii) incorporate within the above analysis a further option, if possible, of maintaining the existing blue and grey box programs in order to promote and maximize source separation of recyclables; and**
  - (iii) establish a protocol to ensure the objectivity of the comparative analysis.**

The Works Committee reports, for the information of Council, having:

- (1) requested the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report directly to Council for its meeting commencing on November 23, 1999, on:**
  - (i) any adjustments which may be required to the RFP to harmonize the approaches taken to greenhouse gas emissions and/or deficits within the RFP for diversion and for disposal;**
  - (ii) any adjustments which may be required to the RFP to harmonize the issue between diversion and disposal contracts regarding turning over the facilities in 20 years; and**
  - (iii) whether or not modifications to the RFP criteria are required with regard to greenhouse gas emissions, in particular to account for the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions that could be accomplished by using anaerobically**

produced digester gas to displace the production of electricity or other forms of energy and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions elsewhere;

(2) further requested that:

- (i) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services review and comment on the Wet/Dry Proposal submitted by CUPE Local 416 and the Toronto Environmental Alliance (TEA), and report back thereon to the meeting of the Works Committee scheduled to be held on March 22, 2000;
- (ii) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services further report to the March 2000 Works Committee meeting on current plans and budget commitments for constructing composting and recycling facilities to see if these plans could be modified to fit with a wet/dry system; and as part of the review, on using the Dufferin composting and sorting plants to quickly implement the first phase of the CUPE/TEA Wet/Dry Plan; and
- (iii) the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, be requested to review the CUPE/TEA proposal's financial recommendations, and report back thereon to the March 2000 Works Committee meeting; and

(3) commended the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Toronto Environmental Alliance for their efforts in developing a proposal aimed at saving the City money, helping the environment and creating jobs.

**The Works Committee submits the following report (October 26, 1999) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services:**

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to seek Council authority to issue the Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process ("TIRM") Request for Proposals ("RFP") for Proven Diversion Services.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no direct financial considerations arising from this report.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process Request for Proposals for Proven Diversion Services be approved for issuance on or about December 1, 1999, substantially in accordance with the Request for Proposals document attached to this report as Appendix "A".

### Council Reference/Background/History:

On October 2, 1998, City Council provided direction to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to:

“...immediately proceed to engage the marketplace to secure solid waste management options including waste diversion and disposal capacity to meet the City’s long-term requirements through a Request for Expressions of Interest and Request for Proposals process based on the work undertaken in the planning process to date, but without proceeding to the submission of an environmental assessment.” (Clause No. 2 of Report No. 8 of The Works and Utilities Committee.)

In addition, City Council provided direction on a comprehensive range of policy and operational matters, which are summarized below:

- the establishment of a 50 percent diversion rate by the year 2006 or sooner;
- inclusion of potential export to the United States;
- inclusion of Energy from Waste (“EFW”) technology as a marketplace option;
- engagement of Regional governments in the Greater Toronto Area as potential partners with Toronto for future disposal capacity contracts;
- active consideration of potential partnership proposals with Toronto that may contain a range of options including transfer of ownership or leasing arrangements; and
- preparation of a planning process to engage the marketplace that includes public and industry consultation and development of multi-faceted evaluation criteria.

At its meeting of April 13, 14, and 15, 1999, City Council approved the issuance of the Request for Expressions of Interest (“REOI”) document for three categories: Category 1, Proven Diversion; Category 2, Proven Disposal; and Category 3, New and Emerging Technologies.

On April 26, 1999, the TIRM REOI was issued as per the Council approved schedule. The TIRM REOI closed on May 31, 1999. A subsequent report, dated July 5, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, provided members of the Works Committee and Toronto City Council with the results of the application of the evaluation criteria to the 32 submissions received in response to the TIRM REOI. Of the 32 responses received, 23 were identified as qualified to proceed to the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) stage (TIRM – Stage 3), with eight responses qualified in Category 1, Proven Diversion Capacity.

On July 27, 28, and 29, 1999, City Council adopted recommended amendments to the TIRM project schedule. The amendments further integrate the RFP processes for acquiring new disposal capacity and for diversion capacity, and will provide Council with the ability to make decisions on disposal and diversion options in an integrated manner.

At its meeting of September 28 and 29, 1999, City Council approved the issuance of an RFP for Proven Disposal Services, and adopted a recommendation to engage MacViro Consultants Inc., and Tory Tory DesLauriers & Binnington, to assist staff in the RFP process for new diversion capacity. The RFP for Disposal Services closes on December 15, 1999. City Council also

authorized at that time the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services not to proceed with the design and issuance of an RFP for New and Emerging Technologies, under Category 3 of the TIRM Process. The Commissioner was also authorized to develop a secondary planning process for the potential engagement of the types of proposals previously submitted under Category 3 of the TIRM Process.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

The attached RFP for solid waste diversion services has incorporated the body of policy decisions made by Council during the course of the TIRM Process. The RFP is designed to provide the City with new diversion capacity to meet and potentially exceed City Council's policy objective of 50 percent diversion of the residential waste stream by 2006 or sooner.

The RFP is premised on a "design, build, own, operate, and transfer" process for the Respondents. It provides the City with the ability to engage the marketplace for the provision of diversion technologies and the marketing of recovered resources on a fee per tonne basis. Should a City-owned site be used, the City would have the option to purchase an operating facility at a depreciated price at two, five, ten and 15-year intervals, following the initiation of operations. At the end of the 20-year operating period, Toronto will have the right, at its sole discretion, to take over the ownership of the facility at no cost.

The RFP provides Respondents with the option of siting a facility on their own property (leased or owned outright) or proposing siting a facility at a City-owned transfer station or other City property.

For the purpose of this RFP, potential utilization of the Scarborough Transfer Station (near Markham Road and Sheppard Avenue East) is proposed for comparative purposes. The Scarborough site has existing amenities such as weigh scales, waste compaction equipment, and an existing Certificate of Approval for solid waste management.

The potential utilization of a transfer station follows the established policy of siting diversion facilities at transfer stations. The City currently has a Materials Recovery Facility operating at the Commissioners Street Transfer Station in the Portlands, and is proceeding to construct a new Materials Recovery Facility and a mixed waste recycling and organics processing facility at the Dufferin Street Transfer Station (near Dufferin Street and the 401). The facility at the Dufferin Street Transfer Station has the potential to expand to a throughput capacity of 100,000 tonnes of mixed waste per year or 150,000 tonnes of organics per year.

Additional transfer stations and other City-owned land may be subsequently identified as we proceed to consider implementation of diversion facilities.

The option of utilization of City-owned facilities is being proposed through the RFP for Diversion Services, unlike the RFP for Disposal Services, for several reasons, which are summarized as follows:

- The approvals process for certain types of diversion facilities is different from that of a disposal facility. If the City were to offer City-owned land for a disposal facility we would be virtually assured of being named as a co-proponent in an Environmental Assessment under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. By contrast, the approvals process for facilities processing leaf and yard waste and some source separated materials is governed by Standardized Approval Regulations (“SARs”). The SARs allow for approvals without proceeding through an individual Environmental Assessment or the issuance of a Certificate of Approval. Other approvals for diversion facilities may require a Certificate of Approval. There remains the potential for the Minister of the Environment to designate any diversion facility under the Environmental Assessment Act;
- utilization of existing facilities reduces the costs associated with the diversion projects and therefore assists in meeting Council’s policy objective of 50 percent diversion by 2006 or sooner;
- our transfer stations are currently receiving and handling large volumes of solid waste and have established traffic pattern flows and hours of operation, and provide at-hand the means to manage residuals that require disposal; and
- utilization of our transfer stations demonstrates a commitment and willingness to manage a percentage of our solid waste resources within the City, and reduces transportation impacts associated with the movement of solid waste resources beyond our borders.

In accordance with City Council’s policy objectives, the RFP for Diversion Services is designed to provide the City with the flexibility to address future policy modifications and solid waste resource market changes, through the following means:

- for a facility located on Toronto property, the RFP provides Toronto with the ability to acquire ownership at two, five, ten and 15-year intervals and to integrate City staff (union and management) into the plant operations one year prior to the transfer of ownership to facilitate a skills and knowledge exchange;
- the RFP provides Toronto with the ability to renegotiate the operating and maintenance fee per tonne at two, five, ten and 15-year intervals to account for any increases in the prices of products;
- Respondents can offer partnership proposals for alternative revenue and risk sharing arrangements, in addition to mandatory fee per tonne proposals;
- Toronto can ensure that material coming into a diversion facility on City-owned land is City-only material;
- a preferred customer clause will be in place for facilities on non-Toronto land, where Toronto is providing for over 50 percent of the materials managed;

- Toronto can have the Respondent assume all risk for marketing output materials, or renegotiate to receive a percentage of the revenue for marketed materials;
- Toronto maintains ownership of all associated emission credits, including greenhouse gases reduction credits; and
- Toronto will have the option to contract with one or more Respondents offering a range of technologies, including the ability to manage mixed waste and/or source separated organics, and/or leaf and yard wastes.

#### Development and Application of Evaluation Criteria:

The evaluation process includes the initial application of mandatory screening criteria followed by the application of the following four comparative evaluation criteria:

- (1) Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions (15 points);
- (2) Traffic Impact (10 points);
- (3) Jobs and Investment (15 points – 10 in Toronto and 5 in Ontario); and
- (4) Waste Diversion Rate to System Cost Ratio (60 points – as it captures both diversion and cost).

The evaluation criteria will be applied to the Respondents' service proposals. The service proposal will consist of the Respondents' technical (environmental) proposal, price proposal (fee per tonne), exceptions and partnership offers. Part A, Section 5 and Appendix B of the RFP document provide a description of the mandatory and comparative evaluation criteria and the process to identify top-qualified proposals.

The top-qualified proposals will then be carried forward to City Council following the evaluation, including the consideration of any partnership offers. At that time we will seek Council's authorization to proceed with due diligence and contract negotiations.

The project schedule calls for the top-qualified proposals to be before Council in April 2000, with a recommendation(s) regarding engagement in contracts in August- September 2000.

#### Stakeholder Consultation on Diversion:

Prior to the development of the Diversion RFP document, stakeholders were invited to a meeting, held on September 9, 1999, at Toronto City Hall. The purpose of the meeting was to solicit stakeholder input on the evaluation methodology to be used in the selection of top-ranked proposals. A letter dated August 30, 1999, was sent out to those on the project database inviting them to participate. This database includes all those who have expressed an interest in this project in the past. In addition, advertisements inviting the public to this meeting were placed in City of Toronto community newspapers during the week of August 30, 1999. (Comments were also invited by telephone, fax, e-mail and mail.) As a result of this meeting, the following three "high priority" evaluation criteria were identified by the participants: health and the environment; residue threshold; and quality of the end product.

The project's newsletter (Volume 2, Bulletin 4, October 1999) features a summary of the stakeholder meeting held on September 9, 1999.

Qualified Respondents in Category 1, Proven Diversion, were also invited to comment on the RFP evaluation methodology prior to the development of the RFP for Diversion. Input from the Respondents was taken into account when formulating the RFP document.

Site specific consultation will take place as facilities are identified for engagement of diversion facilities. Advertised events, such as open houses, will be held at City-owned locations where diversion facilities will operate in order to familiarize interested members of the public with the diversion technologies, solicit feedback, and encourage public involvement in diversion programs.

Other consultation activities planned for the diversion process include an information session on the RFP submissions received and stakeholder consultation on diversion systems. Stakeholders will continue to be notified of opportunities for public participation and updated on the TIRM Process through the project newsletters and postings on project information on the web site.

#### Conclusions:

We are recommending that Council approve the issuance of the TIRM RFP for Proven Diversion Services on or about December 1, 1999, substantially in accordance with the RFP document attached to this report as Appendix "A". The RFP for Diversion Services is scheduled to close on February 29, 2000. A list of top-qualified Proposals is then scheduled to be recommended to Council in April 2000, with recommendations for contracting to come before Council in August-September 2000, following the due diligence process and contract negotiations.

#### Contact Name:

Lawson Oates, B.A., M.E.S., Manager, Strategic Planning  
Solid Waste Management Services  
Works and Emergency Services  
Metro Hall, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Phone: 392-9744; Fax: 392-4754  
E-mail: lawson\_oates@city.toronto.on.ca

**The Works Committee also submits the following communication (November 3, 1999) from Councillor Jack Layton, Don River:**

Recommendations:

- (1) That Works staff review and comment on the CUPE/TEA Wet/Dry proposal and report back to the December 1, 1999 Works Committee meeting.
- (2) That Works staff report back to the January 12, 2000 Works Committee meeting on current plans and budget commitments for constructing composting and recycling facilities to see if these plans could be modified to fit with a wet/dry system. As part of this review, staff report on using the Dufferin composting and sorting plants to quickly implement the first phase of the CUPE/TEA Wet/Dry Plan.
- (3) That the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, review the CUPE/TEA proposal's financial recommendations and report back to the January 12, 2000 Works Committee meeting.
- (4) That the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Toronto Environmental Alliance be commended for their efforts in developing a proposal aimed at saving the City money, helping the environment and creating jobs for Toronto residents and that Council supports keeping all components of this proposal within the public sector.

---

The Works Committee reports, for the information of Council, having also had before it during consideration of the foregoing matter the following communications and submissions:

- (i) communication (October 21, 1999) from Mr. Peter Leiss, Executive Vice-President, Toronto Civic Employees' Union – CUPE Local 416, submitting a document entitled “CUPE Waste Management Plan for the City of Toronto” for distribution at the Works Committee meeting of November 3, 1999;
- (ii) Waste Management Plan (October 1999) entitled “Green Jobs and a Green Future”, submitted by Toronto Civic Employees' Union - CUPE Local 416 and the Toronto Environmental Alliance, prepared by Russell Environmental Services for Local 416 and built around a “wet-dry” recycling model which would include garbage and recycling picked up in the same truck;
- (iii) submission (undated) by Emery International Developments Ltd. respecting an offer to provide the means for recycling the final residues of the paper and packaging industries;
- (iv) communication (November 2, 1999) from Mr. John Cartwright, Business Manager, Construction Trades Council, in support of the CUPE proposal “Green Jobs and a Green Future”;



- (v) submission (November 3, 1999) by Mr. Lawson Oates, Manager, Strategic Planning, Solid Waste Management Works and Emergency Services, respecting Toronto's Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process (TIRM) Diversion RFP Process;
- (vi) submission (November 3, 1999) by Mr. Mario Kani, Allen Kani Associates, expressing concerns with respect to the proposed environmental weighting in the evaluation criteria for Category 1 – Proven Diversion, and that the RFP process does not have sufficient flexibility between Categories 1 and 2 in order to choose projects with maximum environmental benefit;
- (vii) communication (November 2, 1999) from Mr. Gregory M. Vogt, President, Super Blue Box Recycling Corp., commenting on the draft RFP for proven diversion capacity as part of the TIRM process, and the comparison of diversion to disposal costs;
- (viii) submission (November 3, 1999) by Mr. Jim Hamilton, Thornton, Ontario, member of Stop Incineration Now, respecting the proposal by AGRA Resource Management to the Town of Innisfil to develop an energy-from-waste and composting facility; and
- (ix) document (October 1999) entitled "Innisfil Refuse-Fuelled Power Plant Study – Research Findings" prepared by Angus Reid Group, Inc., and submitted to the Town Council of Innisfil, submitted by Councillor Jack Layton, Don River.

The following persons appeared before the Works Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Gord Perks, Toronto Environmental Alliance; Mr. Brian Cochrane, President, and Mr. Peter Leiss, Executive Vice-President, Toronto Civic Employees' Union - CUPE Local 416; and Ms. Pam Russell, Russell Environmental Services, and presented a Waste Management Plan entitled "Green Jobs and a Green Future";
- Mr. Roy Emery, Emery International Developments Ltd., and submitted material with respect thereto;
- Mr. Mario Kanni, Allen Kanni Associates, and submitted a copy of his deputation;
- Mr. Gregory M. Vogt, President, Super Blue Box Recycling Corp., and submitted a communication with respect thereto;
- Mr. John Cartwright, Business Manager, Construction Trades Council, and submitted a communication with respect thereto;
- Mr. Jim Hamilton, Thornton, Ontario, member of "Stop Incineration Now", and submitted material with respect thereto;
- Mrs. Lois James, Scarborough, Ontario; and
- Councillor Joan King, Seneca Heights.

(A copy of Appendix A, Request for Proposals for Proven Diversion Services, referred to in the foregoing report has been forwarded to all Members of Council, and a copy thereof is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

*(City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following report (November 22, 1999) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services:*

*Purpose:*

*The purpose of this report is to provide responses directly to City Council, as requested by the Works Committee on November 3, 1999, to three information requests regarding proposed adjustments and modifications to the Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management (“TRIM”) Process Requests for Proposals (“REP’s”) for Proven Disposal Capacity and Proven Diversion Capacity.*

*Financial Implications and Impact Statement:*

*There are no direct financial considerations arising from this report.*

*Recommendation:*

*It is recommended that this report be received for information.*

*Background:*

*On November 3, 1999, Works Committee had before it a report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services (dated October 26, 1999), titled “Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management Process – Request for Proposals for Proven Diversion Services”. Works Committee has recommended to Council the adoption of this report. It is listed on City Council’s agenda of November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, as Report No. 2 of Clause No. 5 of the Works Committee.*

*During its consideration of the report regarding an RFP for Proven Diversion Services several deputants came forward and raised issues related to the conditions and evaluation criteria in the RFPs for Proven Diversion Capacity and Proven Disposal Capacity. City Council had previously approved the issuance of an RFP for Proven Disposal Capacity at its meeting of September 28, 29, and 30, 1999. The RFP for Proven Disposal Capacity closes on December 15, 1999.*

*At the conclusion of the deputations, Works Committee asked the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to respond to three information requests and report directly to the City Council meeting of November 23, 24, and 25, 1999. The three information requests and the corresponding responses are presented below.*

*Comments:*

*Information Request No. 1.*

*Report on “Any adjustments which may be required to the RFP to harmonize the approaches taken to greenhouse gas emissions and/or deficits within the RFP for diversion and for disposal.”*

*Response:*

*Both the TIRM RFP’s for Proven Diversion Capacity and Proven Disposal Capacity require that the City retain greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emission reduction credits.*

*Based on policy direction to date it has not been City Council’s intention to undertake a direct comparison between diversion and disposal proposals. Two key tenets of the TIRM Process that have been established by City Council are the policy of advancing to a 50 percent diversion rate by 2006 or sooner for residential waste, and the establishment of three categories of solid waste management to which the marketplace could respond through the TIRM Process:*

- (1) Proven Diversion Capacity;*
- (2) Proven Disposal Capacity; and*
- (3) New and Emerging Technologies.*

*Accordingly, it is not the intention through the TIRM Process to make a direct comparison between diversion and disposal proposals. Proposals within each category will be evaluated utilizing comparative evaluation criteria that are relevant to the potential effects unique to that category of waste management practice.*

*Therefore, evaluation criteria, including the address of GHG emissions in the RFP for Proven Diversion Capacity is different than the criteria proposed for the evaluation of proposals under the RFP for Proven Disposal Capacity.*

*GHG emissions are the dominant priority pollutant associated with waste diversion practices. On the other hand, waste disposal, particularly disposing of the waste that remains after the application of waste diversion practices, has the potential to release to the environment various categories of macro-environmental pollutants, in addition to GHG emissions. Therefore, heavy metals, trace organics, smog precursors and acid gases, as well as GHG emissions are addressed by the evaluation criteria within the RFP for Proven Disposal Capacity.*

*The net GHG emissions associated with both diversion and disposal facilities are being evaluated, within their respective categories, in terms of the emissions generated by the facility and the displacement of conventional energy through alternative energy production.*

*Therefore, the approach to GHG emissions is already harmonized to the extent possible as the City retains the rights to GHG credits and both RFP’s evaluate the impact of net GHG emissions associated with the facility.*

*Information Request No. 2*

*Report on “Any adjustments which may be required to the RFP to harmonize the issue between diversion and disposal contracts regarding turning over the facilities in 20 years.”*

*Response*

*The draft RFP for Proven Diversion Capacity identifies a process whereby if a Respondent was to site a diversion facility at a Toronto transfer station (or other Toronto-owned land) based on a twenty-year contract, at the close of the contract the facility would become the property of the City. This clause would not apply if the Respondent proposed a diversion facility on their own land, unless otherwise negotiated.*

*This process has been designed in this fashion because twenty years is a reasonable timeframe for financing the project with a financial institution and seeking a return on capital investment, and ensures that the facility will become the property of the City, given that it would be sited on City-owned land. The potential increase in costs that a Respondent may face through this clause, is offset by the potential provision of City-owned land at no cost to the Respondent.*

*A Respondent could offer an exception to this clause in their submission. However, it would be at the City’s discretion to accept the proposed exception or not. Based on the content of the draft RFP for Proven Diversion Capacity, the City would have the option to purchase the facility after 2, 5, 10, and 15 years of operations.*

*A similar clause providing options to purchase a disposal facility that the City has contracted for disposal capacity, does not carry with it the same issues related to a facility on City-owned land.*

*First, the inclusion of such options may be considered more than a simple contracting out for waste disposal capacity, as authorized by Council to date, thereby raising issues of approvals required under the Environmental Assessment Act. To include such a clause would also require a re-opening of the matter and an amendment to the RFP by City Council, followed by subsequent consultation with stakeholders.*

*Secondly, the inclusion of purchase options, as mandatory conditions, would complicate the evaluation of the proposals as such options, as a matter of the City’s municipal jurisdiction and powers, could only apply to the purchase of land within Ontario and not to the United State sites. Even then, if it is intended to compare option prices as part of a comparative evaluation, the comparison would be difficult as the prices offered would have to be assessed in relation to the liabilities associated with a site, including residual contamination (which could not be determined until the completion of the due diligence phase).*

*Thirdly, subject to the final proposals and the nature of the contracts for Proven Disposal Capacity, the City will likely be shipping its residual solid waste to a disposal facility that is intended to serve multiple customers and to operate up to twenty-years or more. The inclusion of such mandatory purchase options would likely affect the prices offered to the City, if not resulting in a number of Respondents re-considering their intended submissions.*

*For the reasons stated above, we do not recommend a harmonization between the diversion and disposal contracts regarding turning over facilities at the close of a 20-year contract.*

*Information Request No. 3*

*Report on “Whether or not modifications to the RFP criteria are required with regard to greenhouse gas emissions, in particular to account for the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions that could be accomplished by using anaerobically produced digester gas to displace the production of electricity or other forms of energy and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions elsewhere.”*

*Response:*

*The evaluation criteria within the draft RFP for Proven Diversion Capacity incorporates as a credit the Respondent’s ability to reduce or avoid GHG emissions, through conversion of organic matter to energy, in order to displace the production of electricity or other forms of energy.*

*Table 5.1 of the draft RFP (p. A-38) contains the following description of the comparative evaluation criteria related to GHG emissions:*

*“Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions, associated with the system elements of a diversion proposal (i.e. collection requirements, processing operations, and direct energy resource offset credits), and measured carbon dioxide and methane emissions expressed as CO<sup>2</sup> global warming potential equivalents.”*

*We therefore do not recommend a modification to the RFP evaluation criteria with regard to avoidance of GHG emissions, as this has been integrated into the evaluation criteria.*

*Two qualified Respondents in the diversion category have identified proposed technologies that utilize anaerobic digestion for the management of solid waste, which include the production of biogas that can be utilized for energy production.*

*Conclusions:*

*In conclusion, we present the following summaries of our positions regarding the three information requests identified by Works Committee:*

- (1) Based on the establishment of Council policy to date and the points raised in this report, we do not recommend any action be taken by City Council to further adjust approaches to the evaluation of GHG emissions within the RFPs for diversion and disposal. The approach to GHG emissions is already harmonized to the extent possible as the City retains the rights to GHG credits and both RFP’s evaluate the impact of net GHG emissions associated with the facility;*

- (2) *We do not recommend that disposal facilities, with which the City contracts, become City property after 20 years because of the difficulty associated with the evaluation, the potential effect on pricing, and the potential impact on Respondents who may elect not to submit a proposal and therefore reduce the competitive marketplace response; and*
- (3) *We do not recommend the modification of the evaluation criteria in the RFP for Diversion Capacity as it already contains the inclusion of evaluation of the avoidance of GHG emissions through the production of bio-gas that can be used for power generation.*

Contact:

*Lawson Oates, B.A., M.E.S.  
Manager, Strategic Planning  
Solid Waste Management Services  
Works and Emergency Services  
Metro Hall, 19<sup>th</sup> floor  
Phone: (416) 392-9744  
FAX: (416) 392-4754  
E-mail: loates@city.toronto.on.ca)*

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following:*

- (i) *(November 22, 1999) from Mr. James Crockin, in opposition to the Adams Mine as a Mega-Landfill and in support of Waste Diversion;*
- (ii) *(November 22, 1999) from Ms. Lynn Fraleigh in opposition to the Adams Mine as a Mega-Landfill and in support of Waste Diversion;*
- (iii) *(November 22, 1999) from Ms. Francine Patterson and 12 additional signatories, all in opposition to the Adams Mine as a Mega-Landfill and in support of Waste Diversion; and*
- (iv) *(November 10, 1999) from Mr. Roy W. Emery, Emery International Development Limited, providing information with respect to the methods used by Emery International for unused recycling waste.)*