



SSO and Recycling Infrastructure Sub-Committee – January 5, 2010

- 1. Disco SSO Facility Negotiations**
- 2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002
Review Impacts**
- 3. Mixed Waste Processing
Facility Proposed at Green
Lane Landfill Property**

Geoff Rathbone, General Manager
Solid Waste Management Services
City of Toronto



1. Disco SSO Facility Negotiations

Update

- As per Council direction, negotiations underway with AECOM.
- Results of negotiations will be presented at the February 2, 2010 Public Works & Infrastructure Committee meeting.

2 Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Background

- Act passed in June 2002, mandated a review within 5 years.
- MOE began consultation in April 2007.
- City participated in consultation sessions and submitted written comments.
- Consultation culminated in Minister's report on the *Waste Diversion Act, 2002* review – posted on Environmental Registry on October 28, 2009.
- Deadline for comments – February 1, 2010.

2 Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendation:

1. **Extended producer responsibility – producers fully responsible for waste diversion from residential and ICI sectors.**

City Comments:

- *City supports producers being fully and financially responsible.*
- *Supports designation of all packaging and printed paper sold in Ontario.*
- *Producers should be financially responsible for all printed paper and packaging disposed in recycling, litter, organics or waste streams.*

2 Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendation:

2. Producers be given flexibility to decide how to achieve their WDA regulated obligations – could join a materials management scheme or develop their own individual diversion plan.

City Comments:

- *Flexibility should not be at expense of consumer convenience and accessibility.*
- *Municipalities should have opportunity to participate in planning and operation of new system – provide services at a fair price.*
- *Concerned that flexibility for individual producers could lead to fragmentation of collection system (e.g., depot for cereal boxes, another depot for pop cans) – resident confusion and lower participation.*

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendation:

3. Penalties would be levied on products that fail to meet material specific diversion targets.

City Comments:

- *Penalties must be significant.*
- *Must avoid situation where penalties become a cost of doing business since cheaper than operating diversion program (amount of a parking ticket has to be higher than the price to park).*

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendations

4. Develop a five-year waste diversion schedule as follows:
 - ICI printed paper and packaging, WEEE Phase 3, construction and demolition materials [two years].
 - Bulky items (e.g., furniture and mattresses) [three/four years].
 - Branded organics, vehicles, small household items [five years].

City Comments:

- *Designation of branded organics should occur sooner than five years.*
- *White goods should be included in WEEE Phase 3.*

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendations:

5. Designated materials banned from landfill when a viable alternative to disposal exists.

City Comments:

- *City supports as it will drive diversion.*

6. Disposal levy to narrow gap between cost of disposal and diversion – revenues to be used to advance diversion efforts of businesses, consumers and municipalities.

City Comments:

- *Levy needs to be high enough to influence waste diversion behaviour change.*
- *Revenue should be earmarked for program promotion and Research & Development to support waste diversion efforts.*
- *Levies on municipal waste should be rebated for local diversion initiatives.*

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Minister's Recommendations:

7. During transition phase, attention to focus on minimal disruption of service for consumers. Current framework to remain in place for existing programs until transition is complete.

City Comments

- *During transition to full EPR system, municipalities should be reimbursed for 100% of their costs.*
- *Municipalities should be compensated for stranded assets.*
- *Stranded assets should be assessed based on a number of factors including value of Certificate of Approval, infrastructure and operational equipment, and land value.*

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

Processing Implications

- In August 2009, Council approved Request for Proposal (RFP) for project plan and engineering studies for re-development of Dufferin Waste Management Facility.
- Re-development to include a new 240,000 tonnes per year Material Recovery Facility (MRF).
- Plans for new MRF on hold until *Waste Diversion Act, 2002* transition plan and future role of City is clarified.
- Will consider contract options for existing processors in the interim.

2. Waste Diversion Act, 2002 Review Impacts

NEXT STEPS

- City to submit its written comments to Minister through Environmental Registry by February 1, 2010.
- Once Minister decides what changes to make, new legislation would be drafted and posted on Environmental Registry.
- Proposed legislation would then be debated through Legislature and Committee hearings prior to receiving approval and Royal Assent.
- Could take at least two to three years before changes to WDA take effect. Transition timeline could be significantly longer.



3. Mixed Waste Processing Facility Proposed at Green Lane Landfill Property

- Target 70 strategy includes developing new infrastructure to process and treat residual waste.
- Provides 8% diversion towards 70%.
- Comprehensive study recommended Mechanical and Biological Treatment Technology operating on City-owned property adjacent to Green Lane Landfill.
- Ministry of the Environment issued draft updated compost standards (November 2009) for consultation. Final standards anticipated in 2010.

3. Mixed Waste Processing Facility Proposed at Green Lane Landfill Property

Public consultation (Green Lane Landfill area):

- Presentations to Southwold Township Council, First Nations Liaison Committee, Green Lane PLC.
- Open Houses in St. Thomas – September 29 & 30, 2009.
- September 29, 2009 at Green Lane Landfill:
 - 80 key stakeholders and neighbours invited;
 - Over 65 attendees.
- September 30, 2009 in St. Thomas:
 - Public session, advertised in local newspaper;
 - Over 60 attendees, including local media and MPP staff.
- 28 submissions/comments received.
- Key Issues:
 - Odour, leachate and traffic concerns;
 - Anaerobic preferable to aerobic composting;
 - Community benefits;
 - Increase area of property value protection plan.

3. Mixed Waste Processing Facility Proposed at Green Lane Landfill Property

Public consultation (Toronto):

- Solicited public comments:
 - Invitation to 1300 stakeholders on study mailing list (October 20, 2009);
 - Advertisements in Toronto community newspapers (November 26, & 27, 2009);
 - City website.
- 21 submissions/comments received (comment period ended December 31, 2009).
- Key Issues:
 - Consider other technologies (e.g., EFW, cogeneration, residue for asphalt).
 - Financial/cost concerns (e.g., let budget dictate technology, maximize value for taxpayers, consider transportation costs, sell energy).
- Residual Waste Working Group, citizen advisory group, provided input and advice throughout the study.
- Comments will be used during the RFP stage.



3. Mixed Waste Processing Facility Proposed at Green Lane Landfill Property

Next Steps

- A Request for Pre-Qualification (RFPQ) submission will be released in January 2010.
- This RFPQ will result in a shortlist of qualified Respondents, who will be invited to respond to a RFP call for the design, construction and operation of a minimum 150,000 tonnes per year facility.
- The RFPQ will also consider private sector MBT processing contract arrangements.



3. Mixed Waste Processing Facility Proposed at Green Lane Landfill Property

Timelines

- RFPQ – January to March 2010.
- Bid Evaluation – April to May 2010.
- Prepare RFP – March to September 2010.
- Issue RFP – Late 2010.
- Evaluate and Recommend Proponent – Mid 2011.
- Award report to Council – Mid 2011.
- Begin infrastructure construction or enter into a contract with existing private sector processor – Late 2011.