

New & Emerging Technologies, Policies & Practices Advisory Group Responses to “Getting to 60% and Beyond” Staff Report

Staff Report Recommendation	AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i>
<p>Recommendation 1: The City mandate that apartment owners provide adequate recycling container capacity to enable residents to fully participate in the recycling program, with failure to comply resulting in suspension from City waste collection services for a minimum three-month period.</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.5 and receives the AG’s support, and the City should ensure the planning department enforces existing bylaws concerning recycling facilities in new multi-family developments.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Collection from apartments on a cart system be changed to a bulk container system where feasible, to increase the capture of recyclable materials, such as large pieces of cardboard, and to improve collection efficiencies.</p>	<p>Recommendation 2 is generally consistent with AG recommendations 1.2 and 1.5, but the AG is not in a position to comment on specifics of the recommendation concerning use of a bulk container system.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: The City hire 25 By-law Compliance Officers and associated managerial and administrative support in 2005, to enforce the mandatory diversion procedures outlined in this report for single-family and multi-family residences.</p>	<p>Recommendation 3 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.6 and should be expanded to ABCDs and schools. The AG supports hiring by-law compliance officers but has no comment on the number to be hired. Compliance officers should be linked to education and promotion program. <i>Staff said by-law compliance officers may not necessarily issue tickets</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 4: The City’s residential collection by-law be amended to require the source separation of Green Bin organics once the Green Bin program is fully implemented in single-family homes across the</p>	<p>Recommendation 4 is fully consistent with AG recommendations 1.2 and 1.6. AG supports. <i>Staff said the program will be mandatory on a building-by-building basis, depending on whether a building has the SSO</i></p>

Staff Report Recommendation	AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i>
City. SSO collection in apartments will be mandatory once an SSO program is implemented in the building.	<i>program in place.</i>
Recommendation 5: The City investigate the feasibility of requiring that bags of residual waste put out for collection be translucent to ensure they do not contain recyclable or organic materials.	Recommendation 5 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.6. The AG supports a feasibility study, but has concern over increased use of plastic bags.
Recommendation 6: A hybrid Pay-As-You-Throw (PAYT) program which features a limit of 3 bags per bi-weekly collection funded through the tax base and a charge (tags purchased from the City) for each bag or item collected above that set-out rate be implemented for single-family residences in 2006. Recycling and SSO collection would be provided at no charge.	Recommendation 6 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.7. AG supports.
Recommendation 7: The City provide phased implementation of a PAYT program (e.g., free tags) in 2006 to allow single-family residents to adjust to the program, followed by full implementation in 2007.	Recommendation 7 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.7. AG supports.
Recommendation 8: A PAYT program be fully implemented for apartments in 2005 with no phase-in period, as diversion rates are significantly lower in apartments (12%) than single-family residences (43%).	Recommendation 8 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.7. The AG supports it and recommends that PAYT fees and bag limits should reflect the available diversion programs such as SSO, and that the fees and limits for the multi-family sector should be consistent with the fees and limits for the single-family sector.
Recommendation 9: The City convert all residences to single stream recycling and inform residents of the change in January 2005.	Recommendation 9 does not relate to any AG recommendation but the AG supports this recommendation if it will increase diversion.
Recommendation 10:	Recommendation 10 relates to AG recommendation 1.5, but the

Staff Report Recommendation	AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i>
<p>The City implement an automated recycling cart pilot involving a total of 3600 homes (six routes) in a cross section of areas including areas of traditionally poor recyclers, areas of average recyclers and areas with on-street parking, in early 2005.</p>	<p>AG takes no position on this specific recommendation except to note that carts should be free or low cost to residents.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11: Following analysis of the cart pilots and other alternatives such as allowing the use of special recycling bags for overflow material, switching to weekly recycling collection or providing more blue boxes, the City implement a system that provides residents with adequate capacity for their recyclables.</p>	<p>Recommendation 11 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.5 on containers; however, the AG does not support the use of plastic bags unless they are recyclable. <i>Some AG members supported the occasional use of plastic bags to ensure diversion of overflow from blue and grey boxes.</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 12: The City issue a Request for Quotations for plastic tubs and lids and add this material to the Blue Box program in 2005, if a viable bid from a stable market results.</p>	<p>Recommendations 12-15 are consistent with AG recommendation 2.1. However, the AG believes that the recommendations are not aggressive enough. In addition, the AG notes that where there are no profitable markets for recyclable materials but diversion still produces overall incremental cost savings, the City should still capture the materials and donate them or pay recyclers to take them provided that the materials are diverted from landfilling.</p>
<p>Recommendation 13: Subject to the existence of a stable market for plastic film, this material be added to the City's Blue Box program once a new container system that will provide residents with the necessary capacity for their recyclables is implemented.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 14: The City include ceramics and other types of traditionally non-recyclable glass as an option in its RFQ for mixed glass for the period 2005-2010.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 15: The City monitor polystyrene markets and conduct further evaluation of the impact polystyrene has on sorting/processing operations.</p>	

<p align="center">Staff Report Recommendation</p>	<p align="center">AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 16: Source Separated Organics (SSO) pilots be implemented in 50 multi-residential buildings by 2006, including high-rises, Toronto Community Housing buildings and townhouse complexes, using various collection techniques.</p>	<p>Recommendation 16 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.2. The AG supports it but recommends a more aggressive timeline.</p>
<p>Recommendation 17: The City send test loads of apartment mixed waste to the mixed waste facility operated by Conprorec in Quebec, to determine whether this is a viable contingency method in the event that SSO collection is not suitable for all apartments.</p>	<p>Recommendation 17 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.2. The AG supports it and recommends this be done as quickly as possible. However, instead of evaluating this as a contingency, the City should determine if collection and processing of multi-family mixed waste is a preferred alternative to collection and processing of SSO from multi-family residences.</p>
<p>Recommendation 18: Subject to the pilots demonstrating that SSO collection and processing is viable for apartments and a Waste Limit/Fees policy being in place, the main rollout of SSO collection in apartments commence in 2007 and be phased in according to the following schedule: District 4 – 2007; District 2 – 2008; District 3 – 2009; District 1 – 2010.</p>	<p>Recommendation 18 is consistent with AG recommendation 1.2. The AG supports it but notes the ultimate decision on SSO in multi-family residences will depend on the findings from the implementation of Recommendations 16 and 17. The AG also supports full public input into the evaluation and decision-making on the alternatives. Also, see Note 2 at end.</p>
<p>Recommendation 19: The Provincial Minister of the Environment be requested to adopt the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) guidelines for compost, including any future changes adopted by CCME.</p>	<p>Recommendation 19 does not relate to any AG recommendation. It is superseded by the Minister’s announcement on the potential adoption of CCME standards.</p>
<p>Recommendation 20: The City establish a reusable goods drop-off centre in 2005 to provide residents with a one-stop location for reusable goods.</p>	<p>Recommendation 20 is consistent with AG recommendation 2.2. AG supports.</p>

Staff Report Recommendation	AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i>
<p>Various charitable organizations would pick-up the accumulated items. Depending on the success of the initial reusable goods drop-off centre, the City would establish drop-off centres at other locations and possibly a large reuse centre (operated in co-operation with charitable organizations) that would accept reusable goods and then re-sell them to the public.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 21: The City request the Provincial Minister of the Environment to designate, under the Waste Diversion Act, electronics, mattresses, furniture and carpets as types of waste that require manufacturers of these items to meet recycling targets and share with municipalities the cost of diverting these items from landfill.</p>	<p>Recommendation 21 is consistent with AG recommendation 4.1. AG supports.</p>
<p>Recommendation 22: The City conduct a scrap metal collection pilot involving approximately 20,000 homes in 2005. The materials collected would include smaller scrap metal items such as computers and electronic equipment, copper pipes, door hinges, forks and knives, pots and pans, nails, metal light fixtures, nuts and bolts, coat hangers, taps, wire and lawn chairs.</p>	<p>Recommendation 22 is consistent with AG recommendation 2.1. AG supports.</p>
<p>Recommendation 23: The City conduct an evaluation of the feasibility of expanding a separate scrap metal collection to include reusable goods such as reusable clothing, sporting goods, toys, small appliances, furniture, bedding, building materials such as kitchen cupboards, bathroom fixtures, lighting, windows and doors, and electronics such as televisions, telephones, VCRs and DVDs.</p>	<p>Recommendation 23 is consistent with AG recommendation 2.1. The AG supports it but the system should be designed to protect the reusability of goods.</p>
<p>Recommendation 24:</p>	<p>Recommendation 24 is consistent with AG recommendation 4.1</p>

Staff Report Recommendation	AG Position on Staff Recommendations based on May 26 and June 2, 2004 Meetings <i>Comments in italics represent additional points raised.</i>
The City request the Provincial Minister of Environment to designate litter, under the Waste Diversion Act, as a type of waste that requires manufacturers of products contributing to litter meet recycling targets and share with municipalities the cost of diverting these items from landfill.	and also relates to AG recommendation 1.4. AG supports.
Recommendation 25: The City support the recommendations of the New & Emerging Technologies, Policies and Practices Advisory Group related to ensuring effective implementation of diversion programs, as described in Appendix A.	Recommendation 25 supports AG recommendations 3.1 through 3.5. As such, AG fully supports it.

Notes:

1. The recommendations in the “Getting to 60% Diversion and Beyond” report did not address several recommendations of the AG, including promotion and education (recommendation 1.1), diversion programs in ABCDs and schools (recommendation 1.3), and public space waste (recommendation 1.4), though there is mention of these issues in the text of the report. The AG believes that attention should be paid to these issues and particularly points out the need to implement an aggressive and creative education and promotion program to increase participation and capture rates in diversion programs.
2. Some members of the AG, including one dissenter from the AG position on recommendations 16-18, have raised the need to evaluate various other alternatives to SSO in multi-family residences, including incineration of commingled wastes.