

Request for Decision

Recommendations from the Solid Waste Advisory Panel

Presented To:	Operations Committee
Presented:	Monday, Sep 16, 2013
Report Date	Thursday, Sep 05, 2013
Type:	Managers' Reports

Recommendation

That the City of Greater Sudbury receive item #1 and item #2 in the report dated September 4, 2013 from the Acting General Manager of Growth & Development/Planning Director for information only; and

That the tipping fee rate for waste that requires additional consideration or handling be increased to double the tipping fee rate, plus \$200 per load, including a 48 hour notice as detailed in item #3a of the said report and that a budget option be prepared for the estimated additional revenue stream of \$25,000; and

That a budget option be prepared for the tipping fee rate for garbage loads mixed with electronic waste or garbage loads mixed with scrap metal be increased to double the tipping fee rate as detailed in item #3b of the said report; and

That a budget option be prepared for the tipping fee rate for garbage loads mixed with banned Industrial, Commercial and Institutional blue box materials be increased to triple the tipping fee rate as detailed in item #3c of the said report; and

That the residential weekly disposal exemption be reduced from 100 kg per week to 50 kg per week as detailed in item #3d and that a budget option be prepared for the estimated additional revenue stream of \$75,000; and

That the processing rate for concrete, brick and block be increased from \$20 per tonne to \$40 per tonne and that the processing rate for the two wood waste categories be increased from \$0 per tonne to \$40 per tonne as detailed in item #3e of the said report and that a budget option be prepared for the estimated additional revenue stream of \$400,000; and

That a budget option be prepared for the garbage fee for multi-unit residential properties be increased from \$24 per unit to \$40 per unit effective January 1, 2014 as detailed in item #3f and that a budget option be prepared for the estimated additional revenue stream of \$225,000 ; and

That a budget option be prepared for full cost recovery of the garbage fee for multi-unit residential properties be phased in by 2018 as detailed in item #3f of the said report and that this fee be reviewed annually as part of the User Fee By-law; and

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Chantal Mathieu
Director of Environmental Services
Digitally Signed Sep 5, 13

Division Review

Chantal Mathieu
Director of Environmental Services
Digitally Signed Sep 5, 13

Recommended by the Department

Paul Baskcomb
Acting General Manager of Growth &
Development/Planning Director
Digitally Signed Sep 5, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Sep 10, 13

That the Waste Management By-law be amended to reflect the new changes and rates.

Finance Implications

Approval of any or all of the recommendations would result in the preparation of budget options for consideration during the 2014 budget deliberations.

Background

The following is a summary update and/or recommendations from the Solid Waste Advisory Panel:

1) 5 Year Solid Waste Strategic Plan - the panel is supportive in the development of a 5 Year Solid Waste Strategic Plan.

The plan will outline the history and achievements since the 2005 plan; update the goals; identify potential opportunities; review how to fund new and existing programs; how to align Greater Sudbury programs to the potential new/updated Provincial initiatives; review service delivery options and facility requirements and plot new or revised program delivery on a timeline (i.e. the expansion of the organic program to other sectors, the construction & demolition material recycling program, etc.).

The plan will take some time to develop since many new opportunities may arise from Provincial initiatives currently under review. The entire face of waste management may change if and when the Province rolls out new waste diversion targets on producers of certain waste categories.

The draft plan will be presented to Council at a later date.

2) Landfill Site Equipment Comparison - a staff report (summary pages attached) on the comparison of landfill site equipment specifications was taken to the Solid Waste Advisory Panel in July. The report was reviewed and panel members had no objection with how the specifications had been developed over time and indicated that they were relying on staff's expertise in the matter. The Director indicated that when changes are made, they're either to take advantage of new technology to reduce landfill space consumption or to deal with new programs. The General Manager indicated that the report was requested by Council and indicated that for the most part the specifications had been reduced over time and not increased. The Director did not receive direction to change the method in which landfill site equipment is specified.

3) Two user fee reports were taken to the Solid Waste Advisory Panel in July:

The first report was a review of landfill (garbage) tipping fees by the Finance Section in consultation with Environmental Services staff. The panel supported the methodology used in the review/development of an updated tipping fee rate. The panel recommended that a separate reserve fund be established for the cost of future disposal requirements and that the increase be phased in over 3 years. The details will be presented by Finance staff at a future Finance Committee meeting.

The second report outlined potential new fees or changes to existing fees. The ultimate goal was to increase waste diversion while transferring the financial cost from the tax levy to the generator of the waste material. Based on the recommendations of the Panel, staff have researched and estimated the revenue stream (where possible).

- a) A revised fee for waste that requires additional consideration or handling. This includes asbestos waste and odourous waste (i.e. grit, grease trap solid waste) – Double the regular tipping fee rate + \$200 per load, including a 48 hour notice. The increase in revenue is estimated at \$25,000 per year.
- b) Loads of garbage which include electronic waste or scrap metal - Double the regular tipping fee

rate. Electronic waste and scrap metal is exempt from tipping fees if segregated from garbage and placed in the proper recycling area or bin. If the landfill user that deposited the mixed material would rather sort the waste off site than pay the higher fee, then a re-load charge would be assessed to immediately re-load the waste. Landfill site users would not be permitted to sort their mixed waste at the site. No estimate is available for this item at this time. The desired outcome is to divert more waste from landfill sites.

c) Loads of garbage containing banned Industrial, Commercial & Industrial blue box materials – Triple the regular tipping fee rate. Blue box materials are exempt from all tipping fees if segregated from garbage and placed in the proper recycling bin or area. If the landfill user that deposited the mixed material would rather sort the waste off site than pay the higher fee, then a re-load charge would be assessed to immediately re-load the waste. Landfill site users would not be permitted to sort their mixed waste at the site. No estimate is available for this item at this time. The desired outcome is to divert more waste from landfill sites.

d) Reduce the residential weekly disposal exemption from 100 kg (220 lbs) to 50 kg (110 lbs). Based on 2012 data, an additional \$90,000 would have been generated if the exemption would have been 50 kg per week as opposed to 100 kg per week. However, staff believes that the reduction of the exemption fee will encourage residents to separate and divert more waste from landfill and the revenue is expected to decrease over time as residents make a more concerted effort to recycle. For budgeting purposes, staff estimates that if the exemption is reduced, the 2014 revenue will increase by \$75,000 (over a 12 month period).

The panel also suggested that the remaining 50 kg per week be assessed a flat rate fee of \$5. But after considerable discussion, the panel decided to postpone this concept and agreed that it should be reviewed as part of the 5 Year Solid Waste Strategic Plan.

e) Increase the processing fee for concrete, brick and block from \$20 per tonne to \$40 per tonne and the various wood waste categories from \$0 per tonne to \$40 per tonne. The increase in revenue is estimated at \$400,000 per year for 2014.

f) Increase the garbage collection and disposal fee per unit for multi-unit residential properties. These property owners currently contribute a portion of the cost for garbage collection and disposal services. The fee is reviewed annually as part of the User Fee By-law.

The panel recommends that the City moves to full cost recovery for these services over the next five years. Based on the current data, the fee per unit would increase from \$24 to \$40 in 2014. No cost would be assessed on blue box collection and processing services. The 2014 increase in revenue is estimated at \$225,000.

Report for Solid Waste Advisory Panel



Agenda Item # 3

Meeting Date	July 15, 2013					
Report Title	Landfill Site Equipment Comparison					
Type of Report	Information Only		Request for Comments	X	Request for Support	

Report Authored By	Division Review
<i>Bernice Tario</i> Bernice Tario Co-ordinator of Waste Disposal	<i>Chantal Mathieu</i> Chantal Mathieu Director of Environmental Services

Report

At the May 14th Council meeting, staff was requested to provide a history on the landfill equipment requirements. The attached pages provide a comparison since the 1996/98 time period.

The text in bold in the attached pages indicates a change from the previous contract. The reasoning for the changes are summarized below:

Changes from the 1996/98 contracts to Contract 2002-42:

- 1) Changed the compactor's trash blade from a straight style to a double semi-u style. This style of trash blade helps make the equipment more efficient by forcing the garbage away from the center of the machine - directly into the path of the tracks where it can be more readily compacted.
- 2) Increased the operating weight of the loader from 20,000 KG to 22,000 KG. Staff recalls reviewing the specifications at the time and the manual indicated a higher operating weight.
- 3) Required additional attachments for the loader...snow plough blade and power sweeping.
- 4) Removed the requirement of grader and dump truck.
- 5) Matched the compactor requirements for the Walden, Azilda and Hanmer site.
- 6) Reduced the requirement for a new compactor to a new or used compactor for the Azilda and Hanmer sites. Specified the used maximum hours for the Walden Site. The used compactor could not have more than 6000 hours and/or certified rebuilt by manufacturer.



Meeting Date: July 15, 2013

Report Authored By	Division Review
Bernice Tario Co-ordinator of Waste Disposal	Chantal Mathieu Director of Environmental Services

Changes from Contract 2002-42 to Contract ENG10-52:

- 1) Reduced the requirement for a new compactor to a new or used compactor for the Sudbury Site. The used compactor could not have more than 6000 hours and/or certified rebuilt by manufacturer.
- 2) Upgraded the teeth on the compactor wheels for the Sudbury, Hanmer and Azilda Site.



Changes from Contract ENG10-52 to GDD13-3:

- 1) Added a requirement for another loader at the Sudbury Landfill Site for the future Construction & Demolition Material Recycling Site.
- 2) Increased the operating weight of the existing loaders from 17,000 KG to 22,000 KG and the bucket size from 2.5 m³ to 3.0 m³ at the Hanmer and Azilda Site. This is to handle hauling and loading construction and demolition debris to the Sudbury Site.

Staff has for many years, specified the type of equipment to be used for landfill operation. This is the case for the requirement of equipment used to move, push, spread and compact waste that will be buried. These are daily activities and the equipment must always be available. The landfill equipment compliment is reviewed from time to time and is revised, replaced or upgraded as required.

Other major equipment requirements are selected and provided by the contractor. For example, staff would specify that concrete block and brick would have to be ground to the Ministry of Transportation gradation for granular B. How or what type of equipment to handle, grind, move and stockpile the material would not be specified. This would be the decision of the contractor.