

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The City is undertaking a study to develop a long term strategy to manage municipal organics and residual solid waste as part of an Integrated Waste Management system.

**LONG TERM WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM GOALS & OBJECTIVES** were approved by City Council on July 15, 2008 as listed below.

#### **Environmental Goals**

1. The production of residential and IC&I waste should be minimized by pursuit of the following objectives:
  - a) As an interim objective, stabilizing the waste generation rate (kg/capita generated including Residual Waste, Recyclables and Organics) for both the Residential and IC&I sectors.
  - b) As a longer term objective, an annual decline in the overall waste generation rate.
2. Materials in the overall waste stream should be managed in a manner that maximizes environmental sustainability by pursuit of the following objectives:
  - a) Consideration of the best results for the protection of the environment in the design of waste management programs, processes and facilities.
  - b) Achievement of a residential waste diversion rate of 65% by 2012.
  - c) Working in partnership with the IC&I community to: explore voluntary options for waste reduction; lobby the provincial and federal governments on waste issues; and consider the need for new municipal legislation on waste diversion.
  - d) Minimization of the total amount of residual waste materials with any resource value lost to disposal.
  - e) Consideration of systems and technologies that, at a minimum, limit pollutants generated in the handling of Kingston's waste to levels allowed by applicable laws and regulations.
  - f) Consideration of systems and technologies that reduce overall GHG emissions in accordance with City's obligations required as part of the Partners in Climate Protection Program.
  - g) Management of all designated household hazardous waste materials through appropriate programs;
  - h) Consideration of the sources of waste and responsibilities of both the provincial and federal governments in regulating waste materials.

**INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

**PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

**Socio-Economic Goals**

3. A system of programs, processes and facilities that is integrated in recognition of:
  - a) Differences in sources of waste and service level requirements within the community.
  - b) Opportunities and constraints that may exist between the waste management system and other municipal systems, institutions and business (e.g. drainage, land inventory, energy supply / demand, etc.)
  
4. A system of programs, processes and facilities that is sustainable in recognition of:
  - a) The local environmental, social, and economic conditions.
  - b) The overall impact of construction, operations and maintenance; and
  - c) The ability of the community to pay for services.
  
5. A system of programs, processes and facilities that is sustainable in recognition of the capability of the system to be maintained over time without exhausting the financial resources it needs and without importing waste resources from other municipalities in a manner that would negatively impact Kingston's environment.
  
6. Implementation of a system that rewards individual waste reduction and recycling efforts.
  
7. A system that limits costs to the taxpayer in accordance with the environmental and socio-economic goals stated above and through the full evaluation of:
  - a) Potential sources of revenue;
  - b) Overall capital investment and operations and maintenance costs; and
  - c) The value of social, economic and environmental benefits that will be accrued over the life of the system.

**ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM APPROACHES** were identified and evaluated to meet the above goals and objectives approved by Council.

A preferred approach was recommended by the Environment, Infrastructure & Transportation Policies Committee to Council at meeting No. 07-2009 on March 3, 2009 and approved as listed below.

1. The City of Kingston adopt the waste management hierarchy identified in Phase A and give due consideration to this hierarchy in all future waste related decision making processes. The hierarchy to be followed prioritizes waste management programs and processes as follows:

**INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

**PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

1. Prevention / Avoidance (reduce overall waste generation through behavioral or technological change)
2. Enhanced Design for Reduction or Reuse
3. Product Reuse
4. Material Recycling, Composting and Anaerobic Digestion
5. Resource Recovery (recovery of fuels and/or materials for secondary use)
6. Thermal Treatment with Energy Recovery
7. Landfill with Energy Recovery
8. Landfill or Thermal Treatment without Energy Recovery.

2. The City of Kingston adopt System #2 (two stream recycling collection and processing program i.e. grey box / blue box; a source separated organics and leaf & yard waste collection and processing program; residual waste processed for material and/or energy recovery; remaining waste disposed of by landfill) as the preferred system with consideration given to the potential opportunities afforded by single stream recycling at the period in time when the existing material recovery facility needs to be expanded and mixed garbage/organics processing at the period in time when the current composting contract is up for renewal;

3. The City of Kingston continue with its current efforts and explore additional opportunities to work with local industry and to lobby the Provincial and Federal governments to implement policies to help reduce the quantity of waste being generated;

4. The City of Kingston further investigate the feasibility of potential System Enhancement Component Options that could be implemented in the short-term in the City's current waste management system to further increase waste diversion and reduce the quantity of waste requiring disposal; it being understood that Staff are directed to pay particular attention to 'clear garbage bag programs', 'reusable item diversion' and 'public education and system promotion' (focused on fibres and yard waste); and

5. The City of Kingston further investigate systems for Residual Waste Processing identified as a component of the preferred System #2 to process the waste that remains after recycling and composting in consideration of the waste management hierarchy;

and further,

THAT staff be directed to investigate Recommendation 4 and 5 including receiving additional public input and report back to the EI&TP Committee with final recommendations regarding System Enhancement Component Options and Residual Waste Processing.

## INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY

### PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010

#### INVESTIGATION OF RECOMMENDATION #4 AS DIRECTED BY COUNCIL:

*The City of Kingston further investigate the feasibility of potential System Enhancement Component Options that could be implemented in the short-term in the City's current waste management system to further increase waste diversion and reduce the quantity of waste requiring disposal; it being understood that Staff are directed to pay particular attention to 'clear garbage bag programs', 'reusable item diversion' and 'public education and system promotion' (focused on fibres and yard waste).*

**Waste diversion** is calculated as the amount of residential waste diverted from landfill through various programs (ie: recycling; household organics collection; backyard composting; leaf & yard waste site composting; grasscycling; household hazardous waste; tires; bulky goods; scrap metal; beer, wine & spirit containers returned to the Beer Store; etc.) divided by the total amount of waste generated.

In 2008 the diversion rate was 42%. The preliminary diversion rate for 2009 is 47%. The goal is to achieve 65% by 2012.

**SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS** can be aimed at waste prevention and/or at-source waste diversion.

**WASTE PREVENTION** System Enhancement Component Options are:

1. **Clear Garbage Bag Programs** encourage residents to only dispose of materials that do not belong in one of the diversion programs. There is no incentive to decrease overall waste generation but will ensure greater compliance with other programs.
2. **User Pay Systems** require garbage above an established threshold to have purchased tags attached for collection. This creates a financial incentive to encourage residents to use "free" waste diversion programs (e.g. recycling and composting) helping meet diversion goals and/or decreasing waste generation.
3. **Bag Limit Reductions** encourage residents and businesses to either increase their participation in diversion programs or find alternative means of disposal such as requiring them to take their waste to a disposal site themselves.
4. **Tipping Fee Surcharges** on specific types of waste such as soil, construction materials, and bulky goods encourages the reuse and recycling of materials.
5. **Disposal Bans** on items that belong in a diversion program encourages waste sorting at the household/waste generator level to increase waste diversion.

**INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

**PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

**AT-SOURCE WASTE DIVERSION** System Enhancement Component Options are:

6. **Reusable Item Diversion** programs, often in cooperation with retailers and charitable organizations, are typically low cost options that result in both an increase in waste diversion and a net benefit to the environment.
7. **Public Education and System Promotion** is critical for all waste management systems and can lead to increased participation and capture rates. The greater the level of understanding with the resident of how and why to participate, the better the system will perform.
8. Reduced **Collection Frequencies** for garbage can reduce collection costs and waste generation while increasing waste diversion.
9. **Collection Container Alternatives** include cans, wheeled carts and plastic bags. Container size restrictions can encourage the public to alter their consumption habits to reduce waste generation.
10. **Household Hazardous Waste Diversion** represents a small portion of the residential waste stream, however, the human and ecological risks associated with these products can be significant.
11. **Bulky Waste Management** and **White Goods Management** (fridges, stoves, washers, dryers, etc.) can be in the form of call-in services, amnesty days, annual curbside collection days, drop-off centres and vouchers. These can result in increased waste diversion through the recovery and recycling of steel and other metals, however, there is no impact on reducing waste generation.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **STAFF INVESTIGATION COMMENTS:**

#### **OPTION 1 – CLEAR GARBAGE BAG PROGRAMS**

Under a clear garbage bag program, residents must use clear, transparent bags for garbage collection. The main goal of the program is to maximize the diversion of waste from landfill by having recyclable and compostable material kept out of the garbage and disposed of properly.

Studies completed by the Stewardship Ontario Effectiveness & Efficiency Fund report that clear bag programs are successful in decreasing the amount of waste being landfilled. The majority of jurisdictions with programs have mandatory recycling by-laws and landfill bans. Privacy issues were cited as the major concern of residents and subsequently most allow one opaque 'privacy' bag. An insufficient supply of clear bags at the beginning of the program was an issue to take into account.

Larger municipalities with active clear bag programs are Guelph, ON (120,000), Omaha Nebraska (440,000), Pictou County, NS (50,000), and Yarmouth & Digby Counties, NS (45,000).

Ontario municipalities that have recently piloted clear bag programs are Markham and Durham Region.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- 13 Nova Scotia municipalities reported a 41% decrease in residential garbage; a 35% increase in recycling; and a 38% increase in organics.
- Recycling in PEI doubled between 2001 & 2003. Clear bags were introduced in 2002.
- In a Stewardship Ontario study, 21 out of 22 municipalities surveyed experienced an increase in recycling tonnage and 6 out of 9 Canadian municipalities experienced an increase in organics tonnage.
- Less landfill space is used needlessly.
- 49% of respondents in Centre Hastings/Madoc reported that they recycled more to comply with clear bag program; 13% disposed of less hazardous waste in their garbage.
- Centre Hastings/Madoc reported 34% decrease in garbage & 12% increase in recycling.
- Organics participation increased by 14% in Durham Region pilot.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- People motivated to recycle due to social pressure.
- If people forget to separate recyclables & organics from garbage, the clear bag offers a reminder.
- Provides opportunity for residents to reflect on their waste disposal habits & to consider diversion options.
- Minimizes the option of concealing recyclables and organics in the garbage.
- Ardent recyclers may feel that they are being punished.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

- A long lead time is needed for residents & stores to use up their supply of opaque bags.
- Proponents may feel that program ensures equal treatment for all households.
- Opponents may feel that program is an invasion of privacy.
- Increases public awareness of waste diversion programs.
- An extensive promotion and education campaign would be required prior to, and during the clear garbage bag program.
- It is difficult to identify offenders in multi-residential buildings where garbage is piled together.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Less expensive to recycle and compost than landfill.
- Residents who do not use bags would have to buy them.

### **OPTION 2 – USER PAY SYSTEMS**

Under user pay systems, sometimes known as Pay-As-You-Throw (PAYT), residents pay for the amount of garbage they generate over an established threshold.

**Full user pay systems** – every bag or container set out for collection is paid for directly by the resident through the purchase of special bags or tags.

**Partial user pay systems** – a specific number of bags or containers may be set out for collection, but additional items require special bags or tags. **This is the system in use in Kingston where tags are required when setting out more than two containers of garbage.**

**Utility or subscription based systems** – these function similar to a water utility. Solid waste costs would be removed from the general tax levy and replaced with a consumption fee. Toronto has implemented this system whereby residents a variable fee for different sized containers.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Reusable or repairable items are more likely to be diverted under a PAYT system.
- Waste diverted from landfill to 3R's programs is better for the environment.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Equity for residents in that you pay for what you put out.
- Full user pay makes the public aware of the true cost of their garbage.
- Creates a more fair system for people who generate little waste or spend periods away from home.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Fixed costs must be covered (eg: cost to run trucks by each house to see if there is any garbage set out for collection; landfill monitoring; etc.) so decreases in garbage may result in increased bag tag fees to cover the fixed costs.
- Potential for reduced labour and equipment costs if fewer working hours are required for collection.
- A full user pay system requires a large bag tag distribution and sales network with the associated administrative costs.

#### **OPTION 3 – BAG LIMIT REDUCTIONS**

The City currently has a two bag limit so the only reduction would be to one bag. A reduction to zero bags becomes a full user pay system. A one bag limit would encourage residents to make use of diversion and reuse programs and to be more conscious of the amount of waste they are generating.

A study of garbage set-outs was undertaken over the last year in four 2-week periods. 500 homes spread out over 10 neighbourhoods were tracked. In each study period the average number of bag / containers set out was 1.3 per household.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Consumers become more aware of packaging and adjust purchasing habits.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Residents may simply “stuff” more into one bag or purchase larger garbage cans to compensate, thereby not actually reducing their waste.
- Grace periods could be provided when additional bags are allowed, such as after Christmas/New Years or Thanksgiving.
- Consideration for families with young children could be provided.
- Consideration for persons with medical conditions could be provided.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Potential for reduced labour and equipment costs if fewer working hours are required for collection.
- Disposal costs would be reduced if tonnage is reduced. If larger cans are used to hold the same amount of garbage, there would be no cost reduction.
- A bag limit reduction may require a larger bag tag distribution and sales network with the associated administrative costs if the sale of tags increases.

**INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

**PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

**OPTION 4 – TIPPING FEE SURCHARGE**

Surcharges could be applied to specific types of waste (e.g. scrap metal, wood, furniture) that could be reused or recycled to discourage landfilling.

**Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Surcharges may encourage resident to divert waste from landfills to 3R's programs which are better for the environment.

**Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.

**Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Surcharge could be used to offset expenses.

**OPTION 5 – DISPOSAL BANS**

Waste that could be diverted from landfill through another program could be banned from garbage. This is most effective if used in conjunction with a clear garbage program so that the banned items are visible.

Typical banned items would be recyclables, yard waste and/or household organics.

**Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill to 3R's programs is better for the environment.

**Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.
- Education of collection staff for proper and consistent enforcement at the curb would be essential.

**Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- This would not be done to save money, as the banned items would be disposed of through another program.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **OPTION 6 – REUSABLE ITEM DIVERSION**

Partnerships with charitable organizations could help prevent reusable items from ending up in the landfill. The City does not have a waste transfer station where this could be set up. “Event Days” at municipal facilities with charitable organizations receiving acceptable reusable items could be coordinated.

Curbside “Giveaway Days” (like a free yard sale) where residents are encouraged to place reusable items in front of their house for others to take for free could be coordinated.

Collection at the curb could possibly be coordinated through a charitable organization.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill to 3R’s programs is better for the environment.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Items that are sold through charitable organizations are less expensive to purchase than by purchasing new.
- Curbside “Giveaway Days” provide free goods for one party while eliminating the disposal expense for the other.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Curbside collection could be provided with the cost recovered as a user fee, through the tax base, or by a combination of both.
- Coordinating curbside collection and / or “Giveaway Days” would require staff resources.
- “Giveaway Days” may create liability/insurance issues.

#### **OPTION 7 – PUBLIC EDUCATION & SYSTEM PROMOTION (focused on fibres & yard waste)**

Staff was directed to focus on fibres and yard waste, as public education and system promotion is already ongoing. If residents understand how and why they should participate, then the system should perform better. “Fibres” are defined as items that residents may not realize are recyclable and may currently be placing out with their garbage, such as Tetra Pak containers, gable top milk and juice containers and glossy magazines.

The Waste Diversion Ontario Best Practices Report identifies that an increased focus on one or two such items, such as fibres and yard waste, should take place within a larger scale Communications plan. Proper research should be conducted to determine which mediums are the most effective for reaching residents as well as the messages that should be included in a promotion and education campaign focused on fibres and yard waste.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

The City currently runs a heavily advertised annual leaf and yard waste collection each fall. Residents can also “top-up” their green bins with yard waste which was heavily promoted when the Green Bin program began.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill to 3R’s programs is better for the environment.
- Organic matter that decomposes in landfills creates methane gas, a major contributor of greenhouse gas that is 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.
- Increased promotion and education should result in an increased awareness by residents of which 3R’s programs are available for their use to divert waste.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Resources would be required to conduct research to determine where efforts need to be focused and to develop a Communications plan to promote and educate residents and for post evaluation to determine the effectiveness.
- Composting yard waste is more cost effective than landfilling it.
- Increased capture of fibres may lead to increased revenues from sale of recyclables, depending on market conditions.

### **OPTION 8 – REDUCED COLLECTION FREQUENCIES**

In Kingston, garbage is collected every week along with organics by a split-body truck. By collecting garbage every second week residents would be encouraged to better utilize waste diversion programs. Green bins should continue to be collected every week during warm weather.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill to 3R’s programs is better for the environment.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.
- Consideration for households that produce a large quantity of diapers.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Collection costs could be reduced if routes were reduced. That would depend on whether or not green bin service is reduced.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **OPTION 9 – COLLECTION CONTAINER ALTERNATIVES**

The City currently allows the use of cans or bags for garbage. Many cans are extremely large and hold more garbage than is actually allowed by by-law. If the maximum size was reduced and enforced, then residents may reduce their waste generation habits and better utilize diversion alternatives.

##### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Reduced waste generation reduces the amount of waste being landfilled which is better for the environment.

##### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.

##### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- Some residents would need to purchase new garbage containers.
- Increased capture of recyclables may lead to increased revenues from sale of recyclables, depending on market conditions.

#### **OPTION 10 – HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE DIVERSION**

The City operates a household hazardous facility every Thursday and Saturday from April to November inclusive. Additional operating hours could help divert more material from improper disposal, although hazardous waste only accounted for about 0.5% of the waste diverted from landfill in 2009.

##### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- The volume of hazardous waste is minor in relation to the total volume of waste being generated in the community.
- Small amounts of hazardous waste can cause significant environmental and human damage when disposed of improperly.

##### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Diverting twice the amount of hazardous waste from landfill would increase the diversion rate by about 0.5%.
- Additional hours may be more convenient for many residents.

##### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- The manufacturers and importers of hazardous waste will be responsible for the cost of receiving and disposal of most hazardous material as of July 1, 2010. The maximum number of hours of operation that would be reimbursed may be dictated by them, however the number of hours should not decrease from the current level.

## **INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

### **PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

#### **OPTION 11 – BULKY AND WHITE GOODS MANAGEMENT**

Bulky goods are oversized items such as sofas and mattresses. White goods are appliances such as refrigerators, stoves and washing machines.

The City does not have a bulky and white goods management program. These items can be taken by residents to the City landfill or a private transfer station where charges apply. Steel appliances that are taken to private facilities and recycled are “lost” diversion as it is not accounted for in the City’s diversion rate.

A municipal program could be set up to help divert these items from landfill. It could be funded by a fee for service, by the tax base, or a combination of both. It could be a curbside collection program or a drop-off centre.

The majority of municipalities in Ontario have some sort of bulky item collection program. They vary from scheduled collection, to call-in collection, to collection alongside bagged garbage. Frequencies vary from weekly to annual service. Maximum quantities and weight limits vary considerably.

Most municipalities landfill the collected items, except metal. Reusable items could be offered to charitable organizations.

#### **Environmental Benefits / Considerations:**

- Bulky and white goods that are diverted from landfill are good for the environment.
- There is potential to recycle large items such as mattresses.

#### **Social Benefits / Considerations:**

- Makes disposal of large items easier and more accessible for residents without the ability to transport their own goods to the landfill or a transfer station.
- Waste diverted from landfill will help achieve our diversion goals.

#### **Economic Benefits / Considerations:**

- There would be increased costs to set up, administer and maintain a program.
- Expenses could be funded by a fee for service, by the tax base, or a combination.
- Scrap steel is a source of revenue.

**INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

**PUBLIC INPUT FOR SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT OPTIONS – JUNE 2010**

**RATE THE OPTIONS IN THE ORDER THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE THEM IMPLEMENTED TO INCREASE WASTE DIVERSION & REDUCE THE QUANTITY OF WASTE BEING LANDFILLED.**

**A rating of 1 identifies the first option that you would like to see implemented; a rating of 11 identifies the last. Please rate all options from 1 to 11 and circle Yes / No answers.**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Clear Garbage Bags</b>	
	- do you recommend allowing the use of a small privacy bag?	Yes / No
	- do you recommend banning recyclables & organics from garbage?	Yes / No
<b>2</b>	<b>User Pay Systems</b> (City currently has a partial user pay system in place)	
	- do you support full user pay?	Yes / No
	- do you support a variable fee for different sized containers?	Yes / No
<b>3</b>	<b>Bag Limit Reductions</b> ( to one bag)	
	- do you support grace periods when additional bags are allowed?	Yes / No
	- do you support exemptions for families with young children?	Yes / No
	- do you support exemptions for persons with medical conditions?	Yes / No
<b>4</b>	<b>Tipping Fee Surcharge</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Disposal Bans</b>	
	- should this be implemented in conjunction with a clear garbage bag option?	Yes / No
<b>6</b>	<b>Reusable Item Diversion</b>	
	- should the cost of collection be recovered by a fee for service?	Yes / No
	- should the cost of collection be recovered through taxes?	Yes / No
<b>7</b>	<b>Public Education and System Promotion</b> (focused on fibres and yard waste)	
<b>8</b>	<b>Reduced Collection Frequencies</b>	
	- should green bins be collected every 2 <sup>nd</sup> week except during warm weather?	Yes / No
<b>9</b>	<b>Collection Container Alternatives</b> (reduced & enforced size restrictions)	
<b>10</b>	<b>Household Hazardous Waste Diversion</b> (extended hours at municipal facility)	
<b>11</b>	<b>Bulky Waste &amp; White Goods Management</b> (develop a municipal program)	

