



CITY OF KINGSTON
REPORT TO THE SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE

Report No.: SW 005

TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Mark Segsworth, Commissioner of Operations

PREPARED BY: John Giles, Solid Waste Manager

DATE PREPARED: 9 July 2002

DATE OF MEETING: 18 July 2002

SUBJECT: Pay-As-You-Throw (User Pay) Implementation Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Solid Waste Management Task Force receive the attached discussion paper, Implementation Strategy for Pay-As-You-Throw (User-Pay) Solid Waste Management in the City of Kingston, and consider the Preliminary Funding & Delivery Recommendations as shown in Section VIII.

ORIGIN/PURPOSE:

Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 63, Clause 4 at its meeting on June 4, 2002 which stated:

WHEREAS Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 2, Clause 7 at its meeting on December 4, 2001 which states amongst other things:
That the City initiates an aggressive education program targeted primarily at the residential sector, and further;
That Council concur with the Solid Waste Management Task Force's investigation of the potential effects of reducing waste by the reduction of the bag limit and/or implementing a user pay system;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff be directed to develop a strategy to implement a pay-as-you-throw (user pay) system with a projected starting date of January 1, 2003; and further

***That staff be requested to bring back a report by the end of July, 2002 to address the implementation of a pay-as-you-throw (user pay) system and outlining a communications plan around the concept of the 3 Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle); and further
That funding models be incorporated into the implementation plan; and further
That consideration be given to alternative implementation strategies, including one bag limit with tags required for additional bags.***

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

Discussion paper, "Implementation Strategy for Pay-As-You-Throw (User-Pay) Solid Waste Management in the City of Kingston" is submitted in response to the motion.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:

By-Law No. 2001-164 as amended – A by-law to provide for a rebate system to certain property owners who do not use the City of Kingston waste collection and disposal service.

Report No. 11 of the Environment & Transportation Committee dated December 17, 1998

City of Kingston By-Law No. 181 as amended – A by-law to provide for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage, ashes and other refuse.

By-Law No. 95-44 as amended – A by-law to impose a special rate for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage in the Township of Kingston.

By-Law No. 95-55 as amended – A by-law to regulate the collection, removal and disposal of garbage and to prohibit the throwing, placing, or depositing of garbage on property within the Township of Kingston.

Township of Pittsburgh By-Law No. 36-95 as amended – Being a by-law to regulate and maintain a system for the collection, removal and disposal of ashes, garbage and other refuse.

LINK TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Getting Our House in Order and the Environment.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Contained in discussion paper.

CONTACTS:

John Giles, Solid Waste Manager 546-4291 ext 2701

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Department of Corporate Services - Finance Division - Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance

Department of Planning & Development Services – Building & Licensing Division – Kim Leonard, Licensing Section Supervisor

APPENDICES:

Discussion paper, *“Implementation Strategy for Pay-As-You-Throw (User Pay) Solid Waste Management in the City of Kingston”*

Mark Segsworth
Commissioner of Operations

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer

DISCUSSION PAPER

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR PAY-AS-YOU-THROW (USER-PAY) SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE CITY OF KINGSTON

Submitted to:
The Solid Waste Management Task Force
July 18, 2002

Prepared by:
John Giles, Manager of Solid Waste
Solid Waste Division
Department of Operations

Financial Assistance by:
Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance
Finance Division
Department of Corporate Services

I. Origin

A. Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 63, Clause 4 at its meeting on June 4, 2002 which stated:

WHEREAS Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 2, Clause 7 at its meeting on December 4, 2001 which states amongst other things:

That the City initiates an aggressive education program targeted primarily at the residential sector; and further

That Council concur with the Solid Waste Management Task Force's investigation of the potential effects of reducing waste by the reduction of the bag limit and/or implementing a user pay system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff be directed to develop a strategy to implement a pay-as-you-throw (user pay) system with a projected starting date of January 1, 2003; and further

THAT staff be requested to bring back a report by the end of July, 2002 to address the implementation of a pay-as-you-throw (user pay) system and outlining a communications plan around the concept of the 3 Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle); and further

THAT funding models be incorporated into the implementation plan; and further

THAT consideration be given to alternative implementation strategies, including one bag limit with tags required for additional bags.

B. Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 44, Clause 6 at its meeting on April 16, 2002 creating a Vision Statement for Solid Waste Services which reads:

"The City of Kingston provides Solid Waste Services to protect the Health, Safety and Natural Environment of our citizens through fiscally responsible, efficient and effective practices that encourage waste reduction and recycling, and that promote economic prosperity by ensuring a clean, healthy and beautiful City."

c. Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 28, Clause 3 at its meeting on February 20, 2001 which created a Task Force on Waste Management to:

- 1. examine our current waste management practices and to recommend short-term and long-term improvements where necessary;**
- 2. determine goals for waste diversion that exceed 50% waste reduction;**
- 3. examine methods of increasing waste diversion, such as, and not limited to: increasing the number of bluebox recyclables, bag tags and decreased bag limits for garbage, encouraging backyard composting, and household compost pick-up;**
- 4. examine the best means of improving public education and awareness;**
- 5. examine new methods of waste management that may be appropriate for the City and examine the experience of other cities such as Guelph, Halifax and Edmonton;**
- 6. harmonize the By-Laws of the three former municipalities, to be implemented for the 2001 budget;**
- 7. examine other matters that will improve the waste management service to our residents in an environmentally sound and fiscally responsible manner.**

II. Goal

The goal of implementing a pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) or user-pay system is to increase diversion of waste from landfill to 50% or more. The City of Kingston currently diverts 38% of its waste from landfill through recycling and composting as measured using Generally Accepted Principles (GAP). A waste audit performed in September 2001 identified that 35% of the materials in a typical garbage bag could have been disposed of in backyard composters and that 13% could have been put in blue boxes for recycling. An additional 21% was found to be compostable through the use of centralized composting facilities.

Studies indicate that a PAYT system can increase diversion by 8 - 13% without the need to implement a curbside source separated organic collection program for composting through a centralized facility.

An aggressive public education and communications plan to encourage the use of backyard composters and to recycle more effectively will be part of the implementation plan for user-pay.

III. Introduction

Municipalities have generally funded solid waste management expenses from the tax base in order to ensure that all citizens have access to the service. This arose from health and safety concerns associated with improperly managed waste. This practice has led to the perception that the service is “free” and consequently to the overuse of the system and rapid growth of waste quantities over the last century. The fraction of municipal waste from packaging and products has risen from 7% to 75% between 1905 and 1996. The appropriateness of a system that does not discourage waste generation has become an important issue for many municipal officials.

User-pay systems represent an attempt to make waste costs more visible and to encourage householders to take more responsibility for the wastes they generate.

The City of Kingston has a variety of approaches to raising the required levies to support its solid waste program. Following amalgamation in 1998, the City made no attempt to harmonize its levying approach and continued to use the methodology from each of the amalgamating municipalities. Tax rates were established for each area at the level prior to amalgamation. The former City of Kingston and the former Township of Pittsburgh levied on the basis of assessment while the former Township of Kingston levied to its residential ratepayers a flat charge. In addition, the former City of Kingston levied a special charge to exempt property assessment and offered a rebate program to those who did not utilize the service.

Although the rates were established, no attempt was made to allocate costs by area and we would argue that that exercise would be virtually impossible. As such, the relationship of actual costs to tax rate by area is not determinable and a move to harmonize the method of the annual levy is required.

At this stage in the review sufficient research has not been completed to determine the implications of eliminating the exempt assessment levy and/or the tax rebate program, however, these issues are substantially linked.

The models included in this report go so far as to make assumptions regarding the elimination of both the exempt assessment levy and the rebate program for illustration purposes only. While these issues will require direction from the Task Force and approval of Council, it is our intention to complete further analysis before specific recommendations with regard to funding are made.

IV. System Components

Solid waste service is made up of several components:

A. Garbage

1. Collection
2. Transfer & disposal

B. Recycling

1. Collection
2. Processing
3. Disposal

C. Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)

1. Collection
2. Disposal

D. Composting

1. Backyard
2. Centralized, or Municipal

V. Funding Models

The three basic models to fund solid waste services are:

- A. Assessment based** – expenses recovered through tax rates assessed on the City wide tax assessment base
- B. User-pay** – expenses recovered by user fees based on usage.
- C. Flat fee** – expenses recovered by a flat fee that is the same for every household, regardless of assessed value, although the fee could vary by property class (e.g., commercial paying a different amount than residential)

These basic models can be mixed as follows:

- D. Assessment based / User-pay** – part of the system cost remains on the tax base and part is transferred to user-pay. A standard level of service is provided by the tax base; and anything above the standard level of service by user-pay. This method is consistent with funding other municipal services, such as transit or recreational activities.

The services that will be recommended to be funded by the tax base are those that contribute to waste diversion. These are recycling, household hazardous waste, leaf and yard waste, and composting. The services that will be recommended to be funded by user-pay are those that negatively affect diversion rates. These are garbage collection and disposal.

- E. Flat fee / User-pay** – part of the system cost is recovered by a flat fee and part is transferred to user-pay. A standard level of service is provided by a flat fee; and anything above the standard level of service by user-pay.

Solid waste system components are currently funded through a combination of garbage tax levies and flat fees, supplemented by revenue from the general tax levy, as shown in Table 1. This shows costs and revenues as approved in the 2002 budget.

Table 1 – As Approved in 2002 Budget

| <u>Costs</u> | <u>2002 Budget</u> |
|---|---------------------------|
| Compost sites | 245,364 |
| Corcan compost site | 157,663 |
| Back yard composting | 16,417 |
| Garbage disposal | 2,267,033 |
| Garbage collection | 1,755,677 |
| Leaf and yard waste collection | 160,033 |
| Recycling processing | 522,296 |
| Recycling collection | 1,547,393 |
| Household hazardous waste | 195,094 |
| Direct service cost prior to rebate program | 6,866,970 |
| Rebate program | 1,120,000 |
| Total | <u>7,986,970</u> |

| <u>Revenues</u> | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|------------------|
| Exempt property tax levies | | 1,188,000 |
| Garbage tax rates and special levies | West | 2,424,000 |
| | East | 416,326 |
| | Central | 3,119,206 |
| Tax levy included in General levy | | 839,438 |
| | Total | <u>7,986,970</u> |

| <u>Tax rate comparison</u> | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>(150,000 CVA assessed res. property)</i> | | | |
| <u>Existing Situation</u> | | | |
| General purpose taxation | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Garbage special area tax or levy | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | <u>1,787.73</u> | <u>1,733.80</u> | <u>1,763.21</u> |

This table identifies that residential properties with a Current Value Assessment of \$150,000 pay various rates for garbage taxes and/or levies, based on geographic area.

In the West, a property pays a \$147.00 garbage levy plus a share of the \$839,438 recovered through the general tax levy which is included in their \$1,640.73 general purpose taxation. In the East, a property pays \$93.07 plus an equal share of the \$839,438 included in general purpose taxation. In the Central area, a property pays \$122.48 plus an equal share of the \$839,438.

Harmonization of Taxes & Service Levels

Table 2 shows the effect on residential taxes of harmonizing service through the elimination of area rates with full funding from the ICI sector in all areas, without the introduction of user fees as well as discontinuing the rebate program. Multi-residential, industrial, commercial and condominium properties may currently apply for an 80% rebate of their waste collection and disposal taxes. Institutional properties may apply for a 60% rebate. Multi-residential and condominium properties are still entitled to recycling service, even if they have received a garbage rebate.

The elimination of rebates may result in more ICI properties utilizing municipal garbage collection and disposal; however, it will be recommended that all properties receive the same level of service. In the case of the current system, that is a three bag limit with additional bags requiring a \$2 tag. The system currently allows unlimited garbage for commercial properties. Some ICI properties may choose to withdraw from municipal collection if they are unable to place out unlimited garbage. Commercial properties presently place out upwards of 170 bags per week, with an average of 18. Not offering rebates for services that are not used is consistent with all other taxes, (e.g.: transit and recreational) the principle being that the taxing component is for the common good.

Table 2 – No Area Rates / No Rebates / Harmonized Service / No User Fees

| | <u>2002 Budget</u> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Compost sites | 245,364 |
| Corcan compost site | 157,663 |
| Back yard composting | 16,417 |
| Garbage disposal | 2,267,033 |
| Garbage collection | 1,755,677 |
| Leaf and yard waste collection | 160,033 |
| Recycling processing | 522,296 |
| Recycling collection | 1,547,393 |
| Household hazardous waste | 195,094 |
| Total | <u>6,866,970</u> |

- Assumptions:**
- 1. Rebate program discontinued**
 - 2. Exempt tax levy discontinued, may be charged if service is provided to exempt properties**
 - 3. All other costs are as budgeted in 2002**
 - 4. Separate tax rate for garbage discontinued and consolidated with general tax rate**
 - 5. ICI sector pays taxation in all areas**

| <u>Tax rate comparison</u> <i>(150,000 CVA assessed res. property)</i> | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>Current situation</u> | | | |
| General purpose taxation | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Garbage special area tax or levy | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | <u>1,787.73</u> | <u>1,733.80</u> | <u>1,763.21</u> |
| <u>Change</u> | | | |
| Less special area tax rate or levy | <u>(147.00)</u> | <u>(93.07)</u> | <u>(122.48)</u> |
| | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Less general tax rate subsidization of garbage costs under current situation | <u>(19.52)</u> | <u>(19.52)</u> | <u>(19.52)</u> |
| | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 |
| Add general tax rate increase to include garbage costs | 134.27 | 134.27 | 134.27 |
| Adjusted general tax levy | <u>1,755.48</u> | <u>1,755.48</u> | <u>1,755.48</u> |
| Change - increase (decrease) | (32.25) | 21.68 | (7.73) |

Table 2 identifies that removal of area rating would decrease the cost to a residential property valued at \$150,000 in the West by approximately \$32 after taking into account the elimination of the rebate program. Similarly, a property in the Central area would see a decrease of approximately \$8, whereas a property in the East would see an increase of approximately \$22.

It is estimated that the weight of a bag of garbage would increase to 30lbs under a full user-pay system, from the current weight of approximately 20lbs. It will be recommended that the maximum weight be 40lbs, however, not all bags will be filled to the maximum.

The budgeted costs of large article disposal (\$150,000) and disposal of materials from Parks, Roads and Kingston Utilities (\$25,500) are currently included in the Solid Waste budget. These expenses are removed in the analysis of user-pay tag costs.

Commissions and administrative expenses would be incurred with a user-pay system. These are estimated at 5% of the bag-tag revenue.

Corporate overhead is included based on 1% of the direct service cost prior to the rebate program, plus the cost of commissions and administrative expenses. Half of this cost is included in the cost for bag-tags, with the other half being charged to the balance of Solid Waste activities.

Table 3 shows the theoretical price per 30 lb bag to cover collection and disposal costs using status quo diversion rates and 2002 budgeted costs for comparison purposes with no free bags. The price per bag in 2003 would be based on projected 2003 budget figures and the implementation date.

Table 3 – Tag cost using status quo diversion & volumes with full recovery for collection & disposal costs

| | <u>Tonnes</u> | Volume estimate - 2002 24,500 tonnes | | | <u>Cost</u> |
|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | | <u>lbs/tonne</u> | <u>lbs per bag</u> | <u># of bags</u> | <u>per bag</u> |
| | 24,500 | 2,204 | 30 | 1,800,000 | |
| <u>Costs to be recovered from tags</u> | | | | | |
| Garbage disposal | | | | 2,267,033 | 1.26 |
| less: large article, parks utilities, roads | | | | (175,500) | (0.10) |
| Garbage collection | | | | 1,755,677 | 0.98 |
| Commissions and admin (5% of total cost) | | | | 200,000 | 0.11 |
| Corporate overhead (50% of 1% of costs + commissions) | | | | <u>35,335</u> | 0.02 |
| | | | | <u>Total Cost</u> | <u>4,082,545</u> |
| Price per tag | | | | 2.27 | 2.27 |

Table 4 compares the taxes as shown in Table 2 (No Area Rates / No Rebates / Harmonized Service / No User Fees) with the general taxes if bag tags are used to cover the full cost of garbage collection and disposal, commissions and overhead; as shown in Table 3.

| Table 4 - Tax rate comparison of No User Pay vs. User Pay (150,000 CVA assessed property) | Table 2 - No User Pay | | | Table 3 - Full User Pay | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
| Current situation | | | | | | |
| General purpose taxation | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Garbage special area tax or levy | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | 1,787.73 | 1,733.80 | 1,763.21 | 1,787.73 | 1,733.80 | 1,763.21 |
| Change | | | | | | |
| Less special are tax rate or levy | (147.00) | (93.07) | (122.48) | (147.00) | (93.07) | (122.48) |
| | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Less general tax rate subsidization of garbage costs under current situation | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) |
| | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 |
| Add general tax rate increase to include garbage costs | 134.27 | 134.27 | 134.27 | 59.74 | 59.74 | 59.74 |
| Adjusted general tax levy | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 | 1,680.95 | 1,680.95 | 1,680.95 |
| Change - increase (decrease) | (32.25) | 21.68 | (7.73) | (106.78) | (52.85) | (82.26) |

Table 4 shows that the cost to a residential property valued at \$150,000 would decrease by approximately \$107 in the West with a full user pay program and tags costing \$2.27 each. Similarly, a property in Central would see a decrease of approximately \$82 and a property in the East would see a decrease of approximately \$53, all based on the 2002 budget.

One Bag Limit or One Free Tag per Property

A one bag limit would be more difficult to regulate than providing one free tag per property. This is due to the mix of residential with commercial in the downtown and in areas of multi-residential. It would be difficult to determine which untagged bags belong to which property, potentially resulting in much confusion. For example, if a commercial property and a residential property above it each put out two untagged bags, it could be next to impossible to determine which two bags are the free ones to take, and which ones should be tagged and left behind. This situation would be even more exaggerated at a multi-residential property.

An alternative to consider is providing one free tag per week per household or property. In this way, all bags would require tags making it easier to manage. This has additional benefits of:

- Educating residents to use tags,
- Minimizing the need to purchase tags at the beginning of the program, as the tags issued would likely be used up completely before purchasing more,
- Allowing residents to use more one week (e.g.: to clean house or entertain), while using less another week (e.g.: while away on vacation),

- Allowing the possibility of reducing the number of free tags in subsequent years.

A drawback to this system would be the administrative difficulty of sending tags to occupants of all properties that the City would intend to collect garbage from. Issues surrounding rental properties, condominiums, basement apartments, group homes, seasonal dwellings, motels, campgrounds, day cares, nursing homes, retirement homes, churches, boarding houses, etc. would need to be addressed.

We currently collect an average of approximately 35 lbs in 1.8 twenty pound bags per week from each of about 30,000 households or properties, resulting in 2,800,000 bags. If the weight increased to 30 lbs per bag, a typical household or property could place out one bag one week and two the next. Consequently, we would sell 26 bags to 30,000 households or properties, or 780,000 tags. In order to be conservative, it is suggested that we anticipate selling 500,000 tags, with any excess revenues being held over into the following budget year. If the tags were priced at the current rate of \$2.00 each, then \$1,000,000 revenue would be generated.

Table 5 shows the effect on residential taxes for a property valued at \$150,000 with one tag being provided, additional tags sold at \$2.00 each, with the rebate program eliminated and the exempt property tax levy discontinued.

| <u>Table 5</u> | <u>2002</u> |
|---|-------------------------|
| <u>Costs</u> | <u>Budget</u> |
| Compost sites | 245,364 |
| Corcoran compost site | 157,663 |
| Back yard composting | 16,417 |
| Garbage disposal | 2,267,033 |
| Garbage collection | 1,755,677 |
| Garbage special organic | 160,033 |
| Recycling processing | 522,296 |
| Recycling collection | 1,547,393 |
| Household hazardous waste | <u>195,094</u> |
| Direct service cost prior to rebate program | 6,866,970 |
| Rebate program | <u>0</u> |
| Total costs prior to revenues | <u>6,866,970</u> |
| Revenues (Estimate 500,000 tags @ \$2) | <u>1,000,000</u> |
| Net costs to be raised by taxation | <u>5,866,970</u> |

Assumptions:

1. Rebate program discontinued
2. Exempt tax levy discontinued, may be charged if service is provided to exempt properties
3. All other costs are as budgeted in 2002
4. ICI sector pays taxation in all areas
5. Revenues from sale of tags are estimated only for illustration purposes

Table 5 (continued)
Tax rate comparison
(150,000 CVA assessed res. property)

| | Fully funded by taxation | | | Funded by taxation and user fees | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------|---|-------------|----------------|
| | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Current situation | | | | | | |
| General purpose taxation | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Garbage special area tax or levy | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | 1,787.73 | 1,733.80 | 1,763.21 | 1,787.73 | 1,733.80 | 1,763.21 |
| Change | | | | | | |
| Less special are tax rate or levy | (147.00) | (93.07) | (122.48) | (147.00) | (93.07) | (122.48) |
| | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Less general tax rate subsidization of garbage costs under current situation | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) |
| | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 |
| Add general tax rate increase to include garbage costs | 134.27 | 134.27 | 134.27 | 114.72 | 114.72 | 114.72 |
| Adjusted general tax levy | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 | 1,735.93 | 1,735.93 | 1,735.93 |
| Change - increase (decrease) | (32.25) | 21.68 | (7.73) | (51.80) | 2.13 | (27.28) |

Table identifies that if one free tag per week was provided to each property, and additional tags were sold at \$2.00 each, then the cost to a property valued at \$150,000 in the West would decrease by approximately \$52 after taking into account elimination of the rebate program and removal of area rating. Similarly, a property in the Central area would see a decrease of approximately \$27, whereas a property in the East would see an increase of approximately \$2.

Two Bag Limit or Two Free Tags per Property

It is not anticipated that reducing the bag limit to two would decrease costs, as the average number of bags per residential property is currently at 1.8. The weight per bag would likely increase as residents attempt to minimize the number of bags placed out for collection. If all bags required a tag, even though the first two are supplied free, then the overall costs would likely increase due to the administrative costs of dispensing tags.

Implementation Timeframe

It will be recommended that a user-pay program be implemented on April 1st of 2003, in order to allow time for the 2003 budget to be finalized, a communications plan to be presented to the public, for the purchase of tags, and for a distribution network to be set up.

Solid Waste funding would for 2003 would be completely assessment based for the first quarter, with user-pay covering the cost of garbage collection and disposal for the latter three quarters.

VI. Reported Impacts

User-pay is reported to impact generally in four areas:

- A. Waste reduction / increased diversion** – user fees are reported to result in reduced waste generation and increased waste diversion. The introduction of a user-pay system, with no additional diversion programs added at the same time, is reported to add 8 to 13 percentage points to a municipality's diversion rate. This includes source reduction, composting and recycling.
- B. Decreased Municipal costs** – in a survey of 33 Canadian user-pay municipalities in 1999, 60% of respondents felt that the introduction of user fees saved their municipality money; 27% reported that costs were unchanged. The reduction in costs was generally attributed to reduced garbage disposal. These savings cannot be taken for granted, however, as an increase in recycling may result in increased costs depending on the value of the recycled materials.
- C. Illegal dumping** – a survey of residents of large (>50,000) Ontario municipalities regarding user-pay for solid waste, found that illegal dumping was a concern both for skeptics and supporters. It was the single strongest concern identified. Despite these reservations, studies conducted in both the United States and Canada have shown no sustained increase in illegal dumping in user-pay areas. Most municipalities that implement user fees impose monitoring and enforcement procedures to prevent and /or stem problems, including both “soft” and “hard” enforcement.
- D. Inequities** – supporters of user-pay believe that it is fairer to charge for the amount of service used; opponents believe that user fees hurt low-income families disproportionately.

VII. Delivery Options

There are various ways that PAYT systems are generally implemented, as follows:

- A. Tag Based** – special tags must be purchased and attached to each bag or waste container. (This is the most commonly used delivery option as it allows the greatest flexibility from a resident perspective.)
- B. Bag Based** – specially marked bags must be used.
- C. Bag-Tag Hybrid** – special bags are used for waste and tags are used for bulky items. (e.g., furniture or white goods)
- D. Subscription** – user buys a subscription from the municipality for a certain size of container supplied by the municipality.
- E. Weight Based** – waste is weighed by scales on the truck and properties are invoiced.

VIII. Preliminary Funding & Delivery Recommendations

- A.** That the Solid Waste Service be treated as a separate Cost Centre with operating surpluses or deficits being calculated annually and forming part of the following year budget submission for the purposes of calculating revenue required through tax rates and bag tags.
- B.** That the tax rate structure be harmonized City wide and that the general tax rate include the amount for the solid waste cost centre across the City for waste collection and disposal services using an assessment based – user pay model with the cost of recycling, household hazardous waste and composting being funded through an assessment based tax and the cost of garbage collection, transfer and disposal being funded through a user-pay model.
- C.** That levies on tax exempt properties be reviewed with consideration being given to elimination.
- D.** That the tax rebate program be reviewed with consideration that it be discontinued.
- E.** That a harmonized level of garbage collection and disposal service be available to all properties.
- F.** That recycling collection be restricted to residential properties only at this time. Significant changes to our current system would be required to expand beyond residential collection. The merits of system expansion will be evaluated after we have achieved relative stability with changes.
- G.** That a Tag Based system be implemented to deliver user-pay garbage collection.

IX. Communications Plan

An aggressive education program will be developed by a Marketing/Promotions Coordinator position that is anticipated to be filled in September of 2002.

A Communications Plan will be developed to prepare public meetings in order to provide the public with education and information regarding pay-as-you-throw, or user pay systems. Newsletters and news releases will be prepared in order to keep the public informed. The Customer Service Representatives in Client Services will be provided with answers to frequently asked questions.

The three major selling points of a PAYT program could be referred to as the “3 Es” – Environment, Economics, and Equality. PAYT can encourage residents to recycle and reduce waste.

References:

Solid Waste Management Policy Review (Draft) – LURA Consulting – Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Apr 2002

The Waste Diversion Impacts of Bag Limits and PAYT (Pay-As-You-Throw) Systems in North America – EnviroRIS – Apr 2001

User-Pay Systems for Solid Waste Management in Canadian Municipalities – Glenn Munroe – Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research – Sept 1999



CITY OF KINGSTON
REPORT TO THE SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE

Report No.: SW 006

TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Mark Segsworth, Commissioner of Operations

PREPARED BY: John Giles, Manager of Solid Waste

DATE PREPARED: 08 August 2002

DATE OF MEETING: 22 August 2002

SUBJECT: Pay-As-You-Throw (User-Pay) Implementation Strategy Options

RECOMMENDATION:

RECOMMENDATION:

1. *That the funding of solid waste management services be through an assessment based / user-pay approach in 2003 with full user pay in 2004 on the premise that services which contribute to waste diversion are funded by property taxation and those that negatively affect diversion are funded through property taxation to support a standard level of service approved by Council, with service above the standard level funded by user-pay.*
2. *That a full user pay system be implemented in 2004 on the premise that services which contribute to waste diversion are funded by property taxation and services that negatively affect diversion are funded by user pay.*
3. *That solid waste management services be harmonized throughout the whole City of Kingston so that residential, industrial and commercial properties have access to solid waste services at the level of service approved by Council.*
4. *That the number of untagged bags for collection be reduced for residential, industrial and commercial properties in 2003, with full user pay in 2004. Additional bags require tags.*
5. *That solid waste services be accounted for as a separate Cost Centre with operating surpluses or deficits being determined annually and allocated to the following year's budget for the purposes of calculating revenue requirements*
6. *That the garbage rebate program be discontinued in 2004.*
7. *That a special tax rate for exempt properties be established for waste management system costs, in accordance with Section 208 of the Municipal Act, RSO 1990 as amended, and that any changes required by the New Municipal Act with respect to this matter be incorporated into the special rate calculation beginning in 2003.*

ORIGIN/PURPOSE:

The Solid Waste Management Task Force considered the discussion paper, *Implementation Strategy for Pay-As-You-Throw (User-Pay) Solid Waste Management in the City of Kingston* at the July 18, 2002 meeting. Action was deferred and staff was directed to bring back further implementation options for consideration.

- A. Council approved Committee of the Whole Report No. 28, Clause 3 at its meeting on February 20, 2001 which created a Task Force on Waste Management to:

1. *examine our current waste management practices and to recommend short-term and long-term improvements where necessary;*
2. *determine goals for waste diversion that exceed 50% waste reduction;*
3. *examine methods of increasing waste diversion, such as, and not limited to: increasing the number of bluebox recyclables, bag tags and decreased bag limits for garbage, encouraging backyard composting, and household compost pick-up;*
4. *examine the best means of improving public education and awareness;*
5. *examine new methods of waste management that may be appropriate for the City and examine the experience of other cities such as Guelph, Halifax and Edmonton;*
6. *harmonize the By-Laws of the three former municipalities, to be implemented for the 2001 budget;*
7. *examine other matters that will improve the waste management service to our residents in an environmentally sound and fiscally responsible manner.*

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

The goal of implementing a pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) or user-pay system is to increase diversion of waste from landfill to 50% or more, in order to meet Task Force mandate No. 2 above.

Full user pay will result in achieving maximum diversion, however, a progressive waste reduction approach will allow us to standardize the funding & service level issues. In addition, it will enable those affected by the changes to gradually adjust towards our diversion targets. Full user pay may result in increased cost to a homeowner due to the loss of cross subsidization inherent in an assessment based taxation system. This creates a challenge to balance increased diversion with cost fairness.

Recommendations in this report are projected to increase diversion. It is estimated that moving to a two bag limit for residential will increase diversion by 2% annually to 40%. Moving to a one bag limit should increase diversion a further 4% to 44%. Finally, a full user-pay system has the potential to increase diversion the remaining 6% to achieve a 50% diversion rate.

An aggressive Promotion & Education program will be developed to help encourage participation.

As a result of questions and concerns expressed at the July 18, 2002 meeting, staff considered alternate implementation strategies and analyzed the impact of imposing a special rate upon exempt properties to defray the expense of waste management facilities and services related to diversion activities which are provided for the common good and eliminating the rebate program. Based on this research, it will be recommended that bag limits be initiated for industrial and commercial properties, and the current limit for residential properties be reduced. This will provide consistent service across the municipality.

In addition, it became clear that we should separate the issue of harmonizing waste management by-laws of the former municipalities (Task Force mandate No. 6 above) from the PAYT issue. Otherwise, it becomes difficult to demonstrate whether adjustments to revenues collected through taxation are due to harmonization or PAYT.

2002 Costs / Revenues / Tax Rate Comparison

Waste management system components are currently funded through a combination of garbage tax levies and flat fees, supplemented by revenue from the general tax levy. Table 1 shows costs and revenues as approved in the 2002 budget.

| <u>Costs</u> | <u>Table 1 – As Approved in 2002 Budget</u> | <u>2002 Budget</u> | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Compost sites | 245,364 | |
| | Corcan compost site | 157,663 | |
| | Back yard composting | 16,417 | |
| | Garbage disposal | 2,267,033 | |
| | Garbage collection | 1,755,677 | |
| | Leaf and yard waste collection | 160,033 | |
| | Recycling processing | 522,296 | |
| | Recycling collection | 1,547,393 | |
| | Household hazardous waste | 195,094 | |
| | Direct service cost prior to rebate program | 6,866,970 | |
| | Rebate program | 1,120,000 | |
| | Total | <u>7,986,970</u> | |
| | | | |
| <u>Revenues</u> | | | |
| | Exempt property tax levies and other | 1,188,000 | |
| | Garbage tax rates and special levies | | |
| | West | 2,424,000 | |
| | East | 416,326 | |
| | Central | 3,119,206 | |
| | Tax levy included in General levy | 839,438 | |
| | Total | <u>7,986,970</u> | |
| | | | |
| <u>Tax rate comparison</u> | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
| <i>(150,000 CVA assessed res. property)</i> | | | |
| <u>Existing Situation</u> | | | |
| | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| | <u>1,787.73</u> | <u>1,733.80</u> | <u>1,763.21</u> |
| | <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | | |

This table identifies that residential properties with a Current Value Assessment of \$150,000 pay various rates for garbage taxes and/or levies, based on geographic area.

In the West, a property pays a \$147.00 garbage levy plus a share of the \$839,438 recovered through the general tax levy which is included in their \$1,640.73 general purpose taxation. In the East, a property pays \$93.07 plus an equal share of the \$839,438 included in general purpose taxation. In the Central area, a property pays \$122.48 plus an equal share of the \$839,438, amounting to \$19.52.

The initial step is to look at the impact of harmonizing existing waste management by-laws.

Harmonization of Waste Management By-laws:

The following issues must be considered in the harmonization of waste management by-laws:

1. Funding model to be used
2. Tax capping
3. Exempt property tax levy and the impact of discontinuing
4. Payments in lieu of taxes (PIL's)
5. Tax rebate program and the impact of discontinuing
6. Property classes receiving service
7. Level of service provided to each property

A discussion of each follows:

1. Funding model:

B. Assessment based / User-pay – part of the system cost remains on the tax base and part is transferred to user-pay. A standard level of service is funded by the tax base and anything above the standard level of service by user-pay. This method is consistent with funding other municipal services, such as transit or recreational activities. Services that negatively affect diversion (garbage collection and disposal) may ultimately be funded through full user-pay, however, this could be achieved over time. Services that contribute to waste diversion should be funded by the tax base. These are recycling, household hazardous waste, leaf and yard waste, and composting.

If base level service is available to industrial and commercial properties, they would contribute to the cost of the garbage collection and disposal program, whether they choose to use it or not. If costs were completely recovered through a full user-pay program, then only properties that use the system would contribute to the cost of providing it. Staff suggests it is reasonable to expect that all properties contribute to a base level service for the public good, as industrial and commercial properties are responsible for generating waste that the public buy and use.

c. That funding waste management services be through an assessment based / user-pay approach on the premise that services which contribute to waste diversion are funded by property taxation and those that negatively affect diversion are funded through property taxation to support a standard level of service approved by Council, with service above the standard level of service funded by user-pay.

2. Tax capping:

The harmonization of tax levies across the Municipality will be captured in the municipal levy change portion of the capping program. Municipal levy change percentages are determined for each property class, based on previous year's tax rates and total assessment compared to that of the current year. This means that overall levy increases (decreases) caused from changes (including this one) will be subject to tax capping legislation. Increases will be restricted to 5%.

3. Exempt property tax levy:

The current system of taxing exempt properties provides a tax levy and a rebate opportunity for those that satisfy the rebate criteria. With the discontinuation of the rebate program, no opportunity will exist to rebate exempt property. The purpose of levying a tax rate on the exempt property is to recover a share of service costs. Staff recommends that the existing exempt levy be revised to provide for a waste management system as described in Section 208 of the Municipal Act, RSO 1990, as amended. This system will define the waste management program and related costs, which will form the basis for a special tax rate to be collected from the exempt properties. Revenue estimates from the exempt property class for the waste management program, not including garbage collection and disposal, are \$450,000. This is down approximately \$50,000 from current amounts net of rebates.

That a special tax rate for exempt properties be established for waste management system costs, in accordance with Section 208 of the Municipal Act, RSO 1990 as amended, and that any changes required by the New Municipal Act with respect to this matter be incorporated into the special rate calculation.

4. Payments in lieu of taxes:

Payments in lieu of taxes, in general, will be impacted to the extent that the tax rate changes. It is anticipated that with Full User Pay PIL levies will reduce the general revenue base by approximately \$350,000.

5. Tax rebate program:

The tax rebate program has been available for those properties which do not utilize the garbage collection and disposal service, subject to meeting the

program criteria. Changes to service delivery will now mean that all taxable properties will have access to the service. With Full User Pay the tax rebate program can be eliminated.

That the garbage rebate program be discontinued in 2004.

6. Property classes receiving service:

Residential and commercial properties currently receive garbage collection and disposal service in Kingston Central and East, whereas only residential properties receive service in Kingston West.

That waste management services be harmonized so that residential, industrial and commercial properties are entitled to waste management services including garbage collection and disposal to the level of service as approved by Council.

7. Level of service provided to each property:

Garbage collection is currently provided weekly with residential properties having a limit of three bags and additional bags requiring a \$2 tag. Commercial properties receiving service are allowed to place unlimited garbage out for collection, with the average being 18 bags per stop.

Staff has considered the merits of bag limits vs. bag tags and has concluded that it is less complex to administer a bag limit, rather than attempt to distribute a fixed number of tags to every property. This is due to distribution and operational complexities surrounding rental units, seasonal dwellings, commercial properties, condominiums, group homes, motels, campgrounds, daycares, nursing and retirement homes, churches, boarding houses, etc. (e.g.: if tags were distributed – would a seasonal dwelling be issued a full years worth of tags or for a part of the year only?; would tags be sent to the owner of a rental unit or the tenant?; if commercial properties were allowed more bags than residential there could be a significant number of unused tags from small commercial properties being available for improper use at other properties; etc.) It is recognized that issues in mixed residential / commercial areas will require special attention.

In order to encourage increased diversion it is suggested that the residential limit, before tags are required, be decreased from three to two for 2003 representing a one-third decrease. Similarly, it is suggested that a limit be placed on commercial and industrial garbage of one-third less than the current commercial average, which would be 18 less one-third, or 12 bags, with additional bags requiring a \$2 tag. This could be referred to as “Progressive Waste Reduction” and has the advantage of not requiring that a large distribution network be set up to sell tags at this time. If all bags required a tag, even though the first were supplied free, then the overall cost would increase due to administrative costs of dispensing tags. The program

could be reviewed after a year to determine the effect on diversion and for further action as deemed appropriate by Council.

It is not anticipated that reducing the bag limit to two would decrease costs substantially, as the average number of bags per residential property is currently at 1.8. The weight per bag would likely increase as properties attempt to minimize the number of bags placed out for collection.

That the number of bags for collection be limited to two bags per residential unit and twelve bags from an industrial or commercial property. Additional bags require tags.

Table 2, which is presented next, identifies the impact on a residential property with a \$150,000 assessment through:

- A) Harmonizing tax rates; B) Moving to a 2 bag limit; and C) Moving further to a 1 bag limit;
- D) Full User Pay.

A list of the assumptions relating to information in Table 2 follows.

Table 2 - Assumptions

1. Harmonized tax rates
2. Exempt tax levy discontinued, replaced with a plan under Section 208 of the Municipal Act
3. All other costs are as budgeted in 2002 adjusted for incremental changes relating to alternatives
4. Separate tax rate for garbage discontinued and consolidated with general tax rate
5. Rebate program discontinued by 2004
6. Assumptions include incremental increase in diversion at 2% (2 bags limit); 6% (1 bag limit), 12% full user pay, change in recycling revenues to reflect improved market, incremental PIL increase for West properties previously not levied.
7. Cost of the tag will be in the range of \$2.25

Table 2 - Incremental Impacts

| | 02 Budget | 2 Bag Res 12 Bag I & C +2% | 1 Bag Res 6 Bag I & C +4% | Full User Pay +6% |
|--|----------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Costs | | | | |
| Compost sites | 245,364 | | | |
| Corcan compost site | 157,663 | | | |
| Back yard composting | 16,417 | | | |
| Garbage disposal | 2,267,033 | (40,000) | (80,000) | (120,000) |
| Garbage collection | 1,755,677 | | | |
| Garbage special organic | 160,033 | | | |
| Recycling processing | 522,296 | 9,000 | 18,000 | 27,000 |
| Sale of additional recyclable material | | (12,500) | (25,000) | (37,500) |
| Recycling collection | 1,547,393 | 9,000 | 18,000 | 27,000 |
| Household hazardous waste | 195,094 | | | |
| Tag administration | | | 50,000 | 235,335 |
| Direct service cost prior to rebate program | 6,866,970 | | | |
| Exempt property levy | (1,120,000) | | | |
| less: rebates paid to exempt | 620,000 | | | |
| | (500,000) | | | |
| Rebates paid to I & C | 500,000 | 0 | | (450,000) |
| PIL revenue change | | (40,000) | | 400,000 |
| Adjustment to revenue re: market for recycling | | (150,000) | | |
| Increase in tag revenues (net) | | (10,000) | (1,000,000) | 3,070,000 |
| Incremental Change | | (234,500) | (1,019,000) | (2,988,165) |
| Total costs to be levied by taxation | 6,866,970 | 6,632,470 | 5,613,470 | 2,625,305 |

Tax rate comparison

(150,000 CVA assessed res. property)

Current situation

| | <u>West</u> | <u>East</u> | <u>Central</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| General purpose taxation | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Garbage special area tax or levy | 147.00 | 93.07 | 122.48 |
| <i>Combined general and garbage tax</i> | 1,787.73 | 1,733.80 | 1,763.21 |

Change

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Less special are tax rate or levy | (147.00) | (93.07) | (122.48) |
| | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 | 1,640.73 |
| Less general tax rate subsidization | (19.52) | (19.52) | (19.52) |
| | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 | 1,621.21 |
| Add general tax rate increase to include garbage costs | 134.27 | 134.27 | 134.27 |
| Adjusted general tax levy | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 | 1,755.48 |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| A) Impact of harmonizing tax rates - increase (decrease) | (32.25) | 21.68 | (7.73) |
| Incremental impact of moving to 2 bags | (4.59) | (4.59) | (4.59) |
| B) Impact of moving to 2 bag limit - increase (decrease) | (36.84) | 17.09 | (12.32) |
| Incremental impact of moving to 1 bags | (19.92) | (19.92) | (19.92) |
| C) Impact of moving to 1 bag limit - increase (decrease) | (56.76) | (2.83) | (32.24) |
| Incremental impact of moving to full user pay | (58.43) | (58.43) | (58.43) |
| D) Impact of moving to Full User Pay on taxes | (115.19) | (61.26) | (90.67) |

Harmonizing tax rates without introducing reduced bag limits or user fees would have the effect of reducing the cost to a \$150,000 property by approximately \$32 in the West and \$8 in the Central area, with an increase of approximately \$22 in the East.

By moving to a 2 bag limit for residential and 12 bags for industrial and commercial, the applicable costs would be reduced approximately \$37 in the West, \$12 in the Central area, with an increase of approximately \$17 in the East.

By moving to a 1 bag limit for residential and 6 bags for industrial and commercial, costs would be reduced in all areas by approximately \$57 in the West, \$32 in the Central area, and \$3 in the East.

Line D above, reflects the average taxation change to a property assessed at \$150,000.

Cost associated with User Pay will depend on the number of individual tags purchased and used.

Cost Centre:

It is suggested that the Solid Waste Division be treated as a separate Cost Centre with operating surpluses or deficits being calculated annually and forming part of the following year budget submission for the purposes of calculating revenue required through tax rates and bag tags. In this way, if more revenue than expected is collected through the sale of tags, it will be used to offset other expenses in the operation of the Solid Waste Division, not for other purposes. Similarly, if excess revenues are achieved through the sale of recyclables due to the nature of the volatile market that we are in, they can be used to offset poorer market years. Market prices since 1998 have varied considerably as shown below:

| <u>Commodity</u> | <u>High</u> | <u>Low</u> | <u>July 2002</u> |
|------------------|-------------|------------|------------------|
| Newsprint | 148 | 51 | 112 |
| Cardboard | 208 | 41 | 208 |
| PETE (#1) | 517 | 66 | 154 |
| HDPE (#2) | 551 | 110 | 364 |
| Aluminum | 2086 | 1055 | 1624 |
| Steel | 114 | 11 | 61 |

That solid waste services be accounted for as a separate Cost Centre with operating surpluses or deficits being determined annually and allocated to the following year's budget for the purposes of calculating revenue requirements

Options for Consideration:

- 1 bag limit vs. 2 for residential; 6 bags vs. 12 for industrial and commercial:**
Table 2 above identifies that all areas would experience savings if the limit was reduced to one bag for residential properties and six bags for industrial and commercial.
- Added spring leaf and yard collection:**
A spring leaf and yard waste collection could be added for approximately \$140,000 or \$3 per household.
- Additional collection in the BIA:**
An additional collection in the BIA would likely pick up garbage that business are currently having collected through private haulers due to their inability to store an entire weeks worth of garbage at a time. Estimating that an additional 50 tonnes per week, or 2600 tonnes per year, would be collected, it would cost approximately \$250,000 extra for collection and disposal. This amount could be added to the BIA alone, as a special cost for a defined area, or distributed across the entire assessment base, as a service in support of tourism promotion. The cost would be approximately \$5 per household if spread across the entire assessment base.
- Reducing impact on properties through use of the Working Fund Reserve:**
Council could consider the use of the WFR in order to reduce the financial impact of these recommendations.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:

By-Law No. 2001-164 as amended – A by-law to provide for a rebate system to certain property owners who do not use the City of Kingston waste collection and disposal service.

Report No. 11 of the Environment & Transportation Committee dated December 17, 1998

City of Kingston By-Law No. 181 as amended – A by-law to provide for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage, ashes and other refuse.

By-Law No. 95-44 as amended – A by-law to impose a special rate for the collection, removal and disposal of garbage in the Township of Kingston.

By-Law No. 95-55 as amended – A by-law to regulate the collection, removal and disposal of garbage and to prohibit the throwing, placing, or depositing of garbage on property within the Township of Kingston.

Township of Pittsburgh By-Law No. 36-95 as amended – Being a by-law to regulate and maintain a system for the collection, removal and disposal of ashes, garbage and other refuse.

LINK TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Getting Our House in Order and the Environment.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Included in the body of the Report.

CONTACTS:

John Giles, Solid Waste Manager 546-4291 ext 2701
Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance 546-4291 ext. 2205

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Department of Corporate Services – Finance Division - Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance

Department of Corporate Services – Legal Services – Dianne Corcoran, Senior Legal Counsel

APPENDICES:

None attached.



Mark Segsworth
Commissioner of Operations

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer