## WMC13-001 Appendix B: Summary of Recommendations and Implementation Plan Summary

	Cambium's Recommended Diversion Strategy (Section 7, Table 10) *	Staff Comments	Implementation Timeline
1.	<ul> <li>Public Space Recycling</li> <li>Ranked 7<sup>th</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>1-3%</li> <li>Annual net cost \$2.23/hh</li> </ul>	In addition to the seasonal recycling bins already placed throughout the City's parks and trails, there are plans to establish 40 new permanent recycling/garbage depots throughout the City at public facilities, trail heads and bus shelters. An agreement with Creative Outdoor Advertising means that this can be accomplished <u>at no expense to the</u> <u>City</u> , other than staff time. The purchase of additional bins for parks can be covered under the current Capital Budget for Public Space Recycling.	Current and on- going
2.	<ul> <li>Staff Training</li> <li>Ranked 8<sup>th</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>1%</li> <li>Annual net cost \$5,000.00</li> </ul>	Staff training is a relatively inexpensive means of staying current with technologies, policies and legislation, and learning new and creative ways to educate residents and develop new diversion programs. Numerous training opportunities are available in the waste management field, mainly in the GTA. Municipalities that train their staff receive higher scores from WDO when calculating blue box funding, as this is considered a Best Practice.	Current and on- going

	Cambium's Recommended Diversion Strategy (Section 7, Table 10) *	Staff Comments	Implementation Timeline
3.	<ul> <li>Enhanced Promotion and Education</li> <li>Ranked 4<sup>th</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>2-3%</li> <li>Annual cost increase \$0.10-\$1.10/hh</li> </ul>	Effective Promotion and Education (P&E) is the backbone of a municipality's waste management program. If residents do not understand what they can do, programs are worthless. To ensure all sectors of the community hear the message, multiple modes of promotion need to be utilized, including social media, radio, television, school programs, and more. The current P&E budget (\$1.92/hh) allows for only the basic minimums in communicating the messages. WDO Best Practices recommend \$2-\$3/hh. (2014 budget)	Begin 2014 and on-going
4.	Establish New/Expand Existing Markets	be required when launching new programs such as organics collection. Markets and technologies have recently emerged for the	
	<ul> <li>Ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>5-8%</li> <li>top diversion option chosen by survey respondents (PIC#2)</li> <li>\$ TBD</li> </ul>	recycling of bulky items such as mattresses and carpeting, making diversion of these items from landfill possible. Given the high diversion potential and relative ease with which it could be implemented, this recommendation should be implemented as soon as the necessary changes to our disposal by-law can be made. A decision on the financing of this program will also be required: one option is to charge residents an additional fee to cover the recycling costs; another option is to absorb the cost, which will require a budget increase <b>(2014 budget)</b> . Consideration of a ban on commercially-generated mattresses should also be explored.	1-2 years

	Cambium's Recommended Diversion Strategy (Section 7, Table 10) *	Staff Comments	Implementation Timeline
5.	<ul> <li>Waste Exchange/Reuse Centre</li> <li>Ranked 6<sup>th</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>1-3%</li> <li>Annual net cost \$1.00/hh</li> </ul>	Large quantities of good-quality items find their way into our landfill. Establishing an area at this facility where users can conveniently drop reusable items for no charge would be a welcome cost-saving and waste-diversion opportunity for residents. Together with the County, a partnership with a local charitable agency should be investigated, thereby reducing operating costs while assisting the agency. Capital costs for the facility would be equally shared with the County <b>(2015 budget)</b> .	2-3 years
6.	<ul> <li>SSO Collection and Processing (SF Dwellings)</li> <li>Ranked 1st for diversion potential</li> <li>17%</li> <li>81% endorsement by survey respondents</li> <li>2nd choice for diversion by attendees of PIC#2</li> <li>Annual net cost \$20.00/hh</li> </ul>	This is the critical next step in the City waste diversion program. There is a high public acceptance and expectation for this program, as most other Ontario communities of Peterborough's size already have organics programs. Implementation of this program will provide the greatest potential for diversion from landfill, which could ultimately extend the life, and the stability, of the landfill by as much as 2.5 years. Financial requirements TBD. Would require one additional full-time in-house staff and/or consultants for a minimum of one-year for program planning and implementation. A public-private arrangement for processing would negate the need for large capital expenditure, but require higher annual operating costs, the exact nature of which remains unknown until the location/process/ownership is determined. <b>(2015 budget).</b>	2-4 years

SF – Single Family

	Cambium's Recommended Diversion Strategy (Section 7, Table 10) *	Staff Comments	Implementation Timeline
7.	<ul> <li>Pickup Frequency and Collection Optimization</li> <li>Ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>3-7%</li> <li>65% of survey respondents support this idea</li> <li>Potential cost savings</li> </ul>	In the planning of a curbside organics program, collection efficiencies for the 3 waste streams (organics, recyclables and garbage) should be investigated. Co-collection of waste streams could reduce costs and environmental impacts. Once a city-wide organics collection program is available, reducing the frequency of garbage collection from once/week to twice/month, with weekly organics and recycling would promote diversion and reduce collection costs. Substantial amendments to the Garbage Collection By-Law would be required. Cannot occur until implementation of an SSO collection is confirmed.	<b>2-4 years</b> (to coincide with the implementation of SSO)
8.	<ul> <li>Regular Waste Audits</li> <li>Ranked 9<sup>th</sup> for diversion potential</li> <li>No direct diversion attributable</li> <li>Annual net cost (for years audits are done) \$1.79/hh</li> </ul>	Regular curbside waste audits are essential for determining how residents are participating in diversion programs. This reveals where improvements to programs and targeted education are needed. Audits would be contracted out every 3-5 years. A minimum of two audits should be done each year they are conducted (ideally, one per season). Audits are being conducted in 2012/2013; the next audits should occur with the commencement of an SSO program, or in 3 years, whichever comes first.	Begin the first year of SSO collection or 2016

\* Section 7 Table 10 of the WMMP lists the consultant's top nine Recommendations in order of highest diversion potential to lowest. However, fiscal and procedural realities dictate that the timelines for implementing these options do not necessarily match these diversion-based priorities. The Implementation Plan Summary lists the Recommendations according to staff's best estimate of actual implementation dates, from earliest to latest.

hh - household
P&E – Promotion and Education
WDO – Waste Diversion Ontario

SSO – Source Separated Organics TBD – To Be Determined WMMP – Waste Management Master Plan

SF – Single Family

The estimated annual net costs for each Recommendation, as reported by Cambium in the Plan, are listed. However, it must be noted that these are very broad estimates which Staff cannot necessarily verify until clearer details for each program are determined and pricing is solicited through a formal bid process. It is felt that several of the recommendations may be completed with existing resources and accordingly, these recommendations are assigned a shorter implementation period. The recommendations that require additional resources have been assigned a longer implementation date, to allow for further budgetary and planning needs.

The Waste Management Master Plan is intended to be a living document and accordingly, one of the recommendations of the Plan is to provide for a review and update of the Plan every five years to ensure currency with technology and conditions