RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the City continue the weekly collection of the two additional containers of Leaf and Yard Waste with the green cart;

(b) That the City continue to provide separate bi-weekly collection of unlimited Leaf and Yard Waste during peak periods in the spring and fall;

(c) That the practice of “Grasscycling” and leaving grass clippings on the lawn be actively promoted as a way to save time and reduce impacts on the environment including reducing waste, saving water and energy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions;

(d) That the City’s waste management communications for 2009 include the promotion of the practice of “Grasscycling”;

(e) That staff be authorized to negotiate with the Central Composting Facility operator, Maple Reinders Constructors Ltd., to make capital improvements at the facility to better process Leaf and Yard Waste and that Maple Reinders Constructors Ltd., be authorized to execute those improvements at a cost not to exceed $700,000 to be funded from Capital account #5120294115;

(f) That the City continue to process Source Separated Organics from the County of Simcoe resulting in a projected revenue of $290,000 for 2009 to offset operating and capital expenditures for a net reduction of $5,000 to the 2009 Waste Management Division Operating Budget.

Gerry Davis, CMA
Acting General Manager
Public Works Department
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report is in response to direction received from Council on November 12, 2008 directing staff to look at alternatives to Report PW08126, respecting proposed changes to collection of the Leaf and Yard Waste (LYW) program with the Green Cart Program. Concerns were raised by the Public Works Committee that the recommended approach would be a challenge for residents. The item was referred back to staff for further investigation of additional options that take into consideration the comments raised by the members of the Public Works Committee at their November 3, 2008 meeting, with a report back to the next appropriate Public Works Committee meeting.

Presently, the City’s Green Cart Program allows residents to top up their green cart with LYW plus set out two (2) additional containers of LYW on a weekly basis with their cart. This practice has resulted in a large portion of the materials currently collected as part of the Green Cart Program being LYW. The high volumes of LYW being collected as part of the Green Cart Program are causing operational problems and changes are required in either the amount of LYW collected as part of the Green Cart Program or how theses materials are processed at the Central Composting Facility (CCF). The LYW collected as part of the Green Cart Program are also causing collection problems. The operational concerns are twofold:

- Grass clippings - The clippings are difficult to remove from carts, causing carts to break. Odour inside the CCF is higher during the summer when grass clippings are received, increasing demands on the odour control systems.

- Volume of other LYW - The additional LYW being collected with the Green Cart Program fills trucks faster requiring additional trips to the CCF. The CCF was not designed to the take volumes of LYW being received and requiring the material to be re-processed several times. The Glanbrook LYW facility and separate LYW collection program are under utilized.

The materials received at the CCF from Halton Region and Simcoe County primarily contain source separated organic waste, with no LYW. As a result, reducing the quantities of material received from outside sources will not resolve the processing concerns.

Staff have looked at a variety of alternatives that will allow the residents of the City to continue to place two additional containers out with their green cart while still addressing collection and processing concerns. Additionally, a best practices review was conducted of Ontario municipalities to assist in determining the most appropriate alternatives. The review of options considered the following factors in arriving at a recommended approach:

- Ease of use and impacts for residents
- Minimizing collection and processing concerns that result from accepting grass in the Green Cart Program
- Addressing processing challenges with receiving high volumes of LYW at the Central Composting Facility (CCF)
- CCF capacity to enable the City to continue to receive organic waste from Simcoe County
- Minimizing budget impacts
It is recognized that from a resident perspective, further changes to the City’s waste collection programs are not desirable at this time. As a result the recommended option, while not preferred from an operational perspective, proposes an information campaign and capital upgrades to the CCF over any of the options that required changes to the Green Cart Program. The recommended option includes:

- Maintaining existing collection service levels for both the Green Cart and LYW Programs and attempting to reduce the excessive quantities of grass in the Green Cart Program by promoting the practice and benefits of voluntary “grasscycling” – leaving grass clippings on the lawn. Education efforts may assist in alleviating some of the operational challenges for both collection and processing. “Grasscycling” would be promoted through targeted print advertising which would be done during peak grass cutting season. This would be supplemented by the 2009/2010 waste collection calendar as well as the City’s website, Public Service Announcements and the City’s customer service staff.

- Changes to the processing equipment at the CCF to better handle the large volume of LYW received at the facility.

The capital upgrades to the Central Composting Facility (CCF) will allow the facility operator to process more LYW in a faster and more efficient manner given the facility was not originally designed to accept the high percentage of LYW that is being received. Funds are available to undertake the required work in previously approved Capital and there are no additional operating costs. Capital upgrades would be conducted by the operator over the winter months of 2008/2009 so that the CCF will be ready for the spring peak period of LYW. Staff will also continue to explore other potential processing changes to maintain the processing contract with Simcoe County.

The recommended option results in a net savings of $5,000 for the City as outlined in Table 2. The financial benefits of the recommended option include continuing to receive $290,000 in processing revenue from the County of Simcoe and a reduction in processing costs of $10,000 by processing grass clippings at the Glanbrook LYW facility instead of the CCF as a result of education efforts. The $10,000 processing savings is offset by a one time cost of $5,000 for communicating the benefits of grasscycling, resulting in the net savings of $5,000.

The recommended approach provides a solution that maintains ease of use for residents, addresses operational concerns at the CCF and minimizes financial impacts to the operating budget. To a lesser extent, this approach also addresses some collection concerns, however not all issues will be solved. No service changes to the Green Cart Program will be required at this time by promoting voluntary grasscycling to reduce the amount of grass collected and undertaking the capital upgrades to the CCF to maintain capacity at the CCF will continue to allow capacity to be sold as a revenue source to offset operating expenditures and capital upgrades.

**BACKGROUND:**

The information and recommendations in this report have City Wide implications.

On November 12th, 2008, City Council referred Report PW08126 back to staff asking that a review of alternative options be evaluated and subsequently brought back to
Committee and Council. This report contains a review of those alternatives and further recommendations.

Since 2007, the Green Cart Program has allowed residents to place two (2) additional LYW containers with their green cart. As a result of this operational change there have been unexpected operational problems that are primarily caused by excessive grass clippings in the LYW portion of the Green Cart material. These problems include but are not limited to the following:

- Grass clippings are very heavy and puts strain on the carts when being tipped resulting in a high frequency of breakage;
- Grass clippings are odourous when it has been sitting more than a couple of days which is unpleasant for collection crews and residents when dealing with their green carts;
- Due to the weight of the carts with grass clippings, tipping of carts with side load trucks often result in spillage of the clippings / contents;
- Grass clippings are difficult to dislodge from green carts and often remains stuck inside; and
- Grass produces high levels of ammonia during the composting process that is difficult to control in the CCF odour control system.

As a result of the difficulties experienced, Report PW08126 was prepared to try and deal first and foremost with the operational issues caused by large amounts of LYW which is composed of a high amount of grass clippings. The recommended changes discussed in this report PW08126a are to explore options that can address operating concerns while minimizing impacts on existing collection service levels and continuing to maintain capacity at the CCF that can be sold as a revenue source to offset operating expenditures and capital upgrades.

**ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:**

The review of options focused on the two operational concerns resulting from the volumes of LYW being collected as part of the Green Cart Program:

- Grass Clippings
- Volume of other LYW

The review also considered impact on residents and CCF capacity.

a) Grass Clippings

Staff conducted a best practices review of other Ontario municipalities to determine how other municipalities effectively deal with grass clippings and whether they are banned from the waste stream or if they are processed in the same or in a different way. Table 1 shows the results of this review.
Table 1 - Grass Clippings in Ontario Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Grass in green cart (Y/N)</th>
<th>Grass in LYW Program (Y/N)</th>
<th>Grass Ban in Effect (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Grass is banned in all of Halton except in Burlington where grass is allowed in the LYW program but not June - September.

** Grass is banned in the Region of York however some area municipalities allow in LYW.

Instead of placing grass clippings in the green cart or additional containers, there are several options for residents to recycle their grass clippings. These include:

- Grasscycling - residents leave the clippings on your lawn (don’t bag) where they will break down and re-feed the soil. This option is heavily promoted by municipalities in Ontario and across Canada;
- Grass clippings can be set out for LYW collection during peak periods in spring and fall;
- Grass clippings can be dropped off at the CRCs for free; and
- Grass clippings can be composted in back yard composters.

A review of other municipal literature has shown a number of environmental benefits to grasscycling and as such these benefits will be communicated to residents. These benefits include but are not limited to:

- Savings in time spent on lawn care;
- Reduced watering requirements for lawns;
- Reduction in the amount of chemical fertilizer needed by approximately 25%;
- Reductions in carbon emissions of approximately 500 kg per household\(^1\); and
- Elimination of odours.

In addition to the environmental benefits of grasscycling, reducing or eliminating grass from the Green Cart Program would allow the City to more fully utilize the LYW composting facility at the Glanbrook landfill, ensure that waste collection vehicles are used effectively, and also reduce operating costs. Since the introduction of the green cart and two additional containers in 2007 the LYW composting facility has been under utilized. The processing of LYW in windrows is more cost effective than composting this material at the CCF.

b) Volume of other LYW

During the staff review of alternatives the capacity and efficiency of the CCF was also assessed. The facility was designed to meet the needs of the City’s residents based on the waste composition studies from the Green Cart Demonstration Project when the

\(^1\) Carbon Dioxide Reduction Edmonton, Edmonton’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Energy Strategy, [http://www.co2re.ca/ecoscaping.htm](http://www.co2re.ca/ecoscaping.htm)
green carts were tested prior to full roll-out across the City. The Demonstration Project areas included representative samples from across the City. The Demonstration Project homes were permitted to top up their container with LYW but no additional containers were accepted. Therefore the percentage of LYW in the green cart waste stream was much lower than it is today. With the launch of the Green Cart Program, changes were made to allow one additional container of LYW with the green cart. This program change resulted in operating savings in curbside collection by reducing the number of weeks LYW is picked up separately and using the same fleet for bulk pick-up during the times of year the LYW program is not running. Approximately one year after launch, an additional container was added to the Green Cart Program (for a total of two) due to requests received by some members of Council from the public. Combined these two program changes have resulted in a substantial change in the amount of LYW material being collected from the LYW Program (and being composted at the Glanbrook LYW Composting Facility), which is now being captured as part of the Green Cart Program (and being composted at the CCF).

The volume and weight of LYW received at the CCF far exceeds what it was designed to process. This has resulted in excessive use of the front end loaders, which means they have to be replaced more frequently at the City’s cost. The amount of LYW being processed has also caused a large amount of woody material that is not breaking down in the time frame the CCF was designed to process organic material through the facility. To address these concerns, staff met with the facility operator Maple Reinders Constructors Ltd. (MRCL) to come to a solution to these problems.

Through facility equipment modifications, which would include the installation of a single conveyor belt to transfer woody material and a stationary grinder, the capacity of the facility can be maintained with the amended LYW composition and the efficiency with which it runs can be improved allowing the material to be completely composted and marketed faster. These improvements will allow the City to continue offering residents the option of placing up to two additional containers with their green cart and will also allow the City to continue earning revenue processing other municipal organic material to offset operating expenditures and capital upgrades.

Staff will need to negotiate the capital upgrades with MRCL, who designed, built and operate the CCF to supply and install this equipment at a cost not to exceed $700,000. Sufficient funds are available in Capital Account 5120294115 to complete these upgrades without additional pressures to the capital or operating budgets. Through the addition of this capital equipment, additional short and long term operating costs relating to excessive LYW will be avoided.

Staff recommend that MRCL complete the negotiated capital modifications taking into consideration conditions outlined in the agreement between the City and MRCL. MRCL has a great deal of experience with the CCF having been the company that designed and built it. Under the agreement with the City, either the City or MRCL may suggest capital upgrades and can negotiate the costs for implementation and/or maintenance. Through discussions with MRCL and staff, MRCL is willing to negotiate no operational cost increases for the maintenance of the modifications and under the same terms and conditions of the contract. Given that MRCL also operates the CCF, having MRCL design and install the modifications will allow them to work within the limitations caused by the CCF operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week and in a minimum amount of time.
or interruptions in service. Separate contractors would likely not be as well coordinated in the installation, modification and simultaneous operations of the facility.

c) **Resident Impact**

The City’s waste management programs have undergone a number of changes over the past few years as we move toward a target of 65% diversion. In 2009, waste container limits will be reduced to a maximum of 2 containers per week. Diversion rates are improving as residents become familiar with the collection systems and achieving a one container limit for garbage will further improve diversion rates. Given the primary goal of reducing waste set out for collection and utilizing diversion programs, no changes to the types of materials set out for collection are recommended at this time. Resident feedback on the changes proposed in Report PW08126 also supported maintaining collection programs in their current form.

Promoting voluntary grasscycling as a means to reduce grass clippings is the recommended approach to reduce some of the operational concerns related to the collection of grass clippings as part of the Green Cart Program. Communication of the benefits of voluntary grasscycling would be promoted through targeted print advertising which would be done during peak grass cutting season. It is expected that the additional cost of these communications will be $5,000. Existing communication tools such as the Waste Collection Calendar, website and public service announcements will also be used.

d) **CCF Capacity**

Through the promotion of grasscycling and capital improvements to the CCF outlined above, the City will be able to maintain capacity to process source separated organics for other municipalities and continue to generate revenue for the City and offset operating expenditures and capital upgrades. Solid Waste Management Master Plan Recommendation #1 contains one of the guiding principals accepted by Council which is to consider inter-regional waste diversion facilities. The processing capacity of the CCF is 60,000 tonnes/year. The operator of the City’s CCF has been successful in selling, with the City’s approval, processing capacity to other municipalities including Halton Region and recently Simcoe County. The addition of the tonnages from external sources provides revenue to the City but also provides a unit cost per tonne reduction since the processing rate per tonne that the City pays to the CCF contractor decreases as tonnage processed increases.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

There are four (4) alternatives for consideration and the costs are summarized in Table 2 and a summary of alternatives can be found in Appendix A.

(a) **Status Quo** - There are collection and processing concerns associated with continuing to accept two (2) containers of LYW with the green cart and still allow grass clippings to be included in the acceptable materials list. In addition there are capacity issues at the CCF, which would necessitate the cancellation of the agreement with the County of Simcoe.

As outlined in report PW08126, there are cost implications with this option and further changes are required at the CCF to handle the large quantities of LYW. As
such it is not feasible to continue with the status quo. Capital improvements would be required to effectively process the LYW being received and these costs are further described in Option 1 below.

Collection problems would continue to be experienced including damage to green carts and additional trips to unload materials.

The City would also face higher costs for processing LYW at the CCF rather than at the LYW composting facility. Also the CCF operating contractor may request an increase to the processing rate for material received at the CCF due to the disproportionate volume of LYW.

(b) Option 1 (Recommended) - Make capital improvements to the CCF to accommodate the LYW being collected as part of the Green Cart Program and explore processing changes to maintain the processing contract with the County of Simcoe.

No changes to the collection system would be made, continuing the collection of extra containers of LYW with the green cart (plus top-up) and no changes to the list of acceptable materials accepted as part of the Green Cart Program. Collection concerns would not be fully addressed with this option, meaning that staff will continue to experience some difficulties when collecting green carts and carts may still break when overloaded, however, some improvement is possible through the active promotion of grasscycling as a voluntary option for residents.

The operational concerns at the CCF can be addressed through capital upgrades. As part of this option, staff would work with the CCF operator to upgrade CCF processing equipment to allow the facility to continue to accept and compost the high percentage of LYW at a capital cost not to exceed $700,000 as outlined in the financial section below.

Additionally, staff will continue to work with the CCF operator to assess the capital equipment upgrades and also explore other potential processing changes to maintain the operating contract with the County of Simcoe. This will allow the City to still offset operating expenditures through this revenue source and also assist another municipality in reducing their landfilling requirements.

(c) Option 2 (Previously the recommended option in Report PW08126) - Eliminate the additional LYW containers collected with the green cart

This alternative involves ending the collection of additional containers of LYW with the Green Cart Program and allowing top-up only of the green cart. This option would see sufficient additional capacity made available at the CCF, which would allow the City to continue the processing contract with the County of Simcoe. The proposed change would be communicated with the public through the waste collection calendar and through additional advertising. The budget implications include communication costs.

This option addresses the operational issues for the Curbside Collection Program and the CCF without the requirement of capital equipment upgrades.

(d) Option 3 - Discontinue collection of extra containers of LYW with the green cart on a weekly basis and include additional bi-weekly LYW collection circuit(s) during the summer months.
With this option, the spring LYW collection period could be extended for up to four two-week collection circuits (eight weeks), to provide additional unlimited collection opportunities on a bi-weekly basis during the summer months. Call-in bulk waste collection would not be provided during this period since the same waste collection vehicles are used to collect LYW and bulk waste during the year. The multi-residential bulk collection program would not be affected. The City would discontinue the collection of two additional containers of LYW with the Green Cart Program and allow top-up only of the green cart on a weekly basis. The City would face increased collection costs of $61,500 per two-week collection circuit that is added to the LYW program, to a maximum of $242,000 to provide continuous bi-weekly LYW collection from April to December.

This option would promote operational efficiency since the quantity of LYW processed at the CCF would be reduced and avoid the need for additional capital upgrades at the CCF and would also address the operational issues with the Curbside Collection Program.

(e) Option 4 – Continue the collection of extra containers of LYW with the green cart but no longer permit grass clippings as part of the Green Cart Program and only allow grass clippings in the LYW program to address operational issues with the Curbside Collection Program. Two containers of LYW could be set out with the Green Cart provided they do not contain grass. Grass would continue to be collected in the separate seasonal LYW program and free of charge at the CRCs.

As with Option 1, the processing equipment at the CCF would be modified and upgraded to efficiently process the large amounts of LYW received as part of the Green Cart Program.

Table 2 - Operations Cost Summary (2009 Summary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Management Activity</th>
<th>Status Quo Costs Increase or (Decrease)</th>
<th>Recommended Option Option 1 Increase or (Decrease)</th>
<th>Option 2 Increase or (Decrease)</th>
<th>Option 3 Increase or (Decrease)</th>
<th>Option 4 Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection – Cost per additional two-week collection circuit for Leaf and Yard Waste</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,500 per two-week circuit</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Revenue</td>
<td>$145,000*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Processing Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($10,000)</td>
<td>($20,000)</td>
<td>($19,000)</td>
<td>($20,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget Impact</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>$57,500 to $242,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Contribution</td>
<td>$145,000*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost to City</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>$57,500 - $242,000</td>
<td>($5,000)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* loss of revenue from cancelled processing contract
**net benefit to City by sale of processing capacity = $295,000 (difference in net operating costs between Status Quo and Recommended Option)
FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial - The recommended option is expected to result in operating savings of approximately $5,000. Maintaining the present contract with County of Simcoe, the City avoids additional costs of $290,000 per year through the sale of merchant capacity at the CCF.

Promoting voluntary grasscycling will help to reduce the quantity of grass clippings collected and making capital equipment upgrades at the CCF will result in operating efficiencies, saving approximately $10,000. These efficiencies are offset by $5,000 in communication costs to promote grasscycling. Without approval of the recommended option, the City would have to cancel the contract with the County of Simcoe or potentially pay additional costs to the operator to process LYW from the City.

Staff will need to negotiate CCF capital upgrades with MRCL at a cost not to exceed $700,000. Sufficient funds are available in Capital Account 5120294115 to complete these upgrades without additional pressures to the capital or operating budgets. Funds are available to undertake the required work in previously approved Capital.

Staffing - No additional staff would be required for the proposed changes. Staffing for the operation of the Glenbrook composting facility and Central Composting Facility are provided under contract. There are no staffing implications for waste collection services since this change can be accommodated through existing routes. The Customer Contact Centre or Councillors Office may initially receive calls from residents enquiring about the change.

Legal - There are no legal implications with the recommendations.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

(a) Corporate Strategic Plan

The proposed changes support the Corporate Strategic Plan desired end results to increase diversion from landfill and maximize non tax revenue funding sources

(b) Public Works Strategic Plan

Reviewing costs associated with the collection and processing of LYW is fiscally responsible and environmentally sustainable. The Public Works Strategic Plan also strives to make Public Works a leader in the “greening” and stewardship of the City. Maximizing landfill space is environmentally and fiscally responsible.

(c) Solid Waste Management Master Plan (SWMMP)

The recommendations in this report are guided by the Solid Waste Management Master Plan (SWWMP) and support the following recommendations of the SWMMP:

Recommendation #1 - The City of Hamilton must maintain responsibility for the residual wastes generated within its boundaries. Inter-regional diversion facilities will be considered. The Central Composting Facility is a resource, and the City of Hamilton can optimize the use of its processing capacity to generate revenue for the City.
RECOMMENDATION 

Recommendation #2 - Contributing to the optimization of the Glanbrook landfill by removing grass clippings from the waste stream.

Recommendation #3 - Contributing to the 65% diversion target.

Recommendation #13 - Supporting continuous improvement to the waste management system.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

The options presented in this report were reviewed by the Solid Waste Management Master Plan Steering Committee. Options 1 and 4 were considered to be reasonable alternatives by the Committee that could be brought forward for consideration by the Public Works Committee.

Staff from Purchasing, Finance and Administration Section and Customer Services Section were consulted for input on the recommendations contained in this report.

The change was also reviewed by Maple Reinders Contractors Ltd. / Aim Environmental Group, the Central Composting Facility operator since it has an impact on the CCF processing requirements. Excessive quantities of grass clippings and LYW at the CCF has lead to mechanical and processing difficulties and increased costs to the contractor.

The Waste Reduction Task Force discussed the options at the October 15 and November 19, 2008 meetings and passed a motion at the November 19 meeting recommending that Council be requested to approve the changes to the waste collection system as originally recommended, to remove the additional two (2) containers of leaf and yard waste from the collection with green carts.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, and economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No

By reviewing best practices and examining actual costs the community can be assured that their tax dollars are being used effectively. Public services and programs are delivered in an equitable manner, coordinated, efficient, effective and easily accessible to all citizens.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No

Waste is reduced and recycled - Grass clippings are diverted from landfill.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No

Hamilton's high-quality environmental amenities are maintained and enhanced. The City will be able to optimize the use of its composting facilities, particularly the Central Composting Facility by processing additional source-separated organic waste rather than excessive amounts of grass.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?

☑ Yes ☐ No

This report supports the following elements of the City’s strategic plan:

- Sustainability – to contribute to a balanced community, economy and environment: to minimize the footprint of our activities and reduce environmental impact.
- A Healthy, Safe, and Green City – Reducing Waste going to Landfill. Council will commit to an aggressive waste diversion rate to increase the lifespan of our landfill and ultimately reduce costs, both financial and environmental, for taxpayers.
Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?  

☐ Yes  ☒ No

The proposed change has no staffing implications.
GREEN CART & LEAF AND YARD WASTE (LYW) PROGRAM CHANGES - ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STATUS QUO</th>
<th>OPTION 1 (RECOMMENDED OPTION)</th>
<th>OPTION 2 (NOV 3RD RECOMMENDED OPTION)</th>
<th>OPTION 3</th>
<th>OPTION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Cart</td>
<td>Top-up + 2 bags</td>
<td>Top-up + 2 bags Promote Grasscycling</td>
<td>Top-up only</td>
<td>Top-up only</td>
<td>Top-up + 2 bags Grass no longer accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate LYW Collection</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td>15 - 18 weeks</td>
<td>14 weeks Grass OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Issues</td>
<td>Not resolved</td>
<td>Some improvement is possible through the active promotion of Grasscycling</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>Resolved for grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![ ] (X)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCF Market Capacity</td>
<td>![ ] (X)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCF Capital Improvements</td>
<td>![ ] (X)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
<td>![ ] (✓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost / (Benefit) to City</td>
<td>$290K</td>
<td>($ 5K) for 2009</td>
<td>($ 5K)</td>
<td>$57.5K - $242K ($ 5K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>