1. Approval of the Agenda

Moved by Ron Speranzini, seconded by Peter Hutton:

The agenda was approved as written

CARRIED

2. Administrative items

Staff announced that advertisements for the recruitment of new Task Force members will be in circulation soon (perhaps before the next meeting). Three positions will need to be filled.

3. Operations

a) Financing Options

In a roundtable forum, members discussed the options and alternatives as outlined in the “Sustainable Financing Study Options 2009” presentation which was put forward at the last meeting held August 19, 2009. This is a follow-up to Recommendation 7 of the Solid Waste Management Master Plan (SWMMP) and a 2007 Council direction for staff to review and evaluate the potential of user pay or utility-based system and report back in 2009 once garbage container limits have been reduced.

Staff reminded members that the purpose of the discussion is to address Recommendation 7 of the SWMMP regarding consideration of a user pay system as a means of encouraging diversion and funding waste management activities.

Comments from the members included:

- like the transition to full cost recovery; move to a utility bill; should cost people for unacceptable behaviour
- Status Quo is good; those who don’t comply with the limit should be penalized
- one bag limit for everyone; no tags; Status Quo
- don’t understand why the changes would be made when what we are after is increased diversion and the options don’t present this
- like the flat rate, property tax, full PAYT suggested approach (slide 17); agrees with the staff recommendation
- prefer reducing the number of pick ups to once every two weeks
• agree with Status Quo - would like the 1 container per week limit to remain; favour the tag system for additional garbage set out - 10 tags/year, sale of tags would generate revenue; encourage residents to set out garbage only when collection is needed; give rewards and incentives for generating less garbage, perhaps a credit
• alternative 3 - each household receives 58 tags/year is good in theory; prefers to "Stay the Course"
• taking the utility bill route will only produce half of what we want, prejudicial against small households, and low income households, all issues haven’t been worked out possibly creating further inequities; doesn't offer a compelling case for change therefore stay the course but hire more staff to enforce the by-law
• utility system gives residents the ability to opt out if the resident has other opportunities to dispose of their garbage; tag system is sensitive to others (culturally), tags could be colour coded specific to a neighbourhood or collection zone and used for tracking; also in favour of maintaining the Status Quo
• prefer alternative three, a tag system would be culturally sensitive since residents could use the tags at their discretion; built in education component; would like to see some sort of reward system; impact on diversion since people will talk about garbage collection and be mindful of it.

After individual points were noted, preferred options and alternatives were discussed as a whole in order to narrow down the suggestions. Member agreed that the following were the most pressing from the previous discussion:
• preference for maintaining the Status Quo
• create a reward system for generating less garbage
• penalize those not in compliance
• use a tag system - tags have no expiry date and can be used in the following year thus providing a built in reward system. Conversely, residents who use the tags too quickly need to purchase more the following year thus providing a built in penalty.
• don’t agree with the 58 tag idea as it will not work at multi-residential buildings; production cost for tags also needs to be considered, there’s no cost recovery; however, there will be administrative costs
• residents could sell the extra tags for profit
• tag system provides flexibility but is culturally sensitive
• tag system may be the easiest to implement as it may promote setting out garbage only when necessary since residents could make their tags last longer
• like the educational component
• need to relate the cost at the curb to the charges at the CRC; consequently, based on $8.00 for the first 100kg at the CRC, each curbside bag tag would at least $2.00.

Members voted on the most popular aspects of the alternatives and options -
• 1 member was in favour of the Staff recommendation (flat rate, property tax, full PAYT)
• 4 members were in favour of the PAYT tag system, and
• 6 members were in favour of the Status Quo “Stay the Course”

Concerns regarding staying the course -
• the rate has not been established; good idea to tell people how much it costs but there’s no incentive to divert; if the cost is taken out of a taxation situation is the transparency dissolved?
• staff commented that when discussions began about moving garbage to a utility based system, a flat fee for disposal cost was related to the provision of the same level of service for garbage
• add - 58 tags be given out the 1st year for free, residents could use them sparingly and benefit since the tags are good in perpetuity

• feel that people don’t look at the fee structure that comes with the tax bill

• a flat fee provides no incentive - if a household puts out one bag and the other puts out more, they are still paying the same amount of money.

With regard to the PAYT Alternatives

• would like to see a transition to full cost recovery

• maintain the one container limit

• provide 58 tags with no expiry date

• educate residents

• bonus system lends itself more towards the reward system for garbage

• no tags for Special Consideration

• replace grace period with option to buy tags

• set a stage for bi-weekly collection in 2013; move toward less garbage pick-up

• socioeconomic considerations: difficult for lower income households to buy tags and to take excess garbage to the CRC; meanwhile, for those that can more than afford it, it may lead to increased garbage

• lengthen the time before implementation, i.e., hold back until 2013 and then implement collection every 2 weeks. Will seem like less of a panic if residents are allowed to put out 2 bags every 2 weeks.

Alternative 3 (status quo with what has been planned for Alternative 2, Option 1) -

• the price will go up every so many years as the contract gets renewed; with a fee there’s no incentive to keep costs in line, i.e., it’s easy to raise prices

• a reward system is needed

• add an educational component

• is it going to get increased diversion, outside of it there’s enforcement, there’s an educational component

• businesses that sell products to us should continue to contribute; would like an expansion of the characteristics for “staying the course”; don’t think this will help with diversion

• customer service and enforcement has to increase – investing in new staff, translates to investing in landfill by way of program management.

Therefore with respect to the exploration of the option and alternatives the following was decided:

• transition to full pay system – yes

• maintain 1 container limit – yes

• option to purchase 10 tags – no

• 58 tags per year – no

• 58 tags no expiry – yes

• educate residents – yes

• create a bonus reward system for garbage collection reduction

• replace grace period with option to buy tags – no

• set a stage for bi-weekly collection – yes
• measures in place to protect the poor – yes

Members agreed that they prefer the Status Quo without offering tags; therefore, staying the course. The distribution of tags (which would give residents the option to use them at any time) was discussed and considered not to be in high demand. Consequently, it was determined that the reasoning behind the enhanced service and the associated cost to provide such service is not justified.

From all discussion, comments and suggestions the following motion was made for Jim Sweetman to take to the next SWMMP Steering Committee meeting:

Moved by Paul Barrett, seconded by Mark McQueen:

That:

Whereas the one container limit will be implemented effective April 2010 and enforced excepting the provision for special considerations and the current “grace periods”, and whereas all waste management costs are included on the tax bill, the WRTF is resolved that Council be requested to not implement a PAYT system now. The recommendation to implement a PAYT system will be reviewed again within a timeframe to be determined by staff.

That said, the WRTF is resolved that a PAYT system should include the following:

1. Expanded educational communications with the focus on encouraging residents to set out garbage only when necessary, and less than once per week if possible in preparation for potential implementation of bi-weekly garbage collection in 2013;
2. Any and all changes to the collection services be assigned with goal/review dates to ensure diversion targets & budget considerations are being achieved;
3. Create a bonus/reward system recognizing residents who set out less than the minimum number of allowable containers (similar to the existing “Gold Box Program”);
4. Review current enforcement measures and by-laws, with the intent to increase fines, and/or penalties for non-compliance;
5. Increase fees at the CRCs with the intent of discouraging users opting for disposal versus diversion options; and,
6. That any PAYT options contain measures in place to protect those who are financially challenged.

CARRIED

4. Other Business

There was no other business.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, 2009 location to be determined.

Moved by Elaine Jermy, seconded by Mark McQueen:

That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

Copies to: All present
Regrets
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