| TO: | CHAIR AND MEMBERS <br> CIVIC WORKS COMMITTEE <br> MEETING ON MAY 10, 2016 |
| :---: | :---: |
| FROM: | JAY STANFORD, M.A., M.P.A. |
|  | DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENT, FLEET \& SOLID WASTE |
| SUBJECT | GARBAGE CONTAINER LIMITS (WASTE DIVERSION) |

## RECOMMENDATION

That on the recommendation of the Director, Environment, Fleet \& Solid Waste the following actions BE TAKEN;
a) This report BE RECEIVED for information on the observed trends in garbage containers set out for collection;
b) That Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake a community information and engagement process to receive feedback regarding reducing the garbage container set out limit and BE DIRECTED to report back to the June 8, 2016 meeting of the Civic Works Committee on the results of the community information and engagement process; and
c) That a Public Participation Meeting regarding reducing the garbage container set out limit BE HELD on the June 8, 2016 meeting of the Civic Works Committee.

Relevant reports that can be found at www.Iondon.ca under City Hall (Meetings) include:

- Update: Interim Waste Diversion Plan (2014-2015) and Additions for 2016 (February 2, 2016 meeting of the Civic Works Committee (CWC) Item \#15)
- Waste Diversion - Update on Examination of Residential Organic Waste (Food Scraps) and Next Steps (April 20, 2015 meeting of the CWC, Item \#13)
- Garbage and Recycling Collection - Status and Potential Next Steps (December 16, 2014 meeting of the CWC, Item \#12)
- Interim Waste Diversion Plan 2014-2015 (July 21, 2014 meeting of CWC Item \#18)
- Updates - Proposed Waste Reduction Act and Related Matters for Financing the Blue Box Program (February 3, 2014 meeting of the CWC, Item \#8)
- Waste Diversion and Garbage Collection Updates (November 25, 2013 meeting of the CWC, Item \#7)
- Status Report: Update of Road Map to Maximize Waste Diversion 2.0 (July 22, 2013 meeting of the CWC, Item \#14)


## STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-2019

Municipal Council has recognized the importance of solid waste management including waste diversion, climate change and other related environmental issues in its 20152019 - Strategic Plan for the City of London (2015-2019 Strategic Plan). With respect to this CWC Report 2 of the 4 Areas of Focus address increasing waste diversion as it relates to garbage container limits.

## Building a Sustainable City

- Convenient and connected mobility choices
- Strong and healthy environment


## Leading in Public Service

- Collaborative, engaged leadership
- Excellent service delivery


## BACKGROUND

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to examine the options for reducing the garbage container (bag) limit and outline a community information and engagement process to receive feedback from residents.

## CONTEXT:

At the February 2, 2016 meeting of Civic Works Committee staff presented the report Update: Interim Waste Diversion Plan (2014-2015) and Additions for 2016. That report provided updates on the five remaining (not completed) approved actions from the 2014-2015 Interim Waste Diversion Plan (IWDP) and proposed three new items to be added in 2016. These eight initiatives are presented in Appendix A.

This report examines one of the remaining actions for review from the IWDP (20142015): Examine reduced container limits for garbage. At the July 29, 2014 meeting of Municipal Council, Civic Administration were directed among other items, to prepare and submit to the Civic Works Committee the following from clause c) of the Council Resolution:

## i) a report examining the advantages and disadvantages of reduced container limits for garbage

This item was also identified in the PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) audit completed in 2014 and submitted to Audit Committee in December 2014 and approved by Council on December 16, 2014.

## DISCUSSION

This report has been designed from a Question and Answer perspective to aid in the proposed community engagement process. Listed below are 10 key questions and overview answers. Further details for each question are provided in Appendix B.

## 1. How and when did we arrive at the current 4 container limit?

A 4 container limit for garbage was adopted by Municipal Council in 2005 as part of the long-term vision for the Solid Waste Management Program and as one action towards the goal of achieving 60\% waste diversion as prescribed by the Minister of the Environment (at that time). A 4 container limit was determined as a reasonable limit because the large majority of residents (about $90 \%$ ) were already within this limit. The previous limit of 2 cubic metres (approximately 16 full-size garbage cans) was not an incentive to reduce garbage and recycle more materials.

The 4 container limit was implemented in January 2006. The change was phased-in to allow for residents to be informed, adapt to the change and to reduce any potential inconvenience to residents.

The most significant challenge with container limits in London compared with other municipalities is the nature of the longer collection cycle that occurs on Mondays and holiday weekends as a result of the 6 Day Collection Schedule (also referred to as the 8 Day Cycle). Although London has a 4 container limit per pickup ( 42 pickups per year), it is actually equivalent to 3.2 containers per week (when compared with other communities).

Also important to note is that a container could contain many small bags or a container could be considered the bag itself. Another way of looking at the container is to think of it as a 'contained lift'. For example, a household is permitted 4 'lifts' of garbage.
2. What has changed since the $\mathbf{4}$ container limit was implemented in January $\mathbf{2 0 0 6} \boldsymbol{?}$

- The average household weight of garbage at the curbside has reduced by $20 \%$; from 15.4 kilograms per pickup in 2005 to 12.6 kilograms in 2016.
- The maximum permitted weight of a container of garbage was reduced in 2007 from 27 kilograms (60 pounds) to 20 kilograms (44 pounds) to discourage residents from overloading containers to reduce the number of containers used instead of diverting waste from the garbage.
- Many initiatives and enhancements to existing diversion programs have been implemented to provide more ways for residents to divert materials from landfill.

3. What are the average number of containers being used each pickup in London?

- 1.9 is the average number of garbage containers placed at the curbside for all collection days, including regular and long collection cycles.
- 1.7 is the average on a regular collection cycle of 8 days between pickups
- 2.0 is the average on a long-cycle of 10 to 12 days between collections, typically on a Monday or the first collection day following a long weekend.
- $91 \%$ of households, on average, are already at 3 containers or less.
- $88 \%$ of households during the long cycles are already at 3 containers or less.
- The data is based on visual inspections of 2,450 households between February and April this year. The data does not include households with zero containers set to the curb.
- Data collected in previous years (since 2007) have similar results with between $85 \%$ to $93 \%$ already at 3 containers or less.

4. What number of containers should be permitted each pickup?

The options range from maintaining the 4 container limit (no change), 3 containers to 2 containers per collection. Because most residents already set out 3 or less containers, Londoners already benefit from the advantages of a lower limit (e.g., reduced garbage to landfill, more recycling, etc.), without causing inconvenience to residents that set out more on a regular basis or occasional.

A 3 container limit is a natural progressive step from our current limit. A 1 container limit is not recommended for consideration without a kitchen organics program in place.
5. How could extra containers be handled if a householder went over the limit?

Existing options include:

- Bagged garbage may be taken to one of the four EnviroDepots at a charge of $\$ 1.50$ per bag
- Two annual exemption pickups (weeks)
- Medical exemptions

Additional options include:

- Extend the $\$ 1.50$ per bag existing option at the EnviroDepots and allow Londoners to use this service curbside for containers/bags beyond the limit through a purchased sticker
- Increase the annual exemption weeks to 4

6. What container limits are in place in other Ontario municipalities?

- Municipalities with lower container limits also have a Green Bin program (with the exception of Sarnia). The limit is 1 or 2 for communities with weekly collection, and between 3 and 6 for those with bi-weekly collection.
- London's limit is between the two other non-Green Bin programs; Sarnia has a 3 container limit per week and Windsor has no limit.
- Many other municipalities have a bag tag program for extra bags (i.e., a charge for bags above the limit).

7. What are the anticipated advantages of lowering the container limit?

- Minor increase in waste diversion. A best estimate ('guesstimate') is 0.5 to $1.0 \%$ ( 800 to 1,600 tonnes) increase in waste diversion based on local experience and discussion with some other municipalities.
- Some minor service cost reductions and increase in revenue from additional recyclables.
- Low cost to implement with a proven track record.
- A step closer to Waste Diversion Ontario's Best Practice of a 2 container limit.
- Aligns with the current practice of most Londoners and demonstrates environmental leadership by the citizens of London.

8. What are the potential disadvantages of lowering the container limit?

- Inconvenience caused to households that are not able to reduce their garbage further.
- The ongoing challenge of the longer collection cycle that occurs on Mondays and holiday weekends.
- Curbside issues for collectors such as over-weight containers and responding to resident complaint.
- Illegal dumping.
- Increased non-recyclables in Blue Box program.

9. How will the community engagement process work?

Early awareness will occur shortly after the report is posted on the City's website (May 4) and the media chose to highlight portion of the report. CWC meeting occurs on May 10. The matter is before Council on May 17 and additional awareness can begin starting May 18 to until June 8.

The information campaign will include print ads (through the in-kind ad space provided by Stewardship Ontario), social media, and displays in public facilities (e.g., community centres). Feedback will be solicited through interactive features of the displays, social media, including an on-line feedback form. A Public Participation Meeting is proposed for the June 8, CWC meeting.

## 10. When does Council have to make a final decision on this matter?

There are three potential timelines:

1. At the Council meeting of June 14, 2016 as it would allow plenty of time to make any changes to the Waste Reduction \& Conservation Calendar (September 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017);
2. At the Council meeting of July 26, 2016. It would allow much less time to make any changes to the Waste Reduction \& Conservation Calendar (September 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017); or
3. Beyond these two key dates, Municipal Council may choose any date up to June 2017 and the next Calendar cycle.
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Appendix A Interim Waste Diversion Plan Initiatives, 2016 (Status reflects January 2016)

Appendix B Additional Information for Questions 1 to 10

## Appendix A <br> Interim Waste Diversion Plan Initiatives, 2016 (Status reflects January 2016)

| \# | Initiative/Program | Comment | Status |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carryover from 2014-2015 IWDP |  |  |  |

## Appendix B Additional Information for Questions 1 to 10

## Question 1: How and when did we arrive at the current 4 container limit?

London has a 4 container limit for garbage. Containers can be bags or cans weighing up to a maximum of 20 kilograms per container. In addition to the 4 containers, residents may set out uncontained 'bulky' items such as carpet, and small and large furniture and mattresses.

The 4 container limit was implemented in January 2006. Prior to 2006 the limit was two cubic metres of garbage at each residential property (about 16 containers). The 2 cubic metre limit did not encourage waste diversion. In the first year following the 4 container limit implementation there was approximately a $10 \%$ reduction (weight) in the amount of garbage placed at the curb and a $16 \%$ increase (weight) in recycling.

## Question 2: What has changed since the 4 container limit was implemented in January 2016??

Graph B. 1 illustrates London's historical curbside household garbage generation rates since 2000. There has been a $20 \%$ reduction in garbage at the curb per collection by residents since the 4 container limit was introduced. Residents placed an average of 12.6 kilograms to the curb each collection in 2016. They are permitted up to 80 kilograms per pickup.

Graph B.1: Garbage Generation 2000 to 2015 (per household)


To provide more ways for Londoners to reduce their waste to landfill, many initiatives and enhancements to existing waste diversions programs have been implemented since 2006 (Table B.1).

Table B.1: Diversion Initiatives to Reduce Curbside Garbage since the 4 Container Limit (2006)

| New Materials | $\bullet$ | milk and juice cartons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Added to the | $\bullet$ | drinking boxes |
| Blue Box | • steel paint cans and aerosol cans |  |
| Program | - | \#3, \#6 and \#7 plastic bottles, tubs and jugs |
|  | - | thermoform PET plastic (e.g., clamshell containers) |
|  | - | cardboard cans |
|  | - paper cups (hot \& cold take-out beverage cups) |  |
|  | - clear rigid packaging |  |

London has made very good progress towards increasing diversion, however more progress could be made. Waste audit data indicates that as much as $70 \%$ of what is currently in the garbage could be diverted from landfill under comprehensive waste diversion and resource recovery systems.

A portion of this ( $25 \%$ to $35 \%$ ) could be diverted by existing diversion services such as the Blue Box (and Blue Cart) recycling program and the EnviroDepots.

A larger component is kitchen organics which represents between $35 \%$ and $45 \%$ of the residential waste that is landfilled. This could be reduced through existing programs such as home composting, edible food waste reduction, and/or diverted through a future citywide kitchen organics diversion program.

## Question 3: What are the average number of containers being used each pickup in London right now?

## Container Set-outs - Data Collection Methodology

Tables B. 2 to B. 6 provide details on the number of containers of garbage set to the curbside per household. The data was obtained by drive-by visual inspections to count the number of bags and cans of garbage. The 2016 survey was conducted from February through April and included 2,450 homes, across all six collection zones. Each home was monitored over four collection cycles for a total of 9,800 data points (pickups). Approximately $50 \%$ of these were completed on a long cycle day: a Monday, or Tuesday following a long weekend. Households that had zero containers at the curb were not included as they may be on vacation or garbage may have been set out later in the day after the visual inspections were completed.

Table B. 5 compares results from previous years that were obtained from the same neighbourhoods and methodology as in 2016.

Table B.2: Average Number of Garbage Containers Collected per Household, 2016

| Collection <br> Day | All Days: <br> Monday to Friday | Regular Day: <br> Wednesday to Friday, <br> and Tuesday (when <br> not following a long <br> weekend) | Long-cycle Day: <br> Mondays and days <br> following a long <br> weekend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days <br> between <br> Collections | 8 to 12 | 8 | 10 to 12 |
| \# of <br> Containers | 1.9 | 1.7 | 2.0 |

Table B. 2 presents the average number of garbage containers per household.
However, because averages do not represent all residents, it is important to determine the percent of households that will be impacted if the container limit were reduced. This is represented in Tables B. 3 and B.4. The impact will be greatest following a long cycle when households will have more garbage. The long cycle occurs on Mondays and on days following long weekends (usually a Tuesday). On a long cycle collection day $97 \%$ of households are compliant with the current 4 container limit, $88 \%$ set out 3 or less containers, $73 \%$ set out 2 or less, and $43 \%$ set out 1 container.

Table B.3: Percentage of Households by Container Limit Scenarios, 2016

| Number of <br> Containers <br> (Bags or Cans) | All Days: <br> 8 to 12 days <br> between collection | Regular Cycle: 8 <br> days between <br> collection | Long Cycle: <br> 10 to 12 days <br> between collection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Above Current Limit: <br> 5 or more | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Current Limit: <br> 4 or less | $98 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| 3 or less | $91 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| 2 or less | $78 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| 1 | $48 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $43 \%$ |

Table B. 4 is similar to B.3, but provides the percentage of households that have set out $1,2,3,4$ and 5 or more containers of garbage. It illustrates the percentages of households that may be challenged under different reduced container limits scenarios. For example, at a three container limit on a long cycle, this represents $12 \%$ of the households ( $9 \%$ at 4 containers plus $3 \%$ at 5 or more). In terms of numbers this is
approximately 2,400 households on each long cycle collection day ( $12 \%$ of approximately 20,000 stops per day).

It is important to note that in the event that there is a change to the container limit some of the households currently above the new limit would likely make the change to be complaint when required.

Table B.4: Percentage of Households by Number of Containers Set Out, 2016

| Number of <br> Containers <br> (Bags or Cans) | All Days: <br> 8 to 12 days <br> between collection | Regular Cycle: 8 <br> days between <br> collection | Long Cycle: <br> 10 to 12 days <br> between collection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 or more (i.e., <br> above current limit) | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| 4 | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| 3 | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| 2 | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| 1 | $48 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Total (within each <br> cycle length) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Table B. 5 compares monitoring results from previous years, completed at the same households using the same methodology, as noted above.

Table B.5: Number of Containers at the Curb, Selected Years

| \# of | 2004 |  | 2007 |  | 2013 |  | 2014 |  | 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Cont/ } \\ \text { Bags } \end{array}$ | All days | Long Cycle | All days | Long Cycle | All days | Long Cycle | All days | Long Cycle | All days | Long Cycle |
| $5+$ | Not available | 10\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| 4 |  | 8\% | 9\% | 12\% | 5\% | 5\% | 8\% | 10\% | 7\% | 9\% |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} 3 \text { or } \\ \text { less } \end{array}$ |  | 82\% | 88\% | 85\% | 93\% | 93\% | 90\% | 88\% | 91\% | 88\% |

Table B. 6 summarizes 2016 long cycle monitoring data for each of the six collection zones.
Table B.6: Number of Garbage Containers following a Long Cycle (10 to 12 days) by Garbage Collection Zone, 2016 Data

| Zone <br> $\#$ of <br> Containers | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 or more | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| 4 | $9 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| 3 or less | $89 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $92 \%$ |

## Question 4: What number of containers would be permitted each pickup?

The options range from maintaining the 4 container limit to 2 containers per collection. Because most residents already set out 3 or less containers, Londoners already benefit from the advantages of a lower limit (e.g. reduced garbage to landfill, more recycling, etc.), without causing inconvenience to residents that set out more on a regular or occasional basis. Adopting a 3 container limit is a natural progressive step from our current limit. Moving to a 1 container limit would not be recommended without a kitchen organics program.

## Question 5: How could extra containers be handled if a householder went over the limit?

Should Council approve a lower container limit, implementation will include a phase-in adjustment period, which will be similar to how the 4 container limit was implemented. The objective would be to inform residents of ways to further reduce their waste and not cause inconvenience. During the phase-in period collection staff would make allowances by collecting additional containers above the limit. A period of fairness would give a second-chance to those still above the new container limit.

There are three measures under the current program to assist households when they have extra garbage:

1. Extra Bags to EnviroDepots - Bagged garbage may be taken to one of the four EnviroDepots. In 2015, 154,700 bags of garbage were dropped off at a depot. There is a bag fee $(\$ 1.50)$ at three EnviroDepots and a weight-based fee at the Landfill EnviroDepot.
2. Annual Exemption Pickups - There are two per year, (post-Christmas and late April/early May), that allow for extra garbage after the holiday season and during spring cleaning.
3. Medical Exemption - Medical exemptions are considered on a case by case basis.

Additional options include:

- Extend the $\$ 1.50$ per bag existing option at the EnviroDepots and allow Londoners to use this service curbside for containers/bags beyond the limit through a purchased sticker.

Many Ontario municipalities have a partial bag-tag program. It is partial because only the bags above the limit are required to be tagged. Residents are permitted to place extra containers (above the limit) at the curb but the bags must be tagged. Tag program details in other municipalities are included in Table B.7.

This option is worthy of consideration whatever the outcome for changes to the container limit. 'Bag tags' offer convenience for residents that are not able to or don't wish to take extra garbage to an EnviroDepot. Tags purchased by residents would be placed on all bags above the limit and these bags would be collected. Tags could be sold from EnviroDepots, City Hall or City-owned facilities (e.g., community, recreation facilities and libraries).

- Increase the annual exemption pickups to 4. This would allow some relief but require the ability for the homeowner to hold some items for a much longer period of time


## Question 6: What container limits are in place in other Ontario municipalities?

Reducing container limits has been shown to be an effective way to encourage residents to make better use of existing diversion programs. Compared to other Ontario municipalities London is on the high end of container limits. Municipalities with lower limits generally have a Green Bin program.

Compared to the other 2 municipalities that do not have a Green Bin program, London's limit is in between. Sarnia has a three container limit (weekly). This is 156 containers per year, compared to London at 168 containers per year. Windsor does not have a garbage limit. Table B. 7 includes a summary table of container limits in other municipalities.

Table B.7: Garbage Container Limits in Ontario Municipalities, 2016

| Municipality | Single <br> Family Households | Garbage Container Limit per Collection | Total \# Containers per Year | Bag Tags for Extra Containers at Curb | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Communities Without a Green Bin Program |  |  |  |  |  |
| London | 117,600 | 4 (equivalent to 3.2 per week) | 168 | X | $\$ 1.50$ per bag at EnviroDepot |
| Sarnia | 25,800 | 3 | 156 | $\checkmark$ | \$1.50 per tag |
| Windsor | 120,000 | No limit | No limit | - |  |
| Green Bin Communities with Weekly Garbage Collection |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hamilton | 168,900 | 1 | 52 | $\checkmark$ | Provide 26 tags per year at no charge |
| Kingston | 45,400 | 1 | 52 | $\checkmark$ | \$2 per tag |
| Niagara | 170,200 | 1 | 52 | $\checkmark$ | \$2 per tag |
| Simcoe County | 127,600 | 1 | 52 | $\checkmark$ | \$3 per tag (sold as sheets of 5), 8 containers maximum |
| St. Thomas | 13,100 | 2 | 104 | $\checkmark$ | \$1.75 per tag |
| Green Bin Communities with Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection |  |  |  |  |  |
| Durham | 192,800 | 4 | 104 | $\checkmark$ | \$2.50 per tag |
| Guelph | 29,400 | - | - | - | Cart based program |
| Halton | 154,000 | 3 | 78 | $\checkmark$ | \$2 per tag. Also have a diaper tag program |
| Ottawa | 277,200 | 6 | 156 | X | Weight based fee for extra garbage at landfill |
| Ottawa Valley Waste Recovery Centre | 18,100 | 4 | 104 | x | Weight based fee for extra garbage at Depots |
| Peel | 329,600 | - | - | - | Cart based program plus $\$ 1$ per tag |
| Toronto | 459,000 | - | - | - | Cart based program |
| Waterloo Region (Cambridge, Waterloo, Kitchener) | 146,600 | 4 <br> Effective March 2017 | 104 | $\checkmark$ | \$2 per tag (with new program) |
| Richmond Hill |  | 3 | 78 | $\checkmark$ | \$2 per tag |
| Vaughan | York Region 298,700 | 3 | 78 | $\checkmark$ | $\$ 12$ for 10 tags 13 container max |
| Markham |  | No limit | No limit | - | Clear bags, mandatory recycling by-law |

## Question 7: What are the potential advantages of lowering the container limit?

A necessary element in any waste diversion plan is container limits for residential garbage collection. Of particular importance to London is understanding the impacts of the current limit, the best understanding of the actual curbside observations of the number of containers being used now and how low the limit should be set:

1. Potentially Increase Waste Diversion In London and in other municipalities, lowering container limits has been found to reduce waste generation (e.g., increase the amount of backyard composting) and increase the quantity of recyclables and/or organics being collected. As noted above, after the 4 container limit was implemented there was a significant increase in recycling and decrease in garbage. However, as many households are currently already at or below a three container limit, a further reduction in the limit may not see an impact of the same magnitude as when the 4 container limit was implemented.

A best estimate ('guesstimate') is 0.5 to $1.0 \%$ ( 800 to 1,600 tonnes) increase in waste diversion based on local experience and discussion with some other municipalities. Activities that are likely to occur for some or many households are:

- adjustments to the number and types of items purchased that are likely to generate garbage versus items that could be recycled;
- more reuse of some items (e.g., clothing, other household items);
- more use of home composting or some homes may start composting at home;
- more materials placed in the curbside Blue Box recycling program; and
- more materials placed in the multi-residential Blue Cart recycling program due to the increased awareness about recycling and reducing waste.

2. Potentially Reduce Waste Management Costs

Lowering container limits is an effective waste diversion approach that may potentially decrease the overall cost of the waste management system. This may be accomplished by some minor service cost reductions and increasing revenue from additional recyclables.

Reducing the garbage container limit further will have less impact on costs due to diminishing returns and because most residents are already at or below a three container limit. The reduction in garbage generation may reduce long term costs at the landfill (i.e., delay capital expenditures) and for garbage collection (i.e., may delay increasing the fleet of garbage packers). The potential increase in the quantity of recyclables collected may increase the revenue for the recycling program.

There will be initial promotion, public awareness and enforcement costs associated with the implementation of a new reduced container limit.
3. Lowering Container Limits have a Proven Track Record in London and Ontario Other waste diversion strategies and programs typically require construction of new facilities (e.g., collection and composting of source separated organics), extensive pilot testing and long implementation periods. Container limits do not require any new facilities, are a proven method and can be implemented typically in less than a year.
4. A recognized Best Practice by Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO)

London submits an annual report to WDO including details on Best Practices implemented to increase diversion and waste reduction. A portion of the Stewardship Funding that London receives is based on the number of Best Practices implemented. A container limit of two or less per week is considered a Best Practice. For example, implementing a 3 container limit per pickup (42 pickups per year) is the equivalent of a 2.4 limit per week, and would move London closer to achieving this Best Practice.

## Question 8: What are the disadvantages of lowering the container limit?

- Inconvenience caused to households that are not able to reduce their garbage further.
- The ongoing challenge of the longer collection cycle that occurs on Mondays and holiday weekends.
- Curbside issues for collectors such as over-weight containers and responding to resident complaints.
- A potential to increase illegal dumping.
- A potential for increased non-recyclables in Blue Box program.


## Question 9: How will the community engagement process work?

Early awareness will occur shortly after the report is posted on the City's website (May 4) and the media chose to highlight a portion of the report. CWC meeting occurs on May 10. The matter is before Council on May 17.

To inform and obtain feedback from London residents, a three week (May 18 to June 8) process is proposed and will include:

- General community awareness/information:
- Displays at community centres and other locations
- Information to residents through traditional media including print ads in the London Free Press (provided at no cost as part of LFP steward obligation to support recycling)
- Social media outreach
- Community engagement:
- City web feedback (social media, feedback form)
- Interactive displays in community centres

A final Public Participation Meeting is proposed to be held at the June 8 CWC meeting to offer Londoners the opportunity to give their input on this matter directly to the CWC.

## Question 10: When does Council have to make a final decision on this matter?

There are three choices. At the Council meeting of June 14, 2016 as it would allow plenty of time to make any changes to the Waste Reduction \& Conservation Calendar (September 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017). Below is a tentative timeline.

| May 10 | CWC Meeting to discuss this report |
| :--- | :--- |
| May 17 | Council Meeting |
| May 4 to May 17 | General Community Awareness and finalize Community <br> Engagement process (about 13 days) |
| May 18 to June 8 | Launch Community Engagement (about 21 days) |
| May 30 | Report to Clerks - including details on engagement at that time |
| June 8 | Public Participation Meeting |
| June 14 | Council - Final Decision |

Two alternative timeframes are as follows:

- At the Council meeting of July 26, 2016. It would allow much less time to make any changes to the Waste Reduction \& Conservation Calendar (September 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017); or
- Beyond these two key dates, Municipal Council may choose any date up to June 2017 and the next Calendar cycle.

