Hanover
Ontario, Canada

HANOVER-WALKERTON WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14th, 2018 | 1:30pm
Winkler Room / Hanover Civic Centre

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ron Cooper I Peter Hambly I Jamie Morgan I Bruce Davidson I Chris Peabody I Rick Plantt

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Tocheri – Town of Hanover

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

1. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

2. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Moved by PETER HAMBLY I Seconded by BRUCE DAVIDSON
THAT the minutes of September 24th, 2018 meeting be approved as printed and circulated.
CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING

3.1 Polystyrene Densifier

The Committee was advised that a $3,000 grant has been received from Community Foundation Grey Bruce for training and $9,700 U.S. grant from Foodservice Packaging Institute towards the purchase of the densifier.
Bruce Davidson to followup regarding funding from Bruce Power and retail outlets.

Moved by BRUCE DAVIDSON I Seconded by RICK PLANTT
THAT the Hanover/Walkerton Waste Management Committee proceed with the purchase of the densifier to operate a pilot project for a 3 year term for the densification of polystyrene foam at the Walkerton Recycling Centre located at 320 Kincardine Hwy 9, Walkerton.
CARRIED

4. ITEMS FOR DECISION/DISCUSSION

4.1 Seagull Control

The Committee reviewed a report from Predator Bird Services Inc. following the one week trial on having a hawk present to deter seagulls. They are recommending 2 days per week during the summer months at a cost of $8,075.00.
The Committee requested Ron Cooper research costing from other service providers to be considered in the 2019 budget.

4.2 Landfill Site Operations Review

The Committee received a report from Ron Cooper regarding a landfill operations review to provide site operations with municipal staff/equipment as well as reducing the hours of operation from 5 days to 4 days per week which would provide an annual savings of $40,600.

Moved by PETER HAMBLY I Seconded by BRUCE DAVIDSON
THAT the Hanover/Walkerton Waste Management Committee recommend to proceed with operations review as presented.
CARRIED

4.3 2018 Rate Review
The Committee reviewed landfill rates from other municipalities (see attached) noting that tipping fees increased from $110.00 to $120.00/tonne as well as from $220.00 to $240.00/tonne for non-hazardous waste and non-sorted waste effective January 1st, 2018. Based upon a review of rates with other municipalities the Committee is not recommending any rate changes for 2019.

5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

5.1 Landfill Gas Monitoring
The Committee reviewed correspondence from WSP that 3 additional landfill gas monitors are proposed to be installed this fall north of the landfill along the westerly site of the lands fronting onto CR No. 22. The estimated cost for the additional landfill gas monitoring wells is $30,000 plus HST. This work will be completed when ground conditions freeze and allow access in 2019.

5.2 Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority
The Committee reviewed the 2019 business plan which is involved in providing information to those involved in resource recovery and waste reduction activities in Ontario.
No specific timelines were provided with respect to changes to the current blue box program. The report can be obtained from their website at www.rpra.ca.

5.3 Pricing Waste Property
The Committee reviewed an article regarding challenges and opportunities facing our waste management systems (see attached).

5.4 Budget Status
The Committee reviewed the budget status to October 31st, 2018 with no concerns expressed.

6. LANDFILL MONTHLY REPORT
The Committee reviewed the landfill quantities to October 31st, 2018 with no concerns expressed (see attached).

7. LANDFILL OPERATIONAL REPORT
The Committee reviewed the landfill site operations reports for September and October 2018. Ron Cooper advised that as of October waste is being placed in Cell No. 1b which will increase the disposal and treatment of leachate by approximately one-third. The new site trailer is to be operational effective November 20th.

8. NEW BUSINESS - None

9. NEXT MEETING – To be determined

10. ADJOURNMENT
Moved by PETER HAMBLY
THAT the meeting be adjourned at 2:30pm.

Minutes prepared by Ron Cooper, Director of Public Works

_____

Chair/Secretary, Ron Cooper

HANOVER/WALKERTON LANDFILL SITE PRICE SURVEY 2018

SITE	MIN. CHARGE	RES/COMM WASTE TONNE	NON-HAZARDOUS* INDUSTRIAL WASTE TONNE	NON-SORTED TONNE	SHINGLES TONNE	DRYWALL TONNE	BRUSH TONNE	COMPOST	APPLIANCE	TIRES	EXTRA
Hanover/Walkerton	$10.00	$120.00	$240.00	$220.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00 over 2" in diameter Free under 2"	n/c	$10.00	Max. 4 free Car- $5.00 Truck- $10.00	Spring Mattresses - $15.00 ea
Kincardine	230kg or less $25.00	$105.00	$100.00	$210.00	$105.00	$105.00	$25-$105 per load		Freon $21.00 No freon n/c	n/c	Mattress $18.00 Cover $27.50/tonne
Huron	$20.00	$95.00		$190.00	$95.00	$95.00	n/c		no freon n/c with freon $20.00	n/c	
Saugeen Shores	$5.00	$106.12	$159.18	$212.24			over 500lbs $106.12/tonne under 500lbs n/c		$5.00		clean fill $56.06 mattress $20.00 boxspring $20.00
North Perth	$10.00	$94.00	$150 special waste handling fee added to total cost	2x reg			n/c for brush Waste wood $47.00	n/c	NF - n/c Freon - $50.00	car $3.00 truck $20.00 over 24/5" $43.00	$12.00each boxspring mattresses
Durham/Bentinck	under 20kg $5	$100.00		$200.00			$10.00		$10.00 applicances with freon $25.00	with rim $10.00- $20.00 without - free	Mattress $20.00 bsprings $20.00
Arran-Elderslie	$5.00	$103.00		$210.00					No freon n/c with freon $30.00	no rims n/c with rims $5.00	Mattress $15.00
Southgate	$100.00		$200.00		$100.00	$85.00	$70.00-$100.00	n/c	No freon n/c with freon $30.00	tires n/c rims $10.00	Mattress $15.00 Furniture $15.00

*** contaminated soils & asbestos**

Pricing waste properly

A proposal to manage Canadian waste more efficiently

By Dale Beugin and Jonathan Arnold

Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. This simple heuristic has guided waste-management policy in Canada for decades. Yet despite its grip on how we think about waste management, it paints an incomplete picture of the complex challenges and opportunities facing our waste management systems.

Instead, we need to think bigger. How can we make our waste management systems more efficient? How can we reduce costs and increase benefits for municipalities, taxpayers, and the environment? A recent report by Canada's Ecofiscal Commission takes a closer look at these issues and, in a nutshell, finds that our solid-waste management systems can and should rely more on market forces.

Economic challenges and opportunities

Waste management professionals need little convincing that Canadian communities face big challenges in how they manage their waste. China's recent import ban on recycled materials has turned the global recycling market on its head. At the same time, Canadians are among the biggest generators of waste in the world.

It's also no surprise that there's no free lunch in waste management: the more waste we produce, the costlier it is to manage. Building and operating landfills is expensive, especially with increasingly stringent environmental standards. Finding sites for new landfills is a lengthy and grueling process: few people want more landfills in their community. And since one-third of Canadian landfills operate at or near capacity, many communities will soon reckon with a shortage of landfill space and high replacement costs.

Diversion and prevention of solid waste present clear opportunities, but these options can also be costly. Facilities that process organics and recyclables are expensive to build and operate, as are the programs that collect this waste from the curb. There are also limits to how much solid waste consumers and producers are willing or able to eliminate through prevention.

All these factors present important challenges to governments. Why do Canadians generate so much solid waste, and why does so much of it get landfilled? How can governments discourage waste disposal while minimizing the costs of waste diversion and prevention? What is the optimal balance between waste disposal, diversion, and prevention? Or more practically, what policies can help get our waste systems closer to that optimal split?

More efficient systems

Creating more-efficient waste management systems requires that we go beyond traditional yardsticks of progress. Waste diversion targets, for example, establish long-term goals, but they tell us little about the complex trade-offs associated with actually achieving these goals. Reducing disposal is important, yet it is not always the best solution; depending on context and existing levels of service, diversion can be very expensive. And in some cases, excessive waste disposal is a symptom of deeper, more systemic issues.

Instead, we argue that governments should pursue a broader objective: improving the overall efficiency of our waste management systems. More-efficient systems deliver greater benefits of waste management at lower costs. Critically, these costs and benefits must include both financial and environmental factors.

But there is no single model of an efficient waste management system.

One-third of Canadian landfills operate at or near capacity, many communities will soon reckon with a shortage of landfill space.

In practice, the efficient balance between waste disposal, diversion, and prevention depends on many factors, including local context, current technologies, and even international markets for recyclable materials.

Addressing six problems

The best way to improve efficiency is to make waste-management systems work more like well-functioning markets. As we find in our report, however, waste-management markets are not normal, well-functioning markets. Prices for waste management – where they exist – do not typically reflect the full costs and benefits associated with waste management services and materials.

We identify six interconnected problems that cascade throughout solid waste markets. Each of these issues makes waste management systems inefficient:

1. Most Canadian households do not pay directly for waste management

Households typically pay for waste collection through property taxes or as a monthly fee. In other words, the amount residents or businesses pay for waste management has – in many cases – no connection with the quantity or composition of the solid waste they generate.

As a result, households tend to generate and dispose of more solid waste than they otherwise would if they paid directly for the service. Low waste disposal prices also weaken the incentive to divert waste through recycling or composting.

2. Landfills do not charge large waste generators the full cost of disposal

Waste disposal prices are more transparent for the commercial sector, including businesses, large buildings, institutions, and industry. Commercial waste is typically hauled directly to landfills, where waste generators pay a fee to dump their waste based on the weight or type of waste being tipped.

In many cases in Canada, however, the fee for disposing of every tonne of garbage is less than the full cost, encouraging waste generators to landfill more waste than they would otherwise. Fees in Canada often do not reflect the long-term costs of landfilling – that is, the future costs of building new landfill sites when existing ones reach capacity. Similarly, fees often exclude some of the social costs of landfilling,

such as environmental risks to water and soil, greenhouse gas emissions, and impacts on local property values due to odour and unsightliness.

3. The porous boundaries of solid waste management systems make it difficult for municipalities to price waste disposal at its full cost

The boundaries of solid waste management systems are porous. Unlike municipal water and wastewater systems, where municipalities have near complete control over treatment and distribution infrastructure, solid-waste systems – and the flows of waste within them – are more decentralized. These porous boundaries can make it difficult for municipalities to charge the full cost of waste disposal, as it can encourage waste to be exported to jurisdictions with lower tipping fees.

While waste exports aren't necessarily a problem in and of themselves, they can undermine a municipality's ability to recover its costs. Building, maintaining, and closing landfills is capital intensive, meaning that a large portion of disposal costs is fixed. When waste exports increase, municipalities generate less revenue to cover these costs. Waste exports can also undermine environmental outcomes if waste is exported to landfills that are less secure or to systems that put less emphasis on waste diversion and resource recovery.

4. Markets alone may provide inadequate waste diversion opportunities for some materials

Even if communities address Issues 1 to 3 and charge the full cost of waste disposal, the private sector would not necessarily provide adequate diversion alternatives. Collection and management systems for diversion often make financial sense only when operated on a broader scale. Achieving this scale can be difficult, particularly in small, rural, and northern communities.

Persistently high contamination rates may also stymie waste diversion opportunities. Service providers have limited control over how waste is sorted before they collect it, relying on households and businesses to separate their waste correctly. But despite better education and awareness, contamination rates are as high as 25 per cent in some communities, which increases processing costs and reduces the value of diverted materials. Tighter restrictions imposed by China have amplified these problems and made recycling markets more unpredictable, leading many companies to shut down across North America.

Persistently high contamination rates can stand in the way of waste diversion projects.

5. Municipal pricing policies have limited effect on goods manufacturers

If waste management services were priced according to their full cost – in all jurisdictions – consumers would have clear incentives to purchase goods made with less packaging or from materials that are easier to recycle. Producers, in turn, would have incentives to design and manufacture goods that generate less waste.

Contamination as high as 25 per cent increases costs.

But even if individual municipalities charged residents directly for waste disposal, and even if these prices approached the full net cost of the service, prices would have a negligible impact on upstream production. Waste is priced locally, and Canada may be too small to affect global manufacturers.

6. Extracting and processing natural resources generates negative environmental externalities further upstream

The majority of consumer goods produced in the economy use virgin materials, extracted and processed from the natural environment. These processes, however, can cause significant environmental damages that are unpriced or underpriced in markets. This effectively subsidizes the use of virgin materials and distorts markets further downstream for recycling, reuse, and prevention. Firms have an incentive to use more virgin materials and fewer recycled and reused materials in their manufacturing processes.

New policies needed

Policies that address these six issues can make our waste markets work better, improving the overall performance and efficiency of waste management systems in Canada.

To this end, our report lays out several recommendations for governments. It also includes a detailed case study on the City of Calgary that explores these challenges and solutions in practice (see inset, below).

Improving efficiency starts with smarter disposal pricing. First, this means charging tipping fees at landfills that reflect the full cost of the service – including both financial and social costs. Second, it means adopting pay-as-you-throw programs in municipalities, which charge residents directly for the amount of garbage they generate. Both policies encourage waste diversion and prevention, while allowing waste generators to find the cheapest way of doing so.

Yet relying on municipal pricing policies is not enough to address the six issues above. In particular, Extended Producer-Responsibility (EPR) policies have a key role to play. EPR policies require manufacturers to manage the waste generated from their products and provide market-based incentives to make products and materials that generate less waste in the first place. They can, in other words, help overcome key challenges in waste markets that disposal pricing policies alone cannot. Other complementary policies that target organics, such as municipal collection programs or backyard composting programs, also have an important role to play.

Ultimately, the case for improving waste management is an economic one. The EcoFiscal Commission report and related online course have more on how municipalities and provincial governments can better utilize market-based tools to manage solid waste.

Dale Beugin is the executive director of Canada's Ecofiscal Commission. Jonathan Arnold is a senior research associate with Canada's Ecofiscal Commission.

Case Study: Assessing Calgary's Waste Management System

Overall, the City of Calgary has made considerable progress in how it manages its waste. It increased landfill tipping fees to better reflect the cost of service. It has also proposed a pay-as-you-throw program for households, strengthening the link between how much waste people produce and how much they pay. A new organics collection program is also helping divert a significant quantity of waste from its landfills.

Progress at the provincial level, however, has been slower. Most notably, Alberta is the only province that does not have legislated extended producer responsibility (EPR) programs and is falling behind in its commitments under the Canada-wide Action Plan for EPR. If Alberta were to follow the lead of other provinces, such as B.C., and implement full EPR, it would make producers financially and physically responsible for managing the waste generated from their products. An EPR program for residential recycling would also reduce costs to municipalities that would no longer have to provide these services.

2018
HANOVER/WALKERTON LANDFILL QUANTITIES

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL YTD	LAST Y-T-D	%
RECEIVABLES (TONNES)															
HANOVER RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE PICKUP	61.32	40.22	68.46	62.09	70.30	69.91	60.84	78.96	63.32	62.66			638.08	639.38	-0.20%
WALKERTON RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE PICKUP	50.71	30.81	34.43	37.35	47.15	36.52	39.48	43.36	39.05	48.37			407.23	396.60	2.68%
HANOVER PUBLIC WORKS & PARKS (ARENA INCLUDED)	2.31	1.55	9.51	3.13	10.02	6.15	24.21	7.82	3.01	4.83			72.54	79.55	-8.81%
WALKERTON PUBLIC WORKS & PARKS	6.38	5.03	12.15	13.48	30.82	40.54	36.19	21.83	16.50	12.47			195.39	161.37	21.08%
RESIDENTIAL (HANOVER/WALKERTON COMBINED)	48.94	34.98	61.80	61.17	180.25	110.31	100.88	83.44	94.47	85.41			861.65	935.80	-7.92%
RESIDENTIAL - HANOVER ONLY	29.62	17.81	33.79	39.25	131.11	64.52	61.23	50.86	52.49	48.00			528.68	529.46	-0.15%
RESIDENTIAL - WALKERTON ONLY	19.32	17.17	28.01	21.92	49.14	45.79	39.65	32.58	41.98	37.41			332.97	406.34	-18.06%
COMMERCIAL (HANOVER/WALKERTON COMBINED)	195.80	167.29	245.55	235.84	356.38	302.91	259.49	310.19	320.56	307.24			2701.25	2583.05	4.58%
COMMERCIAL - HANOVER ONLY	87.87	60.15	132.30	159.49	204.50	165.92	139.80	173.01	170.70	179.07			1472.81	1405.81	4.77%
COMMERICAL - WALKERTON ONLY	107.93	107.14	113.25	76.35	151.88	136.99	119.69	137.18	149.86	128.17			1228.44	1177.24	4.35%
COMMERCIAL - NON-SORTED WASTE	0.00	0.54	0.98	0.16	1.41	0.95	0.03	0.03	0.29	0.06			4.45	4.53	-1.77%
DEMOLITION MATERIALS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			32.14	23.84	34.82%
ROADSIDE CLEAN-UP	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.42	-100.00%
TIRES	6	2	21	7	71	63	40	18	38	51			317.00	199.00	59.30%
APPLIANCES	2	5	11	3	9	7	4	4	5	7			57.00	74.00	-22.97%
MATTRESS	18	11	23	19	26	26	39	35	39	30			266.00	247.00	7.69%
ASBESTOS INSULATION	4.63	0.60	3.32	0.00	1.53	3.55	0.38	1.36	12.04	8.72			36.13	9.40	284.36%
TOTAL RECEIVABLES													4948.86	4833.94	2.38%
GRANULAR 'A'	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.33	0.00	0.00			21.33	419.26	-94.91%
GRANULAR 'B'	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	314.81	-100.00%
SEALER CLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.99	0.00	87.33	0.00			95.32	42.97	121.83%
SAND - CATCHBASINS	8.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.46	0.00	10.71	20.06	64.74	34.04			166.79	209.77	-20.49%
NON-HAZARDOUS SOIL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	
ASPHALT - HANOVER PUBLIC WORKS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	62.67	17.81	1.64	0.00	9.43			91.55	579.62	-84.21%
ASHPALT - HANOVER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.78	1214.06	31.78	2.25			1278.87	0.00	
ASPHALT - OTHER SOURCES	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36	0.00	0.00	1.30	11.59	0.00	0.00			17.25	0.97	1678.35%
CLEAN FILL - HANOVER PUBLIC WORKS	0.00	119.12	0.00	113.27	123.73	276.85	32.96	109.37	25.65	58.57			859.52	864.83	-0.61%
CLEAN FILL - WALKERTON PUBLIC WORKS	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.02	2.04	293.73	33.58	0.00	21.90	0.00			357.27	168.98	111.43%
CLEAN FILL - HANOVER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS	1033.67	186.75	236.98	736.43	1305.86	0.00	1288.81	4347.28	2039.30	1479.50			12654.58	3367.20	275.82%
CLEAN FILL - HOUSE DEMO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	
CLEAN FILL - OTHER SOURCES	0.00	0.00	435.98	0.00	0.00	913.47	80.98	0.00	0.00	9.71			1440.14	930.63	54.75%
TOPSOIL - HANOVER PUBLIC WORKS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00			0.00	2.47	-100.00%
TOPSOIL - OTHER SOURCES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.89	3.55	0.03	0.00	0.35	0.00			4.82	387.73	-98.76%
CONCRETE - HANOVER PUBLIC WORKS	0.00	0.00	0.12	13.20	0.00	24.10	0.00	0.00	20.58	2.19			60.19	31.69	89.93%
CONCRETE-HANOVER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.63	36.12			75.75	5.33	
CONCRETE - OTHER SOURCES	1.44	0.00	0.00	4.88	0.84	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.50	2.64			11.20	10.31	8.63%
DIVERSIONS (TONNES)															
RECYCLABLES	21.00	11.40	17.07	14.72	20.09	17.54	17.85	0.00	18.65	18.58			156.90	175.27	-10.48%
CARDBOARD	7.21	4.64	6.67	5.78	9.54	7.00	7.59	7.59	7.00	9.07			72.09	73.51	-1.93%
DRYWALL	0.00	0.00	9.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			9.26	28.53	-67.54%
SHINGLES	0.00	0.00	9.95	0.00	10.26	266.87	18.45	9.17	18.64	12.54			345.88	54.44	535.34%
METAL (out)	0.00	0.00	67.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			67.07	0.00	
STYROFOAM	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	1.39	-100.00%
BRUSH	17.98	0.70	5.88	11.26	49.48	50.88	31.26	30.41	16.29	23.29			237.43	205.81	15.36%
COMPOST (includes Wood Chips)	11.40	1.36	5.82	3.64	13.44	12.82	6.97	6.83	12.75	17.50			92.53	73.09	26.60%
FILM PLASTICS	0.34	0.00	0.25	0.26	0.00	0.23	0.14	0.11	0.26	0.19			1.78	1.65	7.88%
TOTAL DIVERSIONS	57.93	18.10	121.97	35.66	102.81	355.34	82.26	54.11	73.59	81.17	0.00	0.00	982.94	613.69	60.17%