EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 11, Report No. 9, of the Committee of the Whole, which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on March 19, 2013.

11 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONAL REVIEW – STATUS UPDATE

The Committee of the Whole recommends approval of the recommendation contained in the following report of the Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works, dated February 26, 2013:

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works, in consultation with the Commissioner of Finance and City Treasurer, the Commissioner of Community Services, the Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services, and the Senior Manager of Strategic Planning, recommends that:

1. This report be received for information.

Contribution to Sustainability

This operational review is intended to review the current practices related to the collection of solid waste in the City's Public Works, Parks & Forestry Operations, and Buildings & Facilities Departments. Through this review, there may be opportunities for efficiencies, which will contribute to the overall sustainability of these programs, and the financial outlook of the City.

Economic Impact

As outlined later in the report, there is a requirement to hire a consultant to assist with reviewing the various municipal solid waste collection services, to determine potential cost savings and/or efficiencies, as well as service delivery options. Funds have been provided in the draft 2013 Operating Budget for this undertaking.

Communications Plan

Once all the phases of the Operational Review have been completed, the results will be put forward to Council in a public report.

Purpose

To update Council as to the status of the Operational Review concerning solid waste management.

Background - Analysis and Options

At its meeting of January 31, 2012 (Item 1, Report 21), Council approved the recommendation of the Commissioner of Engineering & Public Works to undertake an operational review of solid waste management collection services.

Three City departments are currently involved with collection of waste in one form or another

The collection of waste materials is currently managed by three City departments. Residential waste collection is managed by the City's Public Works Department. Collection of waste from the various City-owned facilities is managed by the Buildings & Facilities Department, while collection of waste from City parks and sports fields is managed by the Parks & Forestry Operations Department.

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 11, CW Report No. 9 - Page 2

A project steering committee for the operational review was created consisting of the following staff:

Commissioner of Engineering & Public Works Commissioner of Community Services Commissioner of Finance & City Treasurer Director of Public Works Director of Parks & Forestry Operations Director of Buildings & Facilities Senior Manager of Strategic Planning Manager of Solid Waste Manager of Parks Operations Buildings Manager

Subsequent to the start of the review, the new Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services was hired, and now is also a member of this review team. Once the Director of Innovation & Continuous Improvement is hired, they will be also part of this review team.

The data collection phase of this review has been completed

The review is taking place in four stages. The first is the Data Collection phase. This involved collecting data on all business processes involved in the solid waste collection area. This was completed at the end of the second quarter of 2012.

A number of business activities have been identified relating to solid waste collection across the City

A key task required prior to assessing service delivery model options and considerations is to identify current business functions and processes. These various activities include:

- Blue box, green bin and garbage collection;
- Sales of blue boxes/green bins/garbage tags;
- Administration of Double-Up Days;
- Large Household Collection Program;
- Administration of Environmental Days;
- Park debris collection;
- Sports field debris clean up;
- Administration of Service in Kind/Community events;

The cost of these various business activities range from \$1,600 to \$3.6M annually.

Phase 1 data collection was extensive

In identifying the various business activities, staff were required to provide information on the following criteria:

- Description of the business process
- Opportunities for significant changes or improvements
- Service triggers (planned vs. demand)
- Outputs/outcomes
- Linkage to other City services
- Legislative requirements
- Service standards (Council directed/Operational mandated/best practice)
- How are service levels measured

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 11, CW Report No. 9 - Page 3

- Level of importance/satisfaction (Ipsos Reid)
- Key stakeholders
- Cost drivers
- 2012 budgeted cost
- Source of funding
- Revenue generation opportunities
- Opportunities for outsourcing

The collection of such information also facilitates a more comprehensive evaluation of the program and its business activities. The evaluation framework includes an assessment of "relevance", "success", and "cost-effectiveness" against stated program objectives.

Objective criteria was developed to pare down the number of areas for review

Once the data was collected the business processes were evaluated against the following criteria:

- A monetary activity cost threshold of \$20,000 per year
- Opportunities for efficiencies through process or technological changes
- Opportunities for the service to be contracted out
- Mandated (federally or provincially) versus Council approved program
- Opportunities for cost savings or revenue generation

This selection criteria was chosen to focus on those areas with increased potential for cost efficiencies, or where staff felt there that further information was needed in order to make an assessment.

Of the numerous waste related activities, the following met the above noted criteria:

- Residential waste collection (single family and multi-residential) \$3.8 M / year
- Residential blue box collection (single family and multi-residential) \$2.7M / year
- Residential green bin collection (single family) \$1.2M / year
- Residential leaf & yard waste collection \$1.0M / year
- Blue box, green bin, composter sales \$138K / year
- Environmental Days \$30K / year
- Public space collection (includes park and sports field recycling and debris container collection \$629K/ year, boulevard debris collection \$87K / year, waste collection at City facilities \$73K / year, and recycling collection at City facilities \$20K / year)
- Service in kind / community events container collection and debris pick-up \$26Kyear

Although not meeting the above noted criteria, the following are also being looked at as part of this review to address opportunities or challenges that have been previously identified:

- Canada Post mail box debris
- Expansion of waste diversion programs at City facilities

Insufficient staff resources to undertake Phase 2 of this review requires the acquisition of professional consulting services.

The detailed financial and business analysis, benchmarking, and potential public consultation requires the retention of a consultant to assist with the cost analysis and benchmarking review of the various collection models used across municipalities, and evaluation of alternate service delivery options.

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 11, CW Report No. 9 - Page 4

Opportunities for significant cost savings in the City's residential waste collection programs without significant service level changes may be limited

The residential waste collection programs that are managed by the Public Works Department are the most costly of all the City's waste collection services.

The cost to residents for their current residential waste collection services is approximately \$105 / year for 155 collections per year. Almost \$8.8 million is budgeted annually for the residential waste collection services provided through Public Works, and the breakdown of the budget is as follows:

\$ 3,861,792 for Residual Waste (garbage) collection

- \$ 2,665,211 for Recycling (blue box) collection
- \$ 1,175,328 for Green Bin (organics) collection
- \$ 1,011,928 for Leaf and Yard Waste collection
- \$ 9,800 for Appliance / Metal Recovery collection

As these collection services are fully contracted out, and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, the opportunities for cost efficiencies appear to be limited to either, changing the current levels of service, or, potentially changing the method of collection.

Alternative collection methods will also be assessed to evaluate potential cost savings

There are basically three methods of residential waste collection, these being, manual, semiautomated, and fully automated. The City's current method of residential waste collection is manual collection. There are two staff per waste collection vehicle and one staff per recycling/green bin collection vehicle to load waste materials into the vehicles.

Semi-automated collection involves using existing collection vehicles modified to tip carts for garbage and recyclables. Using this method an employee would roll the cart to the truck, affix it to the cart tipper, and empty the cart. This would still require two staff per vehicle.

Fully automated systems involve a single operator, driving a specialized vehicle allowing the operator to empty the cart into the collection vehicle without having to leave the cab of the vehicle.

Cart-based collection systems have been recently implemented here in Ontario. The City of Toronto implemented a cart-based system for garbage and recyclables in November 2008. Toronto uses a combination of automated and semi-automated collection methods due to the physical characteristics of the city, and the issues created by on-street parking. Other municipalities that have implemented a cart-based system include:

- City of Guelph (3 year phased approach for waste, blue box and green bin)
- City of Hamilton (collection of source separated organics only)
- City of Ottawa (collection of source separated organics only)
- City of Kingston (collection of source separated organics only)

In order to determine the financial impacts associated with changing Vaughan's method of collection from the current "manual" method to a cart-based automated or semi-automated collection service, a consultant with extensive knowledge in residential waste collection is required.

Similarly, knowledge of the waste industry, alternative service delivery models, and cost analysis is required to review the remaining components previously identified, such as public space waste collection.

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 11, CW Report No. 9 - Page 5

Given the extensive work required to review and assess the various activities performed, and explore opportunities for cost savings or alternate service delivery models, a consultant with waste collection knowledge will be required to perform these detailed cost analysis.

The impact of providing waste collection to private residential condominiums was the subject of a separate report

Council, at its meeting of February 21 (Item 1, Report 4), also approved that the Operational Review on solid waste look at the impact of providing municipal waste collection services to those residential condominiums that currently do not receive municipal collection services, as part of the 2013 budget process. That report was completed and received by Council on November 20, 2012.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council. Further, the Solid Waste operational review links to the Vaughan Vision 20/20 theme "Demonstrate Excellence in Service Delivery" by ensuring that current service delivery standards are efficient and effective. As well, there is a link with the theme "Lead & Promote Environmental Sustainability" through validating that the current solid waste business processes protect and enhance the natural environment.

Regional Implications

There are no implications on the Region's waste disposal, transfer, or processing operations, as a result of this report.

City staff continue to work with the Region in developing its long range Integrated Waste Management Master Plan; however, the outcomes of that plan may ultimately impact the City's collection programs.

Conclusion

The first phase of the Operational Review for Solid Waste has been completed. The second phase is underway; however, external resources are required to fully review and analyze the potential efficiencies in the various activities identified. Staff will provide a further status update on the finalized scope of the operational review later this Spring.

Attachments

1. Solid Waste Management Service Review

Report prepared by:

Brian T. Anthony, Director of Public Works, Ext 6116

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – FEBRUARY 26, 2013

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONAL REVIEW – STATUS UPDATE

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works, in consultation with the Commissioner of Finance and City Treasurer, the Commissioner of Community Services, the Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services, and the Senior Manager of Strategic Planning, recommends that:

1. This report be received for information.

Contribution to Sustainability

This operational review is intended to review the current practices related to the collection of solid waste in the City's Public Works, Parks & Forestry Operations, and Buildings & Facilities Departments. Through this review, there may be opportunities for efficiencies, which will contribute to the overall sustainability of these programs, and the financial outlook of the City.

Economic Impact

As outlined later in the report, there is a requirement to hire a consultant to assist with reviewing the various municipal solid waste collection services, to determine potential cost savings and/or efficiencies, as well as service delivery options. Funds have been provided in the draft 2013 Operating Budget for this undertaking.

Communications Plan

Once all the phases of the Operational Review have been completed, the results will be put forward to Council in a public report.

Purpose

To update Council as to the status of the Operational Review concerning solid waste management.

Background - Analysis and Options

At its meeting of January 31, 2012 (Item 1, Report 21), Council approved the recommendation of the Commissioner of Engineering & Public Works to undertake an operational review of solid waste management collection services.

Three City departments are currently involved with collection of waste in one form or another

The collection of waste materials is currently managed by three City departments. Residential waste collection is managed by the City's Public Works Department. Collection of waste from the various City-owned facilities is managed by the Buildings & Facilities Department, while collection of waste from City parks and sports fields is managed by the Parks & Forestry Operations Department.

A project steering committee for the operational review was created consisting of the following staff:

Commissioner of Engineering & Public Works Commissioner of Community Services Commissioner of Finance & City Treasurer Director of Public Works Director of Parks & Forestry Operations Director of Buildings & Facilities Senior Manager of Strategic Planning Manager of Solid Waste Manager of Parks Operations Buildings Manager

Subsequent to the start of the review, the new Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services was hired, and now is also a member of this review team. Once the Director of Innovation & Continuous Improvement is hired, they will be also part of this review team.

The data collection phase of this review has been completed

The review is taking place in four stages. The first is the Data Collection phase. This involved collecting data on all business processes involved in the solid waste collection area. This was completed at the end of the second guarter of 2012.

A number of business activities have been identified relating to solid waste collection across the City

A key task required prior to assessing service delivery model options and considerations is to identify current business functions and processes. These various activities include:

- Blue box, green bin and garbage collection;
- Sales of blue boxes/green bins/garbage tags;
- Administration of Double-Up Days;
- Large Household Collection Program;
- Administration of Environmental Days;
- Park debris collection;
- Sports field debris clean up;
- Administration of Service in Kind/Community events;

The cost of these various business activities range from \$1,600 to \$3.6M annually.

Phase 1 data collection was extensive

In identifying the various business activities, staff were required to provide information on the following criteria:

- Description of the business process
- Opportunities for significant changes or improvements
- Service triggers (planned vs. demand)
- Outputs/outcomes
- Linkage to other City services
- Legislative requirements
- Service standards (Council directed/Operational mandated/best practice)
- How are service levels measured
- Level of importance/satisfaction (Ipsos Reid)
- Key stakeholders
- Cost drivers
- 2012 budgeted cost
- Source of funding
- Revenue generation opportunities

• Opportunities for outsourcing

The collection of such information also facilitates a more comprehensive evaluation of the program and its business activities. The evaluation framework includes an assessment of "relevance", "success", and "cost-effectiveness" against stated program objectives.

Objective criteria was developed to pare down the number of areas for review

Once the data was collected the business processes were evaluated against the following criteria:

- A monetary activity cost threshold of \$20,000 per year
- Opportunities for efficiencies through process or technological changes
- Opportunities for the service to be contracted out
- Mandated (federally or provincially) versus Council approved program
- Opportunities for cost savings or revenue generation

This selection criteria was chosen to focus on those areas with increased potential for cost efficiencies, or where staff felt there that further information was needed in order to make an assessment.

Of the numerous waste related activities, the following met the above noted criteria:

- Residential waste collection (single family and multi-residential) \$3.8 M / year
- Residential blue box collection (single family and multi-residential) \$2.7M / year
- Residential green bin collection (single family) \$1.2M / year
- Residential leaf & yard waste collection \$1.0M / year
- Blue box, green bin, composter sales \$138K / year
- Environmental Days \$30K / year
- Public space collection (includes park and sports field recycling and debris container collection \$629K/ year, boulevard debris collection \$87K / year, waste collection at City facilities \$73K / year, and recycling collection at City facilities \$20K / year)
- Service in kind / community events container collection and debris pick-up \$26Kyear

Although not meeting the above noted criteria, the following are also being looked at as part of this review to address opportunities or challenges that have been previously identified:

- Canada Post mail box debris
- Expansion of waste diversion programs at City facilities

Insufficient staff resources to undertake Phase 2 of this review requires the acquisition of professional consulting services.

The detailed financial and business analysis, benchmarking, and potential public consultation requires the retention of a consultant to assist with the cost analysis and benchmarking review of the various collection models used across municipalities, and evaluation of alternate service delivery options.

Opportunities for significant cost savings in the City's residential waste collection programs without significant service level changes may be limited

The residential waste collection programs that are managed by the Public Works Department are the most costly of all the City's waste collection services.

The cost to residents for their current residential waste collection services is approximately \$105 / year for 155 collections per year. Almost \$8.8 million is budgeted annually for the residential waste collection services provided through Public Works, and the breakdown of the budget is as follows:

\$ 3,861,792 for Residual Waste (garbage) collection

- \$ 2,665,211 for Recycling (blue box) collection
- \$ 1,175,328 for Green Bin (organics) collection
- \$ 1,011,928 for Leaf and Yard Waste collection
- \$ 9,800 for Appliance / Metal Recovery collection

As these collection services are fully contracted out, and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, the opportunities for cost efficiencies appear to be limited to either, changing the current levels of service, or, potentially changing the method of collection.

Alternative collection methods will also be assessed to evaluate potential cost savings

There are basically three methods of residential waste collection, these being, manual, semiautomated, and fully automated. The City's current method of residential waste collection is manual collection. There are two staff per waste collection vehicle and one staff per recycling/green bin collection vehicle to load waste materials into the vehicles.

Semi-automated collection involves using existing collection vehicles modified to tip carts for garbage and recyclables. Using this method an employee would roll the cart to the truck, affix it to the cart tipper, and empty the cart. This would still require two staff per vehicle.

Fully automated systems involve a single operator, driving a specialized vehicle allowing the operator to empty the cart into the collection vehicle without having to leave the cab of the vehicle.

Cart-based collection systems have been recently implemented here in Ontario. The City of Toronto implemented a cart-based system for garbage and recyclables in November 2008. Toronto uses a combination of automated and semi-automated collection methods due to the physical characteristics of the city, and the issues created by on-street parking. Other municipalities that have implemented a cart-based system include:

- City of Guelph (3 year phased approach for waste, blue box and green bin)
- City of Hamilton (collection of source separated organics only)
- City of Ottawa (collection of source separated organics only)
- City of Kingston (collection of source separated organics only)

In order to determine the financial impacts associated with changing Vaughan's method of collection from the current "manual" method to a cart-based automated or semi-automated collection service, a consultant with extensive knowledge in residential waste collection is required.

Similarly, knowledge of the waste industry, alternative service delivery models, and cost analysis is required to review the remaining components previously identified, such as public space waste collection.

Given the extensive work required to review and assess the various activities performed, and explore opportunities for cost savings or alternate service delivery models, a consultant with waste collection knowledge will be required to perform these detailed cost analysis.

The impact of providing waste collection to private residential condominiums was the subject of a separate report

Council, at its meeting of February 21 (Item 1, Report 4), also approved that the Operational Review on solid waste look at the impact of providing municipal waste collection services to those residential condominiums that currently do not receive municipal collection services, as part of the 2013 budget process. That report was completed and received by Council on November 20, 2012.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council. Further, the Solid Waste operational review links to the Vaughan Vision 20/20 theme "Demonstrate Excellence in Service Delivery" by ensuring that current service delivery standards are efficient and effective. As well, there is a link with the theme "Lead & Promote Environmental Sustainability" through validating that the current solid waste business processes protect and enhance the natural environment.

Regional Implications

There are no implications on the Region's waste disposal, transfer, or processing operations, as a result of this report.

City staff continue to work with the Region in developing its long range Integrated Waste Management Master Plan; however, the outcomes of that plan may ultimately impact the City's collection programs.

Conclusion

The first phase of the Operational Review for Solid Waste has been completed. The second phase is underway; however, external resources are required to fully review and analyze the potential efficiencies in the various activities identified. Staff will provide a further status update on the finalized scope of the operational review later this Spring.

Attachments

1. Solid Waste Management Service Review

Report prepared by:

Brian T. Anthony, Director of Public Works, Ext 6116

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Jankowski, P. Eng., Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works Brian T. Anthony, CRS-S, C. Tech Director of Public Works

Attachment 1

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE REVIEW

												2011 Actual 2012 Budgeted		Cost Savngs Identified		
Division Business Activities	Description of Business Process		Outputs/Outcomes	Linkage to other City Services		Service Standards (Council directed/Operational mandate/Best practice)	measure your current	How important a of satisfaction is citizens? (Ipsos	s the service to		Cost Drivers (Resources, Labour, Equipment)	2011/12 Budgeted or Actual cost for service	Service Funding	Revenue Generation Opportunities?	Is the Service Currently Contracted Out?	Opportunities for contracting service?
								Level of Importance	Level of Satisfaction							
Public Works								mportanoo	Calloraduren							
Recycling Collection (residential curbside)	(blue box) material. Co collected with gb material. Top loader -	Opportunity for change Planned via automated collection and altering frequency of collection.	Collection of material.	n/a	Yes - Provincial via Environmental Protection Act Ont Reg 101/94	Weekly 52 x per year	CTS, GPS, Surveys	99% !	90%	Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)	\$2,566,610 WDO grant / revenue	Taxation and a grant via Waste Diversion Organization	No	Yes	n/a
Organics Collection (residential curbside)	(green bin) material.	Opportunity for change Planned via automated collection	Collection of material.	n/a	No	Weekly 52 x per year	CTS, GPS, Surveys	99%	90%	Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)		taxation	No	Yes	n/a
Yard Waste and Christmas tree Collection (residential curbside)	waste and Christmas trees. Rear loader / Side loader - one man via manual collection.	collection	Collection of material.	n/a	Environmental Protection Act Ont Reg 101/94	Seasonal 25 x per year (8 weeks weekly in the spring; 8 weeks weekly in the fall; 18 weeks biweekly in the summer)	Surveys	99% 9	90%	Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)	\$975,400	taxation			n/a
Garbage 'Residual Waste' Collection - including bulky items (curbside)	S Collection garbage (including bulky items) within prescribed limits. Rear loader - two man via manual collection.	Opportunity for change Planned via automated collection - BUT would have to create separate program for bulky items.	Collection of material.	n/a	No - Provincial via Municipal Act 2001 (Part II) defines spheres of jurisdiction but does not specify collection	Every Other Week 26 x per year	CTS, GPS, Surveys			Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)	expense \$3,657,000	taxation	No	Yes	n/a
Recycling Collection (multi unit residential)	Collection of multi unit residential recycling (blue toters) material Top loader - one man via automated collection.	No Planned	Collection of material.	n/a	No - Provincial via Environmental Protection Act Ont Reg 103/94 - it is the 'owners' responsibility	Weekly 52 x per year	Complaints from Property Managers (proven to be contractor error) (not recorded in CTS)			Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)	\$53,000 revenue (WDO grant - included in curbside)	taxation and Waste Diversion Organization grant (included in curbside amount)	eliminate program or charge for	Yes	n/a
Garbage Collection (multi unit residential)	To those properties 'grandfathered in' via council resolution - collection of multi unit residential garbage. Front end - one man via automated collection.	Yes - Place upset limit Planned on the amount of waste collected.	Collection of material.	n/a	No	Twice a Week 104 x per year	Complaints from Property Managers (proven to be contractor error) (not recorded in CTS)			Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)		taxation	Cost Savings - eliminate program or charge for services	Yes	n/a
Bulky Item Collection (multi unit residential)	To those properties 'grandfathered in' via council resolution - collection of multi unit residential bulky items (via rear packer - two man - curbside truck) - Given this is a separate collection, the service is provided by appointment only.	No Demand - MR entity has to complete application onlir (no service fee		n/a	No	Every Other Week 26 x per year	Complaints from Property Managers (proven to be contractor error) (not recorded in CTS)			Residents, York Region	n/a - no additional cost at this time	included with garbage, but separate service	taxation	Cost Savings - eliminate program or charge for services	Yes	n/a
Large Appliance / Metal Recovery Collection	Collection of large metal appliances and large metal items for the purpose of recycling. Cube truck - two man via manual collection.	No Demand - Residents are required to book (and pay a service fee) prin to collection		n/a	No	Weekly 52 x per year	Quantity of appliances picked up by contractor			Residents, York Region	Tendered process - cost of labour and equipment (including haulage)	expense \$7,600 revenue (\$12,700)	full cost recovery	Cost Savings - eliminate program or charge more for service	Yes	n/a

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE REVIEW

ision Business Activities	Description of	Opportunities for	Service	Outputs/Outcomes	Linkage to othe	r Legislative	Service Standards	How do you	How important	t and what love!	Key	Cost Drivers	2011 Actual 2012 Budgeted 2011/12	Service	Cost Savngs Identified Revenue	Is the Service	Opportunities
	Description of Business Process	Significant Changes or Improvements	Triggers (Planned vs Demand)	outputs/outcomes	City Services		(Council directed/Operational mandate/Best practice)	measure your current	of satisfaction i	of satisfaction is the service to citizens? (Ipsos Reid Survey)		(Resources, Labour, Equipment)	Budgeted or Actual cost for service	Funding	Generation Opportunities?	Currently Contracted Out?	contracting service?
									Level of Importance	Level of Satisfaction							
Double Up Days' Program (curbside residential - garbage/residual waste)	Four annual events intended to assist residents with additional waste generated in their household . Six items of garbage may be placed at curbside without the need of a paid garbage tag (curbside residential)	No	Planned. Based on Council resolution.	Collection of material.	n/a	No	4 x per year	Resident participation (surveys)	inportance		Residents, York Region		expense \$38,400	taxation	Cost Savings - eliminate program	Yes	n/a
Large Household Recycling Program (curbside residential)	Program intended to assist large households that are significantly and continually challenged to meet the requirements of the Cit/s waste program. Program requires several staff inspections. If application is approved, resident entitled to one free bb; gb and a limited quantity of garbage tags. Household can	No	on application submission	The primary objective of this program is to assist large hhds with the City's waste program by ensuring residents fully understand and are fully participating in the City's (and Region's) waste diversion programs. This may require (after staff investigation) the provision of an additional blue box and green bin and a limited quantity of garbage tags.	s	No	Estimate 4 to 10 applications a year.	Quantity of applications submitted and outcome of site inspections based on application submitted.			Residents (large hhds)		estimate 6 applications per year x \$900 per application (includes repeated site visits, admin, free items) \$5,400	taxation	Cost Savings - eliminate program	No	No
Backyard Composter Program (City purchases from manufacturer; sells to residents)	only apply once. The sale of backyard composters at cost less \$10. Composters sold at JOC and Env Day events.	themselves from the retail business (of	Demand	To provide the resident with the option to purchase composters (but also available at retail outlets).	n/a	No	JOC M to F 8:30-4:30 <u>Env Davs</u> (5x /yr) 10-3	Quantity sold (tracked annually)			Residents	Cost of Product	expense \$3,000 revenue (\$2,000)	recovery (cost	Cost Savings - eliminate program or charge more for item	No	No
Garbage Tag Sales Program (City prints garbage tags; sells to residents)	The sale of paid garbage tags. Tags sold at Community Centres, JOC, City Hall and Env Day events	No	Demand	To provide the necessary 'tools' should the resident need to place more than the 3 garbage items curbside (but no more than 13)	n/a 3	No	JOC M to F 8:30-4:30 CC Operating hrs of Community Centre <u>Env Days</u> (5x /yr) 10-3	Quantity sold (tracked annually)			Residents	Cost of	expense \$20,000 revenue (\$125,000)	full cost recovery	Increase Revenue - increase cost of garbage tags	No	No
Blue Box Sales (City purchases from manufacturer; sells to residents)	boxes. Blue boxes sold at Community	Yes - City to remove themselves from the retail business (of waste items).	Demand	To provide the resident with an option for the purchase of blue boxes (also available via retail outlets)		No	JOC M to F 8:30-4:30 CC Operating hrs of Community Centre Env Days (5x /yr) 10-3	Quantity sold (tracked annually)			Residents	Tendered Process - Cost of Product	expense \$41,000 revenue (\$27,920)	full cost recovery	Cost Savings - eliminate program	No	No
Green Bin Sales (City purchases from manufacturer; sells to residents)	Green bins sold at Community Centres,	Yes - City to remove themselves from the retail business (of waste items).	Demand	To provide the resident with an option for the purchase of green bins (also available via retail outlets).		No	M to F 8:30-4:30 <u>QC</u> Operating hrs of Community Centre <u>Env Davs</u> (4x /yr) 10-3	Quantity sold (tracked annually)			Residents	Tendered Process - Cost of Product	expense \$52,000 revenue (\$33,600)	full cost recovery	Cost Savings - eliminate program	No	No
Kitchen (organic) Container Sales (City purchases from manufacturer; sells to residents)	containers. Kitchen containers sold at	Yes - City to remove themselves from the retail business (of waste items).		To provide the resident with the an option (also available via retail outlets) to purchase the kitchen containers in order to participate in the City's waste diversion programs.		No	JOC M to F 8:30-4:30 <u>Env Days (</u> 5x /yr) 10-3	Quantity sold (tracked annually)			Residents	Tendered Process - Cost of Product	expense \$7,020 revenue (\$5,900)	full cost recovery	Cost Savings - eliminate program	No	No

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE REVIEW

ivision Business Activities	Dependention of Converting the	e la contra	Outputs (Outputs			Convice Stendards				1/	Coast Driver	2011 Actual 2012 Budgeted	Parrier	Cost Savngs Identified		Opportunitie
	Description of Business Process Significant Changes or Improvements	r Service Triggers (Planned vs Demand)	Outputs/Outcomes	Linkage to other City Services		Service Standards (Council directed/Operational mandate/Best practice)	measure your current	How important of satisfaction is citizens? (Ipso	s the service to		Cost Drivers (Resources, Labour, Equipment)	2011/12 Budgeted or Actual cost for service	Service Funding	Revenue Generation Opportunities?	Is the Service Currently Contracted Out?	Opportunities contracting service?
								Level of Importance	Level of Satisfaction							
Free Replacements for Green Bins, Blue Boxes and Kitchen Containers	The provision of a free To be reconsidered i City issued blue box or the City gets out of it green bin provided that the resident brings in their broken/damaged City issued green bin or blue box.		To provide the resident ongoing replacements of blue boxes and green bins provided that the resident brings in their broken City- issued bb or gb	n/a	No	JOC M to F 8:30-4:30 <u>Env Days</u> (5x /yr) 10-3	Quantity replaced (tracked annually)			Residents	As above	expense \$35,000 approx.	taxation	Cost Savings - Eliminate program or charge for all replacements	No	No
Promotion and Education (P and E)	Ongoing education and promotion efforts to keep residents aware of program requirements etc.	Planned	To produce / generate the required p and e material using predetermined modes o communication to ensure residents have the necessary information to fully participate in City's waste management program (newsletters, calendar, web, mobile signs).		No	year round	Compliance with waste program, number of waste calls to AV / front counter (categorized as resident error)			Residents, York Region	Cost of Printing Cost of Mailing	expense \$126,340	taxation	No	Some printing and design is contracted out.	No
Customer Service - Administration (a) - Access Vaughan - Front office staff (Public Works)	To listen to / document No resolve resident complaints on matters relating to municipal waste collection.	Demand + Planned	To listen to resident complaints and to attempt to resolve using predetermined protocol / processes set by section.	n/a	No	year round	CTS reports			Residents, York Region	Required staff and resources	<u>expense</u> \$189,400	taxation	No	No	No
Customer Service - Managing Day to Day Operations (b) - Manager of Solid Waste Management (100%) - Waste Coordinator (100%) - Waste Coordinator Assistant (100%) - Waste Program and Education Planner (100%) - Director of Public Works (5%)	To listen to / document No / investigate / resolve resident complaints on matters relating to municipal waste collection.	Demand + Planned	To listen to resident complaints (typically escalated) and to resolve using predetermined protocol / processes set by section (i.e site inspections, gps etc.).		No	year round	CTS reports *			Residents, York Region	Required staff and resources to investigate calls	<u>expense</u> \$307,000				
Environmental Days (Spearheaded by Parks) + Public Works Day event	Participation in 4 annual Environment Day events + Public Works Day event. Purpose is to educate, sell bb, gb, composters, garbage tags, kitchen containers and replace damaged City-issued bb and gb.	Planned. Based on Council Resolution	To provide an additional opportunity for residents to purchase green bins, blue boxes and garbage tags etc. Note these events also provide the opportunity for the replacement of damaged (Cit) issued) bb and gb which the CC does not provide.	Parks	No	5 x per year	Resident attendance / participation			Residents, Parks	Required staff and resources	expense \$30,000	taxation	eliminate program	No - but contract with manuf to bring in shipments	No
Debris pick up from water courses and storm water detention ponds	As part of scheduled No maintenance, PW staff pick up debris from wateroourses and storm water detention ponds (grates). Activity may also occur should storm event or complaint require.	Planned + Demand	To minimize / prevent flooding episodes and to ensure watercourses flow as intended (not impacted by debris in water).	the debris located		2 to 3 x per year (+ demand via complaints or storm events)	Staff inspection (and monitoring and staff inspection for deficiencies on new ponds prior to assumption			Residents, York Region, TRCA, Building and Facilities		not available - imbedded in total maintenance costs of storm water management budget	Sewer Rates / Charges	No	No	No
ks																
Park/Sports Field Debris & Recycling (Emptying Recepticals)	Manual Collection of Debris No	Planned (90%) + Demand (10%)	To provide residents and park users with trash/recycling recepticals to deposit waste and recycling materials.	B&F for Disposal	N/A	Weekly	Schedule vrs Actual	95%	86%	Residents / B&F / TRCA	Labour / Equipment	\$630,035.00	Operating (taxation)	YES - Private Company Advertising	No	No
Park/Sports Field/Woodlot debris (on the ground debris)	Manual Collection of Debris No	Planned (90%) + Demand (10%)			N/A	Bi-Weekly	Schedule vrs Actual	95%	86%	Residents / B&F / TRCA	Labour / Equipment	\$337,026.00	Operating (taxation)	No	No	No

3

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE REVIEW

							MENT SERVICE REV						2011 Actual 2012 Budgeted		Cost Savngs Identified		
Business Activities	Description of Business Process	Opportunities for Significant Changes or Improvements	Service Triggers (Planned vs Demand)	Outputs/Outcomes	Linkage to other City Services	r Legislative Requirements	Service Standards (Council directed/Operational mandate/Best practice)	measure your current	How important of satisfaction i citizens? (Ipso	s the service to	Key Stakeholders	Cost Drivers (Resources, Labour, Equipment)	2011/12 Budgeted or Actual cost for service	Service Funding	Revenue Generation Opportunities?	Is the Service Currently Contracted Out?	Opportunities contracting service?
									Level of Importance	Level of Satisfaction							
	Manual Collection of		Planned (95%) +						Importance	Gaisraction	Residents / User Groups (CSO*, Soccer/Baseball/Fo otball/Rugby/Cricke t Clubs, School Boards) City			Operating	No - Revenue generation through permits already		
Service in kind/community events	Debris	No	Demand (15%)	upon service request To provide residents with	B&F for Disposal	N/A	Per Request	N/A			Departments	Labour / Equipment	\$26,171.00	(taxation)	exsisits	No	No
Stormwater management ponds	Manual Collection of Debris	No	Planned (85%) + Demand (15%)	clean storm water	B&F for Disposal	N/A	Quarterly	Schedule vrs Actual			Residents / B&F / Public Works	Labour / Equipment / Contract Administration		Operating (taxation)	No	YES (Partial 80% Contractor/20% Staff Split)	Yes
	Manual Collection of Debris		Planned (85%) +	Clean boulevards free of	B&F for Disposal	N/A		Schedule vrs			Residents / B&F /	Labour / Equipment / Contract Administration		Operating		YES (Partial 70% Contractor/30%	
Boulevards	Debris	NO	Demand (15%)	debris Resolve through	(Nov-March) Access Vaughan /	N/A	Bi-Weekly	Actual			Public Works Residents / Access	Administration	\$86,751.00	(taxation)	NO	Staff Split)	Yes
	Respond to public	Nia	Planned (50%) +		Recreation / By-	N1/A	Des Desus et	N1/A			Vaughan /	Administration	\$70,000,00	Operating	N -	N -	N
Customer Service / Admin (# of FTE)	inquiries	NO	Demand (50%)	order	Law	N/A	Per Request	N/A			Recreation	Labour	\$70,292.00	(taxation)	NO	NO	No
Education	Informative Signage and communication of process to residents	Yes	Planned (50%) + Demand (50%)	Resolve through communication / CTS / work order	Access Vaughan / Recreation / By- Law	N/A	Per Request	N/A			Residents / Access Vaughan / Recreation	Labour / Resources	\$9,495.00	Operating (taxation)	No	No	No
ilding and Facilities	process to residents	105	Demand (50%)	oldei	Law	IN/A	r el Nequesi	19/75			Recreation	Labour / Resources	φ3,433.00	(laxalion)	NO	INO	NO
		Yes - Develop 3rd	Planned +			Yes - Unable to use regional services to											
	Manual Collection of	Stream (Organic)	Occasional	The collection of specified	Community	dispose of hazardous		Scheduled vs.			Residents, Other						Combining contra
Recycling at all city buildings	Recycling Material	waste collection Yes - Develop 3rd	Demand Planned +	waste materials	Services	material Yes - Unable to use regional services to	Daily	Actual			City Departments	Haulage	\$20,385.96	Taxation	No	Yes	with Public Works
Waste collections at all city buildings	Manual Collection of Garbage	Stream (Organic) waste collection	Occasional Demand	The collection of specified waste materials	Community Services	dispose of hazardous material	Dailv	Scheduled vs. Actual			Residents, Other City Departments	Haulage	\$73.318.56	Taxation	No	Yes	Combining contra with Public Works
	Manual Collection of		Planned + Occasional	The collection of specified	Community			Scheduled vs.			Residents, Other		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		-		Combining contra
Organics at City Hall and JOC	Organics	No	Demand	waste materials	Services	N/A	Daily	Actual			City Departments	Haulage	\$7,320	Taxation	No	Yes	with Public Works
	Manual Collection of	Yes - Capital Plan to construct separate offloading ramps to separate waste, and monitor separation of garbage, recycling,	Planned + Occasional	The collection of specified	Community			Scheduled vs. Actual, complaints			Residents, Other						Combining contra
Works yards	Waste	and organics.	Demand	waste materials	Services	N/A	Daily	received			City Departments	Haulage	\$120,000	Taxation	No	Yes	with Public Works
Libraries (Bathurst/Clark) *Note: Other libraries use waste services at other city facilities	Waste & Recycling	No	Planned + Occasional Demand	The collection of specified waste materials	Community Services	N/A	Daily	Scheduled vs. Actual			Residents, Other City Departments	Haulage	\$3,486.84	Taxation	No	Yes	Combining contract with Public Works
Unmanned buildings	Manual Collection of Waste & Recycling	No	Demand	The collection of specified waste materials	Community Services	N/A	Demand	Scheduled vs. Actual			Residents, Other City Departments	Haulage	\$13,000	Taxation	No	Yes	Combining contract with Public Works
Special Events	Manual Collection of Waste & Recycling for special events	No	Demand	The collection of specified waste materials	Community Services	N/A	Demand	Scheduled vs. Actual			Residents, Other						Combining contract

4