

# Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector

## ISSUE

The City of Saskatoon (City) has adopted a target of diverting 70% of waste from the City's landfill. It has implemented or expanded various residential waste diversion programs and services to help achieve this target. Overall reduction of waste tonnage from Saskatoon and area landfills is included in the Low Emissions Community (LEC) Plan in order to reach 2050 greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets. However, the City has yet to implement any approaches to facilitate waste diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector.

The ICI sector generates 68% of all garbage sent to Saskatoon and area landfills. Approximately 45% (75,800 tonnes) of this waste consists of recyclables or organics that could be diverted. Like most North American municipalities, the ICI sector waste that is generated in Saskatoon is primarily managed by the private sector with the City providing optional services including: the City's landfill, commercial garbage collections, and the compost depot. In 2016, 8.5% of the total waste managed by the City was recyclable and organic material that could have been diverted but instead were buried in the City's landfill.

Given these facts, what regulatory approaches could the City adopt to encourage or facilitate greater use of recycling and organics to help Saskatoon reach its waste diversion target and the overall reduction in waste tonnage outlined in the LEC Plan?

## BACKGROUND

### 2.1 History

In 2015, City Council considered two reports, "Implications of Landfill Bans", and "Landfill Ban Implementation Considerations", which recommended the development of a landfill ban on paper and cardboard and outlined a phased program plan. At the November 2015 Budget Deliberations, City Council resolved, in part:

"That a phased landfill ban for paper and cardboard begin in 2016 as outlined in the report of the General Manager, Corporate Performance Department dated November 9, 2015."

The Landfill Ban Implementation Considerations report outlined Phase 1 of the paper and cardboard ban as the requirement for diversion of paper and cardboard at the curb for the ICI sector.

At its meeting on November 27, 2017, City Council considered the Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Waste Diversion Opportunities report which provided an update on Waste Diversion opportunities in the ICI sector. City Council resolved:

“That \$156,000 be transferred from the Waste Minimization Reserve to Capital Project #2184 - Waste Characterization for the development of the *Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Waste Diversion Strategy*.”

In 2017, the City’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan was updated to include more explicit actions pertaining to the goal of Environmental Leadership. The update included the specific action to implement mandatory recycling and organics programs and policies for the Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional sectors.

At its meeting on October 22, 2018, City Council approved the following motion regarding the curbside organics processing Request for Proposals (RFP):

“That the Administration amend the draft RFP to reflect the City’s intent to implement an organics bylaw for the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector within the next 2-4 years.”

The amendment was included in the RFP. The Administration is planning to provide an update on the RFP in early 2020.

## 2.2 Current Status

The Administration has completed the [ICI Waste Diversion Strategy](#); finalized three options for recycling and organics for the ICI sector; completed stakeholder engagement; and determined a recommendation. A decision is required to continue planning and to begin implementation.

At the Preliminary Business Plan and Budget deliberations, City Council approved \$700,000 for the Capital Project #1964 - Waste Reduction – Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional (ICI) and Multi-Unit project for 2020 and 2021. The purpose of the project is for implementation of the strategy presented in this report.

## 2.3 Public Engagement

A total of 870 individuals have participated in engagement that include meetings, workshops, and online surveys. The Engagement Summary is available in Appendix 1 and the full engagement results are available at [Saskatoon Talks Trash: Businesses & Organizations](#). Statistically representative surveys were also conducted by Insightrix and the results are available in the [2019 ICI Waste & Recycling Survey](#) and [2019 Waste & Recycling Survey](#) (residential).

The 2019 ICI Waste & Recycling Survey and the 2019 Waste & Recycling Survey (residential) findings indicate that both residents and members of the ICI sector support programs and policies that require the ICI sector to divert recyclables and organics.

- The 2019 ICI Waste and Recycling Survey found that of the 96% of the ICI sector that generates recyclable materials, 90% supported the City requiring organizations to recycle their recyclable waste. The same survey found that of the 41% that generate organic waste, 85% supported the City requiring organizations to compost or otherwise divert their organic waste from landfill.

- The 2019 Waste & Recycling Survey (residential) found 75% of residents supported the City banning recycling from non-residential garbage bins, and 72% supported banning organics from non-residential garbage bins.

These results differ, however, from the final survey conducted as part of the Engagement to determine stakeholder preferences. It found approximately 62% of the 381 businesses and organizations who participated indicated preference for a voluntary approach instead of the regulatory options presented.

The *ICI Waste Diversion Strategy* indicates how the engagement results informed and refined the options presented to the stakeholders, as well as the selection of the recommendation. Stakeholder preferences for each option, as well as their ability to understand, implement and control costs, are presented as advantages and disadvantages for each option.

#### 2.4 City of Saskatoon's Current Approach

The City has adopted Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw*, to comprehensively regulate solid waste in the City. Through the authority established in the Bylaw, the City requires all businesses and organizations to dispose of waste in a waste container or at a Provincially-approved Waste Management Centre. It does not, however, require the ICI sector to take additional measures to divert recyclable or organic materials.

The majority of ICI waste is managed by the private sector. They undertake or operate waste collections, landfills, material recovery facilities for recyclables, organics processing, hazardous waste disposal, and some construction and demolition waste diversion. The City also provides some waste services for the ICI sector including:

- The City's Landfill;
- Commercial garbage collections; and
- Compost Depots.

The ICI sector also utilizes waste programs that are designated for residents. According to the 2019 ICI Waste & Recycling Survey:

- 23% have used residential recycling depots; and
- 10% have used residential household hazardous waste drop off days.

The City currently does not have any waste reduction or diversion education directed specifically at the ICI sector.

The Province of Saskatchewan does not require recycling or organics diversion by the ICI sector. The province is in the process of developing a solid waste management plan, but has indicated that this will focus on residential waste diversion.

#### 2.5 Approaches in Other Jurisdictions

The approaches used to encourage or facilitate ICI sector recycling and organics diversion varies across Canada. Such approaches are largely dependent on whether ICI waste diversion is regulated at the provincial or municipal level. A more

## Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector

---

comprehensive description of approaches in other jurisdictions is available in the *ICI Waste Diversion Strategy*. A summary of the most noteworthy approaches are as follows:

- The Government of Ontario has enacted regulations for the ICI sector to source separate recyclable material. As a result, municipal governments have not taken additional steps to regulate ICI waste beyond their own commercial customers.
- The Government of Nova Scotia has enacted a ban on recyclables and organics from all landfills in the province. The Halifax Regional Municipality has adopted a complementary policy that requires all businesses to have garbage, recycling and organics collection containers.
- The Government of British Columbia has enacted legislation and regulations that compel municipalities to develop waste diversion plans that require approval by the province. Metro Vancouver and the Regional District of Nanaimo have developed programs for hauler licensing to divert ICI recycling and organics, but have yet to receive provincial approval. The City of Vancouver is exempt from the provincial approval obligation, but it requires businesses to state their plan to divert recycling and organics through the business licensing process.
- In Alberta, both Calgary and Lethbridge have developed source separation requirements for the ICI sector, which requires separate containers for garbage, recycling and organics, independent of the provincial government. Calgary has fully operationalized its program. Lethbridge is in the process of implementing its program, with recycling planned for 2020.

### OPTIONS

The Administration proposes three options for consideration. These options are largely variations of one another and possess several common features, namely:

Required Materials	Match what is accepted in residential recycling and (future) organics programs.
Phased Implementation	A phased implementation timeline is intended to allow businesses and organizations to prepare for the changes and ensure that recycling comes first.
Program Cost for Businesses and Organizations	The costs for waste management and diversion will vary for businesses and organizations based on the types and amounts of waste they generate, and will be paid directly to a service provider of their choosing (if applicable).

**Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector**

Education and Support	A comprehensive education and support program will be put in place by the City that is tailored to the specific option and aims at increasing compliance by making the process easy to understand, offer resources for the business, and reduce administrative burden for the business.
Home-based Businesses Excluded	These options are for commercial businesses and organizations that are responsible for managing their own waste and do not have curbside or multi-unit residential waste diversion available. As is the case now, mixed-use properties will be responsible for contracting additional collections that exceed the capacity provided through the residential programs.
Regulatory Exemptions	<i>The Waste Bylaw</i> will lay out a process where case-by-case exemptions may be made to the City's requirements for recycling and organics under certain circumstances: if recyclable or organics waste is demonstrated as not being generated; if there are risks that cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of local waste processors (such as contamination with medical waste); or if a large generator of a single type of organic waste cannot find a processor (since organics processing requires specific material input balances). This is a common approach in Canadian jurisdictions that have regulated ICI recycling and organics.

Notwithstanding these common features, the options have been evaluated based on various criteria that includes:

- How well they divert waste;
- ICI stakeholders' preference;
- Ability to implement, control costs and understand;
- Safety;
- Administration's effort to plan, implement and operate;
- Ability to adapt post-implementation;
- Resident satisfaction;
- Waste Bylaw compatibility; and
- Precedents in other jurisdictions.

Reference tables comparing the options and their advantages and disadvantages can be found in Appendix 2.

Before describing the options, it is also necessary to address the assumptions and limitations about the Administration's proposals and why some approaches are excluded from the analysis.

First, the Administration is not presenting the status quo as an option for analysis. The reasoning for this is because the Administration has received previous direction from City Council to develop a mandatory program for ICI waste diversion. As explained in section 2, the status quo is essentially a voluntary education program and is an

ineffective way to divert waste. However, when surveyed, stakeholders preferred a voluntary approach to any of the three regulatory options presented.

Second, several other alternatives were considered by the Administration, but they were not developed or included in the analysis because of low stakeholder support, potential legal challenges, high Administrative costs or the lack of precedents from other jurisdictions (additional information can be found in the *ICI Waste Diversion Strategy*). These alternates included:

- Required use of City services for recycling and organics, which while preferred by smaller organizations was not preferred by medium and large organizations, due to the City's likely inability to meet their unique waste disposal needs and the high cost to develop these programs. City diversion services for the ICI sector will remain opt-in.
- Compliance through regular waste audits, which have only been applied to large volume waste generators in some American jurisdictions and would raise both safety and privacy issues.
- Verification that materials in the bins are correctly sorted, which would be challenging to enforce due to potential of illegal dumping being the source of identified contamination as well as safety or privacy issues that could arise when inspecting the contents of bins.
- A disposal surcharge on all garbage landfilled, no matter where it is disposed of, which was the least popular of the options presented in the statistical survey of the ICI sector and while the concept has been developed by two Canadian municipalities, it has not yet been implemented.
- Licensing of waste haulers providing recycling and organics services, which did not have high stakeholder interest (especially by waste haulers), and has not been implemented for waste diversion purposes in Canada.
- Submissions through property tax assessments were found to be incompatible due to the confidentiality required for information collected and the enforcement being through provincial court rather than City bylaws.

### **Option 1 - Separate Waste Containers**

This option proposes to require members of the ICI sector to have three separate and labelled containers in place for each waste stream (recycling, organics, and garbage). It also requires that property owners or occupants provide annual education to their employees and tenants, and ensure all waste is removed and taken to an appropriate facility. Exceptions will apply for businesses that do not generate organics. This option was the most preferred option during the engagement process largely because it the simplest to implement and understand, and is considered to be the least expensive to implement and operate by the City.

The implementation of this option proposes the following mandatory requirements for the ICI sector and the City:

## Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector

---

### Requirements for ICI sector

- Containers and Labelling - The following must be in place:
  - Garbage Container and Recycling Container – applies to all businesses and organizations; and
  - Organics Container – applies to all businesses and organizations that generate food or yard waste as part of their operations;
- Education: Provide information about recycling and organics each year to employees and tenants; and
- Removal of waste and recoverable materials: Contract a hauler and/or self-manage the removal of waste and recoverable materials from your property or on-site processing to be taken to an appropriate facility.

### Verification (Responsibility of the City)

The City will verify that there are appropriate labelled containers and services in place using one of the following approaches:

- Complaint follow-ups - The City would follow-up on complaints of non-compliance through the 24-hour customer service centre or with a site visit; or
- Complaint follow-ups and education blitz – There, in addition to complaint follow-ups, the City would make site-visits to certain areas of the City or to certain sectors, providing education first with the potential of issuing tickets if compliance is not achieved.

Regular site visits (visiting each business every few years to ensure compliance) were considered but have been removed from consideration since they were not preferred by stakeholders and would take significantly more resources by the City to implement.

### Environmental Implications

Each of the recycling and organics options are estimated to result in similar levels of waste diversion; the method of enforcement is expected to influence diversion. For this option, education blitzes are expected to result in slightly higher diversion than complaint follow-up only approaches.

All of the options estimate that 2,400 tonnes of recyclables and 3,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from the City's landfill per year, contributing an additional 5% to the City's waste diversion rate. A total of 17,000 tonnes of recycling and 21,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from area landfills.

Landfilling 38,000 tonnes of recyclables and organics generates 38,000 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions each year. This amounts to 1% of the total community emissions reduction commitment of the LEC Plan. By the 2050 anniversary of the Plan, the cumulative GHG's would be 1,140,000 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e.

### Social Implications

Each option has been designed to respond to stakeholder preference and this option was the most preferred of the mandatory options considered.

One concern that was identified during engagement was that specific groups (i.e. small businesses, non-profits, and those with very low or very high waste generation) might be disproportionately impacted by the requirements. This option responds to that concern by requiring only those in the ICI sector that generate food or yard waste as part of their operations to have an organics container.

### Legal Implications

An update to Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw* will be required.

### Financial Implications

The capital costs for program development between 2020 and 2023 is estimated to be between \$790,000 and \$910,000 for project management, bylaw revisions, education and communications planning and implementation, and the additional staff resources (above what will be required for ongoing operations) that will be required during the phase-in and first year of implementation for both recycling and organics. \$550,000 would be required from the 2020 and 2021 approved capital budget P1964 – Waste Reduction Initiatives of the \$700,000 allocated for ICI and Multi-unit waste diversion projects.

Program operations will start in 2021 with recycling phase-in the second half of the year. Annual operating cost is projected to be \$220,000 to \$340,000 (depending on level of enforcement) and includes 1.2 to 2.2 FTE's for administration and enforcement officers, plus ongoing communications. In 2021, the program will only operate for the second half of the year, requiring half the operating budget. A budget request for additional program development (capital) and ongoing operations will be included in the 2022-2025 budget.

The diversion of 5,400 tonnes of recyclable and organic waste from the City's landfill is estimated to result in a revenue reduction of \$567,000 in tipping fees and up to a \$25,000 reduction in entry fees per year. The diversion would also result in extending landfill life by approximately 5% and preserving approximately \$362,000 of landfill airspace value per year (based on 2018 landfill airspace values).

### Advantages

- Most preferred regulatory option by ICI sector stakeholders of regulatory options presented.
- Easiest to understand by stakeholders during engagement.
- Implementation should be relatively straightforward by businesses and organizations.
- Provides businesses and organizations with flexibility and ability to control costs as they have control over the hauler, or can haul themselves. Businesses and organizations without organics will not be required to have organics bins.
- Will require the fewest FTEs to operate.
- Two Canadian jurisdictions have implemented this option and one is planning to implement in 2020.
- Will meet resident expectations that the ICI sector is required to divert waste.



Disadvantages

- May result in a slightly elevated risk of conflict in the field during site verifications, this will be mitigated through existing safety procedures.
- Less flexibility for businesses and organizations to develop innovative waste diversion solutions and less flexibility for the City to expand the program to accommodate additional materials.

**Option 2 - Separate Waste Containers plus Submission of Proof**

This option proposes to include all the requirements noted in Option 1, but adds additional obligations to the ICI sector. As in Option 1, this option requires members of the ICI sector to have separate and labelled containers in place, provide annual education, and remove waste and recoverable materials from their property, and it adds a requirement to submit proof of containers to the City.

The implementation of this option proposes the following mandatory requirements for the ICI sector and the City:

Requirements for the ICI sector

- The same requirements as Option 1; and
- A one-time Submission of Proof that containers are in place made through business licensing application or renewal process (or a parallel process set up for organizations not requiring a business licence).

Verification (Responsibility of the City)

- The City will verify that there are appropriate waste bins and services in place. It may use one of the following approaches:
  - Complaint and screening follow-ups, where the City would follow-up on complaints of non-compliance through the 24-hour customer service centre or screen applications and follow-up when there are questions with the submission; or
  - Complaint and screening follow-ups plus education blitz, where in addition to complaint and screening-based follow-ups the City would make site-visits in a certain area of the City or a certain part of the sector, providing education first and then time to become compliant in advance of issuing tickets.

Environmental Implications

This option may result in slightly higher waste diversion than Option 1 because of the added level of verification involved in the submission process. However, the differences are not quantifiable. Similar to Option 1, education blitzes are expected to result in slightly higher diversion than the complaint or screening follow-up only approach.

All of the options estimate that 2,400 tonnes of recyclables and 3,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from the City's landfill per year, contributing an additional 5% to the City's waste diversion rate. A total of 17,000 tonnes of recycling and 21,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from area landfills.

## Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector

---

Landfilling 38,000 tonnes of recyclables and organics generates 38,000 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> of GHG emissions each year. This amounts to 1% of the total community emissions reduction commitment of the LEC Plan. By the 2050 anniversary of the Plan, the cumulative GHG's would be 1,140,000 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub>.

### Social Implications

This option was less preferred than option 1 (tied with option 3). This option has responded to the concern around disproportionate impact by requiring only those in the ICI sector that generate food or yard waste to have an organics container. Another concern with this option is that businesses and organizations expect it to have a high administrative burden compared to the other options as a result of the submission process.

### Legal Implications

An update to Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw* will be required.

### Financial Implications

The capital costs for program development between 2020 and 2023 is estimated to be between \$1,420,000 and \$1,480,000 for project management, bylaw revisions, education and communications planning and implementation, the upgrade to POSSE for business license applications and renewals, the development of a parallel submission process for organizations that do not require a business licence, and the additional staff resources (above what will be required for ongoing operations) that will be required during the phase-in and first year of implementation for both recycling and organics. The amount of \$580,000 would be required from the 2020 and 2021 approved capital budget P1964 – Waste Reduction Initiatives of the \$700,000 allocated for ICI and Multi-unit waste diversion projects.

Program operations would start in 2021 with recycling phase-in the second half of the year. Annual operating cost is projected to be \$490,000 and \$620,000 (depending on level of enforcement), and includes 3.7-4.7 FTE's for administration and enforcement officers, plus ongoing communications. In 2021, the program would only operate for the second half of the year, requiring half the operating budget. A budget request for additional program development (capital) and ongoing operations would be included in the 2022-2025 budget.

The diversion of 5,400 tonnes of recyclable and organic waste from the City's landfill is estimated to result in a revenue reduction of \$567,000 in tipping fees and up to a \$25,020 reduction in entry fees per year. The diversion would also result in extending landfill life by approximately 5% and preserving approximately \$362,000 of landfill airspace value per year (based on 2018 landfill airspace values).

### Advantages

- Will meet resident expectations that the ICI sector should be contributing to the City's waste diversion targets.
- Marginally more safe than Option 1, due to a lower risk of conflict in the field.

Disadvantages

- Tied with Option 3 as the least preferred option by stakeholders.
- More difficult for ICI stakeholders to understand, which may result in low compliance with the requirement to provide submission of proof documentation.
- Will require the most FTEs to administer and enforce.
- Less flexibility for businesses and organizations to develop innovative waste diversion solutions, and less flexibility for the City to expand the program to additional materials.
- No jurisdictions in Canada have implemented this option.

**Option 3 - Submission of a Recycling and Organics Checklist/Summary**

This option proposes to require members of the ICI sector to have a waste diversion plan, provide annual education, and remove waste from their property as well as submit a summary of their plan on a form. This option differs from Options 1 and 2 in that it does not require separate containers for recycling and organics. Instead, the submission of a plan summary is how the City will encourage and verify recycling and organics diversion. This option is largely comparable to Option 2 in the cost to implement and operate. However, it provides businesses and organizations within the ICI sector with a high level of flexibility to reduce or divert waste.

The implementation of this option proposes the following mandatory requirements for the ICI sector and the City.

Requirements for the ICI sector

- ICI sector stakeholders develop a waste diversion plan by completing a 1-page template and implement the plan;
- Submit a One-time Recycling and Organics Summary of the waste diversion plan: Complete a new section of the business licensing application or renewal form or a parallel form for organizations not requiring a business licence;
- Removal of Waste and recoverable materials: Contract a hauler and/or self-manage the removal of waste from your property, or provide on-site processing; and
- Education: Provide information about recycling and organics each year.

Verification (Responsibility of the City)

- The City would verify that there is appropriate recycling and/or organic diversion in place. It may use one of the following approaches:
  - Screening follow-ups when a business or organizations submits “no”, “does not create” or “unknown”. The City would review whether that is appropriate for the type of business or organization and follow-up with a call for additional information, with an approach focused on education first and time to become compliant in advance of issuing tickets; or
  - Screening follow-ups plus education blitz where, in addition to screening-based follow-ups, the City would focus on site-visits in a certain area of the

City or certain parts of the sector, with an approach focused on education first and time to become compliant in advance of issuing tickets.

### Environmental Implications

This option may result in slightly lower waste diversion than Options 1 or 2 because of the high degree of flexibility and the reliance on self-declarations for the majority of compliance verification. However, the differences are not quantifiable. Similar to the other options, education blitzes are expected to result in slightly higher diversion than the complaint or screening follow-up approach.

All of the options estimate that 2,400 tonnes of recyclables and 3,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from the City's landfill per year, contributing an additional 5% to the City's waste diversion rate. A total of 17,000 tonnes of recycling and 21,000 tonnes of organics could be diverted from area landfills.

Landfilling 38,000 tonnes of recyclables and organics generates 38,000 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub> of GHG emissions each year. This amounts to 1% of the total community emissions reduction commitment of the LEC Plan. By the 2050 anniversary of the Plan, the cumulative GHG's would be 1,140,000 tonnes CO<sub>2e</sub>.

### Social Implications

This option was less preferred than Option 1 (tied with Option 2).

This option provides the ICI sector with the flexibility to choose waste reduction and diversion approaches that work best for their business or organization, as well as provides the opportunity for those that do not generate a type of waste to not be required to have a plan in place for it. For this reason, it is the least likely to have disproportional impacts. However, stakeholders still found this option to have a high administrative burden on businesses and organizations.

### Legal Implications

An update to Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw* will be required.

### Financial Implications

The capital costs for program development between 2020 and 2023 is estimated to be between \$1,000,000 and \$1,070,000 for project management, bylaw revisions, education and communications planning and implementation, the upgrade to POSSE for business license applications and renewals, the development of a parallel submission process for organizations that do not require a business licence, and the additional staff resources (above what will be required for ongoing operations) that will be required during the phase-in and first year of implementation for both recycling and organics. The amount of \$570,000 would be required from the 2020 and 2021 approved capital budget P1964 – Waste Reduction Initiatives of the \$700,000 allocated for ICI and Multi-unit waste diversion projects.

Program operations will start in 2021 with recycling phase-in the second half of the year. Annual operating cost is projected to be \$490,000 and \$620,000 (depending on level of

enforcement), and includes 3.5-4.5 FTE's for administration and enforcement officers, plus ongoing communications. In 2021, the program will only operate for the second half of the year, requiring half the operating budget. A budget request for additional program development (capital) and ongoing operations will be included in the 2022-2025 budget.

The diversion of 5,400 tonnes of recyclable and organic waste from the City's landfill is estimated to result in a revenue reduction of \$567,000 in tipping fees, and up to a \$25,020 reduction in entry fees per year. The diversion would also result in extending landfill life by approximately 5%, and preserving approximately \$362,000 of landfill airspace value per year (based on 2018 landfill airspace values).

#### Advantages

- Greatest ability for stakeholders to implement and control costs because they can develop a plan to keep recycling and organics from being landfilled that works for their organization.
- One jurisdiction in Canada has implemented this option.
- Easiest to adapt once implemented.
- Marginally more safe than Option 1, due to a lower risk of conflict in the field, tied with Option 2 as the safest option.

#### Disadvantages

- Tied with Option 2 as the least preferred option.
- The most difficult option for stakeholders to understand during engagement, which may result in difficulty in providing education as well as result in inaccurate reporting.
- Will require the second highest number of FTEs to administer and enforce.
- Would require more effort to align with *The Waste Bylaw*.
- May be less likely to meet resident expectations that the ICI sector will be diverting the same waste materials because the high level of flexibility could be perceived as a lower standard than the City's residential programs.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Standing Policy Committee on Environment, Utilities and Corporate Services recommend to City Council that:

1. Option 1 - Waste Bylaw Enforcement plus Separate Waste Containers be approved for implementation; and
2. That the City Solicitor amend Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw* to enact Option1.

#### **RATIONALE**

Option 1 is being recommended as it is expected to result in similar waste diversion to other options and is easier and more straightforward to implement for the businesses and organizations affected as well as for City administration. This option was most preferred by stakeholders, and is likely to meet residents' expectations that the ICI

sector is contributing to the City's waste diversion targets. Further, it has been successfully implemented in both Calgary and Halifax.

Option 1 has the lowest cost to implement, requiring \$790,000 to \$910,000 of capital funding for program development and ongoing operating funding of \$220,000 to \$340,000. Option 2 would cost \$510,000 to \$570,000 more than Option 1 for program development (capital funding), and Option 3 would require an additional \$90,000 to \$160,000 more than Option 2. Both Options 2 and 3 would cost \$150,000 to \$280,000 more per year than Option 1 to operate.

### **ADDITIONAL IMPLICATIONS/CONSIDERATIONS**

#### ICI Waste Diversion Strategy

The City's forthcoming Waste Reduction and Diversion Plan will provide a roadmap for the development of new waste reduction and diversion initiatives. Appendix 3 - The ICI Waste Diversion Strategy Roadmap provides an overview of the initiatives that will impact the ICI sector.

#### City of Saskatoon Compliance

If ICI recycling and organics is approved, additional funding will be required for the City to comply, which will be requested in the 2022-2025 budget.

#### The Waste Bylaw

There are a several outstanding minor amendments that need to be made to Bylaw No. 8310, *The Waste Bylaw*. The Administration proposes coordinating these amendments to the greatest extent possible with the update that is required as part of the implementation of ICI sector recycling and organics.

### **COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES**

A full summary of communications activities that were completed to support engagement with the ICI sector in the development of ICI sector recycling and organics options is available in the full engagement results.

A media strategy was developed for the release of this report. If the recommendation is approved, ICI stakeholders and the public will be informed through the City's webpage, e-mail to stakeholders involved in engagement, and a Public Service Announcement. A comprehensive communications plan will be developed as part of the implementation planning in 2020 for the approved option.

### **NEXT STEPS**

An approval report is expected in early 2021 to recommend changes to *The Waste Bylaw*. The following is the implementation plan for ICI recycling and organics.

## Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector

---

---

Date	Milestone
2020 – Q2-4	Draft Waste Bylaw updates; develop communication and education plan and materials; potential application to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' Green Municipal Fund.
2021 – Q1-2	Approval report to Council for Waste Bylaw changes; finalize education materials and operational implementation plans.
2021 – Q3	Phase-in period of 1 year begins for ICI recycling.
2022 – Q3	Enforcement begins for ICI recycling; phase-in period for ICI organics begins.
2023 – Q3	Enforcement begins for ICI organics.

### APPENDICES

1. Engagement Summary
2. Options Summary and Status Quo Description
3. Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Waste Diversion Strategy Roadmap

### REPORT APPROVAL

Written by: Katie Burns, Special Projects Manager  
Amber Weckworth, Education and Environmental Performance Manager

Reviewed by: Jeanna South, Director of Sustainability

Approved by: Angela Gardiner, General Manager, Utilities & Environment

Admin Report - Regulatory Approaches to Enhance Waste Diversion in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Sector.docx