

REGION OF OTTAWA CARLETON
RÉGION D'OTTAWA CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. **50 06-98-0167**
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 04 September 1998

TO/DEST. Committee Co-ordinators
 Planning and Environment and Corporate Services and Economic
 Development Committees

FROM/EXP. Environment and Transportation Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **AWARD OF CONTRACT CE-8012 - SOLID WASTE
CURBSIDE COLLECTION TENDER CONTRACT**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

That Planning and Environment Committee and Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend and Council approve the following:

- 1. That implementation of the Organics Program be delayed pending further technical study and the Solid Waste Collection Contract award proceed accordingly;**
- 2. That Zone C1, C2 and C3 (as per Annex E) for the collection of waste, recycling and leaf and yard waste, Contract No. CE-8012(C1C2C3) be awarded to Canadian Waste Services Inc., Nepean, Ontario for a total estimated five year cost of \$46,466,774 (GST not included);**
- 3. That Zone C5 (as per Annex E) for the collection of waste, recycling and leaf and yard waste, Contract No. CE-8012(C5) be awarded to Capital Environmental Resource Inc., Burlington, Ontario for a total estimated five year cost of \$16,666,707 (GST not included);**
- 4. That Zone C4 (as per Annex E) for the collection of waste, recycling, leaf and yard waste not be awarded to any of the bidders, and be retained by the Region of Ottawa-Carleton (ROC) for a total estimated five year cost of \$15,755,075;**
- 5. That the Chief Administrative Officer be delegated signing authority for the expenditures in preparation for the start-up of the ROC collection service in Zone C4;**

- 6. That capital project 982-42329, Regional Waste Collection Vehicles, be established for the acquisition of new collection vehicles in the amount of \$ 4,017,000 in order to meet the timelines required for purchasing vehicles for the start up of the ROC collection service in Zone C4.**

INTRODUCTION

Council, at its meeting of 27 May 1998, considered two reports on Solid Waste Collection Contract Development. These reports discussed levels of service for solid waste collection and competitive elements designed to increase competition in the local market. The reports had three common objectives; waste diversion, customer convenience and fiscal responsibility. Council approved the reports, which included the following key components:

- prequalification of firms into the tender phase
- enhancement of the recycling program to an alternate fibre and container collection
- submission of single-zone cost estimates by the ROC
- submission of separate pricing for the collection of organic material

Accordingly, a Solid Waste Collection Tender and Request for Qualifications was released on 5 June 1998. The Request for Qualifications closed on 24 June 1998 and the Tender closed on 4 August 1998.

DISCUSSION

A total of six firms submitted Request for Qualifications documents and five firms were pre-qualified. Solid Waste Collection Tender bids were received from all five firms. The firms submitting tenders included:

- BFI Waste Systems - qualified for five zones
- Canadian Waste Services Inc. - qualified for five zones
- Capital Environmental Resource Inc. - qualified for five zones
- Goulbourn Stittsville Sanitation Ltd. - qualified for one zone
- R. W. Tomlinson Ltd. - qualified for two zones

In addition, as directed by Council, staff prepared cost estimates.

1. Overall Results

For the purposes of bid evaluation, the bids were separated into two systems: with and without organic collection. Low bid scenarios based on the ROC operating no zones to the ROC operating four zones were then prepared. Table 1 details the options for waste, recycling and leaf and yard waste collection with and without the Organics collection implemented.

Table 1
Solid Waste Collection Contract
Five Year Totals

SYSTEM I - LEAF & YARD				SYSTEM II - ORGANICS		
# of ROC Zones	Lowest Price	ROC Zone	Contractor Zones	Lowest Price	ROC Zone	Contractor Zones
0	\$79,705,838	-	C123=CWS C45=CAP	\$84,304,674	-	C123=CWS C45=CAP
1	\$78,889,059	C4	C123=CWS C5=CAP	\$83,174,254	C4	C23=CWS C15=CAP
2	\$79,063,650	C34	C12=CWS C5=CAP	\$83,395,968	C34	C25=CWS C1=CAP
3	\$77,652,758	C345	C1=CAP C2=CWS	\$81,031,405	C345	C1=CAP C2=CWS
4	\$77,662,044	C1345	C2=CWS	\$80,024,026	C2345	C1=CAP

Note: CWS = Canadian Waste Services, CAP = Capital Environmental Resource Inc.

Table 1 shows the five low bid combinations for both the System I and System II options. The low bid combination in the first case is with the ROC operating three zones and the low bid in the second case is with the ROC operating four zones. It should be noted that as directed by Council, staff prepared estimates for single zones only. The multiple zone ROC costs presented in Table 1 are simply the sum of the zone estimates as prepared for the tender opening.

A complete summary of bid prices for the tender are included in Annex A.

2. Operation of a Zone by the ROC

Council directed staff to prepare cost estimates for the operation of each individual zone for this contract tender. The basis of the cost estimates was derived from three inputs, as follows:

- i) Collection Model - Staff designed a collection model which utilizes parameters such as collection time, set out rates, travel time, number of households per zone, supervisory and administrative requirements, etc. This in turn determined the resources and costs required to operate each zone. The Region's ability to compete in collection operations as part of a managed competition process will be dependent upon our ability to retain the favourable employment terms that have been secured from the bargaining agent for the pilot project. The bargaining agent representing these employees has indicated their willingness to discuss the possible continuation of these terms in the course of the 1999 collective bargaining process. Accordingly, appropriate labour costs and benefits were incorporated in the model.

- ii) Collection Experience - In 1995, the ROC assumed the responsibility to administer Region-wide curbside collection. Municipal staff with years of experience in waste management were transferred to the Region. Staff has gained significant operational experience from the management of the Regional Contracts, and, more recently, from providing waste collection services in part of Zone C. The results of the collection model mentioned above were correlated with current collection operations and expertise.
- iii) As part of the co-collection pilot project operated by the Solid Waste Division and funded in part by industry, Resource Integration Systems Ltd., a waste management consultant, was retained to independently model collection systems within Ottawa-Carleton. Results from this model compared well with the results of the ROC model.

It is critical to this process that the estimates submitted by the ROC be credible and fair. Accordingly, as outlined in the Managed Competition Protocol, the Regional Internal Auditor has reviewed the ROC estimates. The Regional Internal Auditor has prepared an accompanying report.

System I - Leaf & Yard cost estimates show that the ROC retaining three zones is the lowest cost option; however, it is recommended for this contract that the ROC retain one zone only. By retaining one zone the ROC builds upon its growing operating experience, and places itself in a position to bid on future tenders, thus ensuring competitive pricing in the marketplace. Also, procuring vehicles for one zone is a difficult task. We currently have the capacity to adequately service one zone on an interim basis while awaiting delivery. The lowest cost option, however, would present a significant challenge for the Region in obtaining sufficient vehicles to perform the work, which could have adverse customer service implications.

As outlined in the Competitive Elements report, the decision to allow the public sector to provide a portion of the collection services has the largest potential to reduce long-term waste management costs. Retaining one zone minimizes the competitive impact on the private sector in the short term, but should establish the basis for full managed competition and more competitive pricing in the future.

The current ROC collection service has been operating with a mixture of vehicles ranging in age between four to ten years old. Purchasing used and surplus vehicles allowed for a quick and cost effective start-up for the short term (June 1998 to May 1999). A longer commitment will require the purchase of some new vehicles, which, based upon industry information, have about an eight month timeline to order. Accordingly, it is requested that a capital project 982-42329, Regional Waste Collection Vehicles, be established now in 1998 for the purchase of necessary vehicles, the cost of which were included in the development of ROC cost estimates. Project Narrative and Cost Summary is included as annex B.

3. Collection/Processing of Organics

As shown in Table 1, there is a collection cost premium to include the Organics Program. Table 2 shows the magnitude of the organics collection premium. This premium was not unexpected in light of the advanced collection technology and request for year round service.

Table 2
Collection Cost of Implementing
the Organics Program
Five Year Costs

# of ROC Zones	System II - Organics	System I - Leaf & Yard	Difference
1	\$83,174,254	\$78,889,059	\$4,285,195

The results from the Organics Processing Request for Proposals ranged from between \$55.00 per tonne and \$109.00 per tonne. This exceeded staff expectations based upon the previously bid prices from the private sector for the small quantities in the organics pilot program at \$44.00 to \$55.00 per tonne. In addition to the collection cost premium, these processing costs have made the proposed phased-in organics system fiscally unattractive at this time. Annex C outlines the results of the Organics Processing Request for Proposals.

In view of the ROC's stated waste diversion goals in the Regional Official Plan, staff will continue to research and develop programs for organic diversion for future implementation with the objective of establishing a viable demonstration project that achieves the stated goal on a pilot basis by the year 2000. Annex D summarizes the benefits of organic diversion.

CONSULTATION

During the development of the Solid Waste Collection Contract, consultation was conducted as summarized below:

1. In January 1998 a telephone survey was conducted to determine residents' opinions on a two box recycling program. About 75% of residents supported an alternating weekly pick-up of recyclables if it saved money. Further, only 11% of residents said that storing an additional box would be a problem. This survey had a margin of error of plus or minus 5.9%, 19 times out of 20.
2. During the preparation of the collection tender, the Solid Waste Division consulted with individual private firms including waste haulers, material recycling processors and organic processors. Generally, the private firms were very supportive of the changes made to the collection tender.

3. In October 1997 a random telephone survey was conducted to determine the acceptability of an expanded Organics Program to the general public. This survey indicated that about 80% of residents would be somewhat likely to participate in the program. During the 1997 Organics Pilot Program, three surveys were conducted with residents participating in the program. In summary, residents indicated their satisfaction with the program by providing an 80% positive response to questions regarding separation of organics, and container characteristics such as storage, size, handling and appearance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Annual operating costs for collection contracts and regional collection cost in Zone C4 over the 5 years will form part of the operating budget for Collection Activities. Funds for vehicle acquisitions to support regional collection in Zone C4 will come from within the new requested capital project 98-42329, the Regional Waste Collection Vehicles.

CONCLUSION

Despite the benefits to the ROC of implementing an Organic Program, it is not fiscally responsible at this time. The Solid Waste Division will continue to develop organics diversion which will achieve all three objectives of waste diversion, customer convenience and fiscal responsibility. Awarding four zones to two different private sector vendors and retaining one zone should continue to develop waste management competition within the ROC.

*Approved by
M.J.E. Sheflin, P. Eng.*

FINANCE DEPARTMENT COMMENT

Approval of the recommended contract awards represents a pre-commitment of the 1999-2004 operating budgets. A budgeting provision will be included in the 1999 draft operating estimates which will be submitted later this year to Committee and Council.

Approval of Zone C4 to the ROC will require a pre-commitment of the 1999 Capital Budget. Financing of the \$4.017 million capital authority identified for new collection vehicles will require the establishment of debenture authority.

*Approved by T. Fedec
on behalf of the Finance Commissioner*

KHW/PM/RV/cp

SYSTEM 1: Five Year Bids without Organics Collection

No.	Zones	BFI	Capital	CWS	GSS	Tomlin.	ROC
1.	C1	\$18,850,139	\$13,775,068	\$13,964,590	\$16,667,414	\$17,877,749	\$13,784,354
2.	C2		\$19,433,998	\$16,273,142	\$20,522,277	\$19,834,178	\$17,188,224
3.	C3		\$21,020,897	\$17,304,373	\$18,826,077	\$21,846,173	\$16,044,234
4.	C4		\$17,687,958	\$19,322,776	\$20,741,399	\$20,911,335	\$15,755,075
5.	C5		\$16,666,707	\$18,585,784		\$19,947,139	\$15,805,239
6.	C12		\$33,208,296	\$30,597,634			
7.	C13		\$34,837,550	\$31,849,271			
8.	C14		\$31,444,066	\$32,725,525 *			
9.	C15		\$30,432,668	\$32,239,616			
10.	C23		\$40,487,359	\$33,617,742			
11.	C24		\$37,117,977	\$34,757,263			
12.	C25		\$36,097,529	\$34,178,600			
13.	C34		\$38,750,741	\$35,700,177			
14.	C35		\$37,726,171	\$34,989,724			
15.	C45		\$33,239,064	\$37,141,270			
16.	C123		\$54,277,266	\$46,467,277 *			
17.	C124		\$50,881,990	\$49,096,735			
18.	C125		\$49,864,037	\$48,442,676			
19.	C134		\$52,530,773	\$49,995,654			
20.	C135		\$51,509,221	\$49,390,312			
21.	C145		\$46,990,219	\$50,209,253			
22.	C234		\$58,190,793	\$50,767,322			
23.	C235		\$57,167,798	\$51,489,618			
24.	C245		\$52,665,200	\$52,718,522			
25.	C345		\$54,319,633	\$53,776,962			
26.	C1234		\$71,962,697	\$66,206,434			
27.	C1235		\$70,949,030	\$64,918,869			
28.	C1245		\$66,424,691	\$66,366,087			
29.	C1345		\$68,084,196	\$67,050,637			
30.	C2345		\$73,751,041	\$69,178,150			
31.	C12345		\$87,519,504	\$89,466,851			

* Note : Bolded items represent adjusted price due to minor rounding or mathematical errors.

SYSTEM 2: Five Year Bids with Organics Collection

No.	Zones	BFI	Capital	CWS	GSS	Tomlin.	RMOC
1.	C1	\$20,401,379	\$14,187,091	\$15,920,587	\$18,204,804	\$19,326,880	\$14,270,311
2.	C2		\$20,282,334	\$18,476,929	\$22,229,399	\$21,882,185	\$17,469,549
3.	C3		\$21,020,896	\$17,304,426	\$18,826,077	\$21,846,173	\$16,044,234
4.	C4		\$18,089,040	\$20,620,886	\$22,049,685	\$21,770,665	\$16,269,332
5.	C5		\$17,248,021	\$19,865,316		\$20,369,420	\$16,053,820
6.	C12		\$34,469,670	\$34,070,915			
7.	C13		\$35,239,277	\$33,365,764			
8.	C14		\$32,264,524	\$35,414,241			
9.	C15		\$31,432,510	\$34,686,249			
10.	C23		\$41,315,684	\$35,472,412			
11.	C24		\$38,367,810	\$37,751,428			
12.	C25		\$37,529,407	\$36,895,311			
13.	C34		\$39,133,287	\$38,512,735			
14.	C35		\$38,288,142	\$35,733,084			
15.	C45		\$34,655,914	\$38,852,647			
16.	C123		\$55,514,184	\$50,608,277			
17.	C124		\$52,547,680	\$53,736,714			
18.	C125		\$51,714,586	\$53,516,032			
19.	C134		\$53,316,948	\$52,771,057			
20.	C135		\$52,480,250	\$52,399,478			
21.	C145		\$48,832,262	\$54,234,348			
22.	C234		\$59,409,861	\$54,022,689			
23.	C235		\$58,565,214	\$54,325,787			
24.	C245		\$54,934,048	\$56,560,806			
25.	C345		\$55,702,265	\$55,658,536			
26.	C1234		\$73,597,523	\$71,754,417			
27.	C1235		\$72,758,593	\$70,603,017			
28.	C1245		\$69,117,313	\$73,383,285			
29.	C1345		\$69,885,030	\$72,837,334			
30.	C2345		\$75,978,192	\$74,321,352			
31.	C12345		\$90,162,515	\$96,776,776			

* Note : Bolded items represent adjusted price due to minor rounding or mathematical errors.

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

1999 CAPITAL BUDGET

Date: 09/03/98
 Time: 03:11 PM
 File: 982-42329

PROJECT INFORMATION

CODE 51 -

DEPARTMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	CONFIDENCE LEVEL	
PROJECT NAME	Regional Waste Collection Vehicles	FINAL	
PROJECT NO.	982-42329	BASELINE	
		PRE DESIGN	
		CONCEPT	1998

SCOPE AND JUSTIFICATION

On 27 May 1998 Council approved two reports relating to Solid Waste Collection Contract Development. One of the key components of the reports was that the RMOC provide cost estimates for retention of collection service for up to four of the five new collection zones.

This project provides for the purchase of new collection vehicles to enable the Region to provide collection service for garbage, recyclables and leaf & yard for one zone.

COMMITMENTS**IMPACT ON OPERATIONS**

The ongoing maintenance, insurance, licencing and depreciation costs associated with these vehicles will be charged to the operating budget. With the Region retaining one zone, a portion of contracted waste collection costs will be eliminated, thereby offsetting the impact on the operating budget of these vehicle costs.

REFERENCE MAP

		# of Vehicles
Collection Vehicles	- Garbage	10
	- Recycling	8
	- Leaf & Yard	4
		<u>22</u>

PERIOD 1995 TO 2004

CONFORMS WITH OFFICIAL PLAN

Budget By:

Date:

Revised By:

Date:

 Planning Department

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON**1999****CAPITAL BUDGET****PROJECT COST SUMMARY**

Date: 09/04/98

Time: 10:23 AM

File: 982-42329

DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL
PROJECT NAME Regional Waste Collection Vehicles
PROJECT NO. 982-42329

PREVIOUS YEAR SPENDING		1998	-2008
PROJECT ESTIMATE	1998	1999	2000
	0	0	0

1. AUTHORITY SUMMARY

(THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS - ADJUSTED FOR

CODE 52 -

	TOTAL PROJECT ESTIMATE	ESTIMATED ACTUAL TO 12/31/98	BALANCE	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004 to 2008
EXPENDITURE	4,158	4,158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RECOVERIES	(141)	(141)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL	4,017	4,017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
REVENUE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
REGIONAL REQUIREMENT	4,017	4,017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FINANCING									
P.A.Y.G.									
R.D.C.									
DEBT	4,017	4,017							

2. SPENDING PLAN

EXPENDITURE									
CONSTRUCTION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENGINEERING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROPERTY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UTILITIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	4,158	0	4,158	4,158	0	0	0	0	0
RECOVERIES	(141)	0	(141)	(141)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	4,017	0	4,017	4,017	0	0	0	0	0
REVENUE									
FEDERAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROVINCIAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MUNICIPAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
REGIONAL REQUIREMENT	4,017	0	4,017	4,017	0	0	0	0	0

Results of the Organic Processing Request for Proposals

On June 18, 1998, the Region of Ottawa-Carleton released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the 1999 Organic Processing Contract. The RFP identified various pre-qualification items that proponents were requested to provide. Twenty eight RFPs were requested and the following four concerns submitted qualified proposals on 10 August 1998:

- 1) Canada Composting Inc./Stone & Webster (CCI/S&W)
- 2) Miller Waste Systems (MWS)
- 3) Stinnes Enerco/Hatch Assoc. (SE/H)
- 4) Tomlinson Environmental/Waste Conversion Inc. (T/WCI)

Contract Options

Several contract options were contained in the RFP:

- phase one tonnage or phase one plus phase two tonnage;
- five, ten and fifteen year contract periods;
- contractor retains all product revenues, contractor and Region share revenues, or Region retains all revenues.

A section for innovations was also provided.

Evaluation Process

To assist Regional staff with the evaluation of the proposals, 2cg Waste Management Consulting Services was hired. 2cg currently manages the composting facility in St. Thomas, Ontario and has assisted other municipal clients with facility procurement. Specifically, 2cg provided the technical review of the proposals.

Of the five proposals submitted, a distinction was made regarding well priced proposals (less than the cost of landfill disposal) and non-competitively priced proposals (greater than the cost of landfill disposal). The three well priced proposals were then subjected to a rigorous review under the following categories which were each weighted before the proposals were received: (i) tip fee; (ii) company prospectus and operational experience; (iii) facility design; (iv) facility operations; and (v) timeline and contingency plans.

In order to clarify proposal details and plans, CCI/S&W, SE/H and T/WCI were interviewed on 17 August 1998 and their proposal assessments adjusted where appropriate.

Overview of Results

Prices ranged from a low of \$55 per tonne to a high of \$109. Some of the options included transferring organic material to facilities outside of the Region, either as a contingency measure or as a medium term solution. Several firms provided twenty year prices only while others did not address the various revenue scenarios as requested. Some firms wanted to mix Regional biosolids with organic wastes whereas other firms indicated that such a mix would compromise the quality of the end product (i.e. heavy metals).

As expected, the larger the quantity of material handled or the longer the contract period, the lower the cost. In most cases, bid prices rose if compost revenues were shared or completely retained by the Region.

The proposed technologies included wide bed composting, in-vessel anaerobic digestion and three variations on in-vessel composting systems. These “higher tech.” systems require significant capital investment and therefore long contracts and depreciation periods. No “low tech.” systems were proposed by the private sector in response to the RFP.

Next Steps

Given the relatively high proposed costs received, Regional staff believe that further research and development is required to identify and test composting systems that use simpler technologies at lower costs without jeopardising public health and safety. This direction was recommended in the 3Rs Study that was approved by Council.

In Germany where there are 580 composting plants, odour concerns led to the development of in-vessel or fully enclosed composting facilities; however, since these new systems are costly and municipal budgets under constant pressure, the open air windrow facility remains popular (80% of the total). One adaptation on this type of system uses semi-permeable membranes and forced aeration and is being tested in Norway, Sweden and Germany. An American firm approached the Region in 1996 with a proposal to test a similar kind of technology.

Finally, since the overall cost of the organics program is higher than anticipated, a larger and longer pilot is justified in order to evaluate alternative collection systems. While an organics diversion program is extremely beneficial from an environmental perspective, the high premium of managing these materials – as determined via the collection Tender and processing RFP – provides sufficient reason for reassessing program design. Solid Waste staff will report back to Council with plans to continue developing organics diversion options.

Benefits of an Organic Program

i) Diversion

The current Leaf and Yard Waste program diverts about 20,000 tonnes of material per year. The first phases of an organics program in which cost effective areas are brought on first, would see Leaf and Yard Waste and organics diversion from to about 48,000 tonnes per year. With full Regional implementation, this would increase to about 60,000 tonnes per year which would help the ROC to achieve 50% waste diversion overall.

ii) 3Rs Study and Official Plan

The 3Rs Study, which was approved by Council, is an fundamental component of the ROC's Solid Waste Planning Process. Option #37 - Implement a Residential 3-Stream Waste Collection System is a primary option and envisions the collection of the following waste streams; dry recyclables, wet organics and residual waste. The ROC Official Plan has as an objective an annual waste diversion per household of 475 kilograms by the year 2000. In 1997, the curbside diversion rate was about 296 kilograms per household (which includes 20,000 tonnes of organic leaf and yard waste). At full implementation, the organics program is estimated to divert an additional about 192 kilograms per household per year, which will allow the ROC to meet it's Official Plan target for waste diversion.

iii) Environmental

Organic waste in the landfill contributes to greenhouse gas emissions. Implementation of the organics program is estimated to reduce the current emissions by about 40,000 tonnes of CO₂ or 10,000 car equivalents per year. This reduction in greenhouse gas will assist the ROC to meet it's objective as a member of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' Twenty Percent Club.

Organic waste also contributes to the potency of leachate emissions from landfills. Although leachate from organic material is not toxic in itself, it has a high moisture content and does contain certain contaminants (BOD - Biochemical Oxygen Demand). Leachate produced at the landfill, is currently trucked to the Pickard Centre for treatment.

iv) Landfill Management

Implicit in the ROC Solid Waste Planning Process is the assessment of alternatives to landfill disposal. Responsible landfill management entails the conservation and economic use of existing disposal capacity which delays the requirement to secure additional capacity and the financial and social cost which that may entail. Over a twenty year period, the Organics Program could add almost five years to the life of Trail Road landfill

site. In other words, one year of landfill disposal capacity is saved for every four years of organics diversion.

Implementation of an Organics Program is pivotal to the Region's Solid Waste Planning Process and will benefit any waste management undertakings in the future under the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA).

v) Public Participation

During the one year pilot conducted in five Regional neighbourhoods, 83% of targeted households claimed to be program participants. The Region-wide participation rate for the blue box program is 78%. Participation rates in similar organic programs in other communities include: St. Thomas (>90%), Caledon (70%), Kingston (91%), Bracebridge (>80%), Laval pilot (70%), Prince County, PEI pilot (83%), Lunenburg pilot (70%), and Markham pilot (85%).

