

Re: Burnaby Refuse Service

In February, Council during consideration of a report on billing for garbage collection was advised that, in the opinion of staff, a study should be conducted to determine the effects of a policy under which the Municipality would provide garbage pick-up services to strata title developments in much the same manner as such services are now rendered to households. It was pointed out that the need for such a study is required because of the considerable amount of strata title development that has and will continue to take place in Burnaby and, also, because any liberalization of garbage disposal services would have a significant impact on manpower, equipment and overall costs.

Since February, a comprehensive evaluation has been underway to determine not only the feasibility of extending pick-up services to condominium developments, but also to determine the need for changes to other aspects of refuse collection with respect to the community at large. The results of this recently concluded evaluation are contained in the following report from the Municipal Engineer.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Municipal Engineer's recommendations be adopted.

* * * * *

7 November, 1974

TO: MUNICIPAL MANAGER

FROM: MUNICIPAL ENGINEER

SUBJECT: BURNABY REFUSE SERVICE

I. EXISTING SERVICE

By-law No. 3282, known as Burnaby Incinerator and Garbage Disposal By-law 1953, had provided for the Corporation to pick up from households two receptacles per week; this By-law was amended in 1967 by the present By-law No. 5174, which allows for the Corporation to pick up household receptacles up to three per week. Both By-laws make reference to a charge for collection of refuse from Commercial and Industrial premises, the rate in the current By-law being \$0.30 for each Commercial and Industrial size receptacle collected and \$1.65 for every cubic yard or part thereof which is collected as bulk refuse.

The Commercial and Industrial service has gone on virtually unchanged over the years, except for the number of customers, which has grown steadily with growth of the community. Refuse service to households has, of course, also increased in concert with the growth of the community, but with one very important additional change, this being the approval of Council having been given to the recommendation that the Corporation pick up all refuse at source, with the exception of landscape and demolition refuse resulting from commercial endeavours. This latter service has proven to be extremely useful in terms of avoiding the problem of finding refuse in roadside ditches, lanes, ravines, and all other such areas. The effect of adopting the recommendation to pick up all refuse at source is that the provision in the By-law for the three receptacle limit is no longer valid, and the applicable portion of the By-law should be amended.

The present By-law makes provisions for pick-up of refuse from premises abutting on a lane such that the receptacle(s) could be located up to twenty feet into the property from a gate, door, or entrance, and conversely, where premises do not abut on a lane, provision is made for receptacles to be as

far back from the front street line as the rear line of the dwelling. The effect of this, apart from being a considerable element of extra cost, is that the provisions actually result in discrimination in the sense that some citizens do set out their refuse, either thinking that they must do so, or else simply doing it as a good deed, whereas other citizens who are aware of the provisions of the By-law do take full advantage of its provisions. It is considered that in this day and age of escalating costs, serious consideration should be given to requiring citizens to set out their receptacles at the front street line and at the edge of the lane allowance where service is provided from lanes. The estimated saving resulting from this change is very roughly estimated to be \$80,000 annually.

Many of our commercial and industrial enterprises arrange for their refuse service to be provided by commercial companies providing container service, i.e. 3 cubic yard, 5 cubic yard, and sometimes even larger, which are picked up by means of specialized equipment and for which both a rental charge and a pick-up (dumping) fee is charged. On the other hand, many commercial and industrial enterprises still elect to utilize the service of the Corporation with the difference that the Corporation service is limited to utilizing normal receptacles (cans). In addition to commercial and industrial enterprises, many rental-type apartment buildings elect to have the Corporation pick up their refuse for which a prescribed charge is made; again, this service is limited to being provided by use of normal receptacles. Many apartment buildings find they are unable to utilize the large container type service because their premises simply have not made adequate provision for storage and access to such containers. Better control is being exercised now in new buildings in the P.P.A. process in terms of planning for proper refuse service.

A recent examination of expenditures and revenue in servicing both the residential and commercial and industrial sectors of the community has disclosed that the cost of servicing the commercial and industrial segment is approximately twice the amount of the annual revenue being derived from that source. Inasmuch as many of our routes service both commercial and residential properties with the same truck and crew, it was necessary for us to conduct a work study analysis of the routes in order to arrive at the foregoing conclusion. It appears that with this information available we should be adjusting the rates for providing service to the commercial and industrial segment of the community to the point where revenue would at least equal the cost of providing the service.

II. INDICATORS OF NEED FOR THOROUGH REVIEW OF REFUSE SERVICE

The Municipal Council has received requests for provision of refuse service to condominium properties and this matter has been referred to the staff for report. The basic argument put forth by owners of Strata Title properties for refuse service out of general revenue is that a Strata Title property is not really unlike single family residences in terms of the respective owners each holding title to a piece of property. Quite frankly this argument is difficult to refute and it appears that the Corporation should seriously consider providing service to Strata Title properties equal to that provided to single family and duplex properties. Although the use of cooperative ownership of apartment buildings is limited, it is considered that the same type of service should be considered to cover that type of ownership. There are currently a total of 1,625 strata title units of various types and if the service is to be extended to them the cost of doing so would be approximately \$50,000 annually; the number of strata title units is, of course, growing steadily and the cost estimate would necessarily have to be revised to suit the growth. Depending on the layout and type of structure, condominium developments are suited to use either normal receptacles (cans) or the larger containers. If condominiums are to be serviced by the Corporation, it will be necessary to provide both types of service, and this will probably mean we should employ a contractor capable of providing large container service as well as normal receptacle service.

Continued ...

The cost of providing the service of picking up all refuse at source, which primarily is done through the means of what has come to be known as 'special pick-ups' is estimated to cost \$160,000 for 1974. We have attempted to discover ways and means of deriving a direct source of revenue for this service but the most obvious ways do not appear to be suitable enough for adoption; these are for the refuse collectors to collect cash and/or for them to enter a log for which an invoice would be sent to the owner. The handling of cash is a difficult situation in itself, but in both cases the cost of lost time at today's wages in terms of entering records and collecting money makes it necessary to reject them. If it is considered that the service is worthwhile retaining, which we feel it definitely is, then about the only alternative available is for the Corporation to consider other means of providing the same service such as, say, contracting it. This would not necessarily solve the problem itself but would, in effect, transfer it from Municipal forces to the contractor. To be effective, the service should best be done in conjunction with regular refuse service, i.e. the same person doing both.

The Municipal refuse collection fleet has reached the point where approximately two-thirds of the total fleet complement must be completely replaced with new units over a period of approximately two years. This requirement would place an extremely heavy demand on capital funds and for this reason the Corporation stands at a point where very serious consideration should be afforded the use of possible alternatives to the present practise of the Corporation providing the service with its own forces.

III. AVAILABLE ALTERNATIVES

It is always possible to consider expanding the Municipal fleet by providing additional and up-dated service with a view to providing all forms of required service, i.e. full container service as well as receptacles. Just to get into the container business, which would be an expansion of present service, is estimated to cost in excess of \$1,000,000. The cost in only two years to replace only a portion of our fleet, just to maintain present service, is estimated to cost an additional \$600,000. One thing is clear, and that is that if the Corporation is to expand and/or maintain its present level of service, additions and/or replacement of the fleet would definitely be required.

On the other hand, there is also available to the Corporation the alternative of contracting for provision of the service and in terms of refuse this could embrace both full container service as now provided by private entrepreneurs, in addition to that provided presently by Municipal forces, i.e. receptacles and special pick-ups. Other Municipalities have arranged for contracting both household and commercial and industrial refuse services, and the preliminary reports we have from both of these Municipalities is that they are satisfied with the service both in terms of cost and adequacy. One of these, Surrey, has only recently changed from collection by Municipal forces to collection by contractor employed by Surrey.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

With the indicators that the Corporation presently has in front of itself and from information available from outside, it behooves the Corporation to at least consider contracting refuse service as a possible viable alternative to the present provision of service through utilization of Municipal forces. Putting together the format of a tender call for such services would need to be very carefully and thoroughly handled inasmuch as very little of this type of work has been done in this particular part of the Country, but nevertheless the indicators appear to be such that it should be given serious consideration.

Certain By-law changes are required, as pointed out in the text of this report. Notable amongst the changes required are with respect to revision of charges, elimination of reference to the three receptacle household limit, and the change respecting setting-out of receptacles onto streets and lanes.

Special pick-up service is well worthwhile maintaining, but a suitable means of providing a direct source of revenue to offset the cost of such service has not yet been developed, but should continue to receive further consideration.

ITEM 21
 MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 74
 COUNCIL MEETING Nov. 12/74

With respect to extending service to condominiums and cooperative apartment ventures, the argument for provision of this service by the Municipality is a strong one and the Corporation should give serious consideration to providing this service.

The annual saving which would result from requiring citizens to set out their receptacles onto the streets and lanes on day of pick-up is considered to be of such a magnitude that the Corporation should adopt the requirement.

IT IS RECOMMENDED:

THAT Burnaby Refuse By-law 1967 be amended as soon as practicable to provide for the following changes:

1. Increase commercial and industry collection rates sufficiently to permit revenue to equal cost of service. This matter will be the subject of a further, more detailed, report to Council prior to presenting the proposed By-Law amendment.
2. Amend the provision relating to three receptacles of refuse for household premises by eliminating reference to the number of receptacles.
3. Amend the section of the By-law permitting receptacles to be located 20 feet from a lane line to a requirement that the citizens place their receptacles at the edge but on the lane allowance.
4. Amend the section of the By-law providing for receptacles to be located at the rear line of a dwelling for front street pick-up to the provision that the citizens place their receptacles at the edge of the roadway in a directly convenient location for pick-up.

THAT special pick-up service be continued as at present as a charge to General Budget, but that the question of deriving an offsetting direct source of revenue be the subject of continuing investigation, and

THAT the Corporation extend its service as a direct charge to the Annual Budget to properties covered by the Cooperative Titles Act and the Strata Titles Corporation Act, and

THAT provision be made for the cost of refuse service in Cooperatives and Condominiums in the 1975 Budget with tenders to be called for provision of such service to commence on 1 March, 1975 as a target date, and,

THAT the Corporation develop a format of tender call which is considered to be suitable to go to tender for provision of all or part of the required refuse service, which tenders probably would be in the form of proposals, at least initially independent of service to condominiums, and

THAT the Engineer meet with representatives of the CUPE Local 23 and the Labour Management Committee in order to provide a full discussion on the recommendations contained in this report and of the actions of Council with respect thereto; and THAT those persons and companies who have expressed an interest in refuse service to condominium properties in the recent past be provided with copies of this report.


 MUNICIPAL ENGINEER

EEO:cmg

c.c. ()Municipal Treasurer
 ()Municipal Solicitor