		Social Implications				Environmental Sustainability				Financial Viability						
		Efficiency & Community Impact	Operating Days	Equity & Inclusion		Local Environmental Impact	Climate Impact	Resource Efficiency		Risk & Reliability	Revenue Potential	Implementation				
Options Under Consideration		Does it have the potential to provide efficient service with minimal community interruption (increased traffic, odour, noise)?	Does it operate frequently throughout the year?	Does it provide equitable level of effort for residents (i.e., reduced mobility or lack of transportation)	TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL	Does it include the potential for contaminant discharge to land, air or water?	Does it have the potential to reduce GHG emissions (i.e., reduce vehicle usage or distance travelled from material transportation, idle time)?	Does it have the potential to recover additional materials to be accepted and diverted from the landfill?	TOTAL	Does this option have an increased risk with reliability or availability of facilities or contractors?	Does this option have the flexibility to increase or decrease operating costs (i.e., PRO funding for additional materials, process optimization/reduction) ?	Can this option be easily implemented/transition ed with the necessary infrastructure, approvals and equipment?	TOTAL	TOTAL PTS	RANK	Estimated Annual Cost Range
		1: long wait time (>30 mins) and significant increased traffic and congestion 3: medium wait time (15min - 19mins), with some increased traffic 5: minimum wait time (<10mins) and no traffic increase	1: open <10 days/year 3: open 150 days/year 5: open >300 days/year	1: residents require vehicular access, ability to physically move waste 3: residents require vehicular access OR the ability to physically move the waste 5: waste collected directly from property		1: no controls in place 3: some controls in place but potential for spills 5: collection option fully equipped with spill containment and air pollution controls	1: individuals travelling >25km for waste disposal, long idle times 3: individuals travelling 5-25km for waste disposal, minimal idle time 5: resident travels <5km with opportunity to efficiently schedule combined collection doorstep pickup, no idle time	1: only HHW is accepted 5: multiple divertible wastes can be accepted		contractors for this	service to reduce costs 3: potential to increase PRO funding and some	1: new service to the City that requires significant capital costs				Low High
	Status Quo (9 Large Collection Events)	3	1	1	5	3	2	1	6	1	3	5	9	20	6	\$1.4M \$1.8M
	One Permanent Depot with Smaller (Limited) Events	2	4	1	7	4	3	5	12	3	4	1	8	27	5	\$2.2M \$4M
	One Permanent Depot and 2 Toxic Taxis	3	5	5	13	4	4	5	13	3	4	1	8	34	<u>2</u>	\$2.3M \$4.3M
	Гwo Permanent Depots	4	5	1	10	5	2	5	12	4	4	1	9	31	4	\$2.8M \$6M
	Two Permanent Depots with 2 Toxic Taxis	4.5	5	5	14.5	5	4	5	14	4	4	1	9	37.5	<u>1</u>	<u>\$3.7M</u> <u>\$7.3M</u>
6	Two Permanent Depots with Smaller (Limited) Events	4	5	3	12	5	4	5	14	3	4	1	8	34	<u>2</u>	\$3.6M \$7M

Depots costs include construction of facility, up-front equipment requirements but not land acquisition or preparation

costs as existing City properties would be prioritized for these locations

Toxic taxis could only be implemented with permanent depot(s) in place to reduce HHW collected under these options, as well as to allow for storage of these materials until collection by the waste hauler

The smaller collection events would limit the materials accepted (i.e., limited quantities allowed per resident) and allow

for the events to be held at smaller sites given the reduced footprint for the acceptance and storage of materials when combined with permanent depot(s).