SSO Feasibility Study

Feasibility Study – Management of Residential Source Separated Organics

The Town of Saugeen Shores, Ontario

Submitted to:
Matt Prentice
The Town of Saugeen Shores
600 Tomlinson Drive
Port Elgin, ON N0H 2C0

Submitted by:
GEI Consultants Canada Ltd.
1260 2nd Avenue East Unit 1
Owen Sound, Ontario N4K 2J3
519.376.1805

February 9, 2026
Project No. 2401298

Table of Contents

Appendices

1. Executive Summary

GEI Consultants Canada has been retained by the Town of Saugeen Shores to assess the feasibility of potential Source Separated Organics (SSO) management strategies, including the evaluation of collection, processing, and the associated costs. This report also examines potential benefits of SSO collection and processing such as landfill space savings and financial cost reductions, alongside logistical considerations and policy alignment.

The Town of Saugeen Shores will likely become subject to the obligation for SSO collection in 5 to 10 years under the existing regulatory thresholds, population growth and evolving policy pressures. As such, proactive planning and evaluation of viable options for SSO diversion are both timely and necessary.

The Southampton Landfill is currently projected to have a site life of approximately five (5) years and is undergoing the Environmental Assessment process to obtain additional disposal capacity. SSO diversion is an important initiative in support of this process, reflecting a commitment to optimize diversion and extend the landfill site life.

The Town is rather unique when compared to the surrounding jurisdictions in that an estimated 85% of its population is situated within urban communities, with 15% residing in the outlying rural areas. In other words, 85% of the population lives in approximately in about 8.5% of the land area (i.e., the “urban” setting). This population profile lends itself to consideration of an Urban only service area for SSO collection.

The primary service area options that have undergone review within this report are:

1. Saugeen Shores, “Urban plus Rural”, the entire municipality,
2. Saugeen Shores, “Urban”, the urban areas of Port Elgin and Southampton,
3. Shared services with five (5) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, (the “Urban 5” alternative), and
4. Shared services with six (6) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, Walkerton, (the “Urban 6” alternative).

The primary SSO management options considered for each of the options stated above are:

a) Collection and SSO processing at Saugeen Shores Southampton Landfill (or other property),
b) Collection, temporary storage, and bulk disposal at a third party processor,
c) Collection with direct delivery/disposal at a third party processor.

As a result, twelve (12) different alternatives are considered (i.e., three options with three separate service area options). POPULATION

Based on this review, the key component to the SSO management systems is the schedule and nature of the collection system. Currently, BASWR (the waste management contractor) has indicated that they would not be interested in conducting SSO collection for Saugeen Shores.

Consequently, it is recommended that the first step in continued investigation into SSO management in Saugeen Shores is consultation with Contractors to determine SSO and/or SSO and waste collection options.

The SSO collection contractor, depending on methodology of collection (for example split or dedicated trucks), may prefer to have bulk shipping in some form. Consequently, it will be important to establish viable contractors as part of the implementation of the SSO program.

The most financially viable option and application option at this time appears to be the collection of Saugeen Shores urban area only via a third party contractor and delivery to regional, or third Party Processor, with a comparative cost estimate in the range of $73 per stop per year.

The cost estimate for implementation would be in the range of $630,000 per year, with indirect and direct savings valued at $192,000 per year. The $630,000 includes annualized costs for the initial purchase of green bins. These estimates and subject to changes based on market conditions. Consequently, it is recommended that contractor quotes be obtained to confirm actual costs.

This option also aligns with ease and schedule of implementation. Based on the use of an existing processing system, no capital costs nor approvals process time is required. Where a rapid implementation is preferred, the option of delivery to a 3rd Party Processor should be included in discussion with the collection contractor.

The following steps are recommended in the event SSO collection is deemed applicable by the Town:

- Include the findings of this Study with other waste management initiatives in a waste system wide approach via any updates to the Long Term Waste Management Study.
- Immediate: Establish details with relevant third party contractors regarding collection schedule, methodology, and costs (potentially leading into a Tender/Contract process) in both of the Town of Saugeen Shores service scenarios (Urban and Urban plus Rural).
- Short term: With relevant contractor(s), confirm pricing for delivery and tipping at 3rd party processing at regional facility for Urban or Urban plus Rural.
- Medium Term (and on-going): Explore opportunities for partnering with local municipalities for Urban 5 and Urban 6 to improve contract pricing and/or efficiencies.
- Long Term (Once Landfill EA Process is complete): Review options for processing in the Town of Saugeen Shores.

2. Introduction

GEI Consultants Canada has been retained by the Town of Saugeen Shores to assess the feasibility of potential Source Separated Organics (SSO) management strategies, including the evaluation of collection, processing, and the associated costs. This Study contemplates four service area configurations:

- Saugeen Shores, "Urban plus Rural", with the entire municipality,
- Saugeen Shores, "Urban", with the urban areas of Port Elgin and Southampton only,
- Shared services with five (5) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, (the "Urban 5" alternative), and
- Shared services with six (6) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, Walkerton, (the "Urban 6" alternative).

This report also examines potential benefits of SSO collection and processing such as landfill space savings and financial cost reductions, alongside logistical considerations and policy alignment.

Ontario's commitment to advancing a circular economy has placed increasing emphasis on reducing the volume of food and organic waste sent to landfill. The implementation of the *Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement under the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act* (RRCEA), 2016, represents a key step in this direction. This policy framework sets targets and obligations for municipalities, particularly those located in Southern Ontario, to establish programs for the diversion and recovery of source separated organics (SSO).

Although Bruce County's municipalities are not currently required to implement mandatory SSO collection under the existing regulatory thresholds, population growth and evolving policy pressures suggest that certain areas, like the Town of Saugeen Shores, will become subject to these obligations in 5 to 10 years. As such, proactive planning and evaluation of viable options for SSO diversion are both timely and necessary.

The Southampton Landfill is currently projected to have a site life of approximately five (5) years and is undergoing the Environmental Assessment process to obtain additional disposal capacity. SSO diversion is an important initiative in support of this process, reflecting a commitment to optimize diversion and extend the landfill site life.

3. SSO Management Background & Policy

The Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016 (RRCEA) is a key piece of legislation that modernizes Ontario's approach to waste management by supporting the transition to a circular economy. Under this Act, the responsibility for managing end-of-life products and packaging shifts from municipalities and taxpayers to the producers who create them. This framework promotes waste reduction, improves resource efficiency, and encourages innovation by mandating that producers meet regulated collection and recycling targets. The RRCEA also provides authority for the provincial government to issue policy statements and designate materials for regulation, while oversight and enforcement are carried out by the Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPRA). This report outlines the core components of the RRCEA, its role in shaping waste policy in Ontario, and the implications for municipal planning, infrastructure, and public engagement.

As a key instrument under the RRCEA, Ontario's Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement (2018) provides direction to municipalities, producers, and other stakeholders on reducing and recovering food and organic waste. The policy supports the broader goals of a circular economy by setting out principles and actions aimed at preventing food waste, increasing source separation of organics, and promoting the beneficial use of recovered materials such as compost and biogas. It includes specific direction for municipalities in Southern Ontario, requiring those with curbside garbage collection and populations over 50,000 to implement source-separated organics programs by 2025. The Policy Statement ensures alignment between land use planning and organics infrastructure development, and it plays a critical role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, extending landfill life, and supporting Ontario's waste reduction targets.

Section 11 of the *Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016* allows the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks to issue policy statements that provide strategic direction on waste reduction and resource recovery. Under this authority, the Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement was issued in 2018, setting out clear expectations for various stakeholders, including municipalities. Municipalities are required to act in a manner consistent with the policy statement when exercising their powers or duties related to waste management. Specifically, the policy directs municipalities—particularly those in Southern Ontario with populations over 50,000 and curbside garbage collection—to implement source-separated organics (SSO) programs by 2025. Municipalities are also expected to support food waste reduction efforts, ensure that new developments include space for organics collection, and collaborate in planning for processing infrastructure. This policy framework aligns municipal responsibilities with Ontario's broader goals of advancing a circular economy, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and diverting organic waste from landfill.

The policy provides direction to municipalities, Ontario's Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) sector and the waste management sector to increase waste reduction and resource recovery of food and organic waste.

Food and organic wastes reportedly make up an estimated one-third of Ontario's waste stream. These organic wastes include residential organic waste (i.e., food waste and leaf and yard waste) and food produced by the IC&I sector, such as food processors, wholesalers, grocery stores, and restaurants.

Although the Province will be implementing mandatory Source Separated Organics (SSO) management for municipalities that meet certain population size and density thresholds, preliminary analysis suggests that Bruce County member municipalities do not currently meet these criteria. Based on our preliminary review, it appears that Saugeen Shores may trigger the mandatory SSO Management in the near future, being a population exceeding 20,000 and a density of more than 100 persons per square kilometre, within the next decade.

In the event mandatory SSO is required, this preliminary assessment may inform which options to pursue in more detail. It is noted that for these municipalities to meet Provincial diversion targets of 50% by the year 2030, SSO diversion will be a necessary component to the waste management solutions offered by the municipalities.

Until January 1, 2026, the member municipalities were responsible for all waste collection and diversion, with the exception of Municipal Hazardous and Special Waste (MHSW), which is managed by the County. As of January 1, 2026, the eligible blue box materials switched to the Individual Producer Responsibility model under Circular Materials Ontario, meaning that the municipalities are no longer responsible for eligible blue box materials.

3.1. Policy Section 4.2 – Increasing Residential Resource Recovery in Southern Ontario

Policy Section 4.2 focuses on increasing the recovery of food and organic waste from residential sources in urban areas of Southern Ontario.

The policy states that municipalities in Southern Ontario that, as of the effective date, do not provide curbside collection of source separated food and organic waste are to provide:

i. Curbside collection of food and organic waste to single-family dwellings in an urban settlement area within a local municipality if the population of the local municipality is greater than 50,000 and the population density of the local municipality is greater than or equal to 300 persons per square kilometre.
ii. Collection of food and organic waste to single-family dwellings in an urban settlement area within a local municipality if:
    a. The population of the local municipality is greater than 50,000 and the population density of the local municipality is less than 300 persons per square kilometre; or
    b. The population of the local municipality is greater than 20,000 but equal to or less than 50,000 and the population density of the local municipality is greater than or equal to 100 persons per square kilometre.

The Town of Saugeen Shores is projected to meet the population and density threshold of item ii b) in approximately 5 years.

3.2. Policy Section 4.5 – Collection Preference and Alternatives for Residential Resources Recovery

Ontario's approach to selecting preferred and alternative methods for collecting residential recyclable and recoverable materials. The policy emphasizes curbside collection as the preferred system, particularly in urban and suburban areas where it is cost-effective and convenient, as it supports higher participation rates and better material quality. In rural or low-density areas, where curbside may not be practical, the policy allows for alternative methods such as depot collection or shared collection points. The section aligns with Ontario's broader waste diversion goals under the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, encouraging municipalities and service providers to adopt systems that are efficient, accessible, and environmentally responsible. It also supports continuous improvement through monitoring, data collection, and pilot projects to enhance overall system performance and adaptability. The policy outlines that for municipalities subject to policies 4.2 (ii):

i. Curbside collection of source separated food and organic waste is the preferred method of servicing single-family dwellings.
ii. Alternatives to curbside collection or source separation of food and organic waste may be used if it is demonstrated that provincial waste reduction and resource recovery targets can be achieved efficiently and effectively.

4. Benefits of Diverting SSO

4.1. Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Methane Generation)

When food scraps and other organic materials end up in landfills, they break down without oxygen and produce methane gas—a greenhouse gas that is more than 25 times stronger than carbon dioxide at trapping heat in the atmosphere. Landfills are one of Canada's largest sources of methane, responsible for about one-quarter of the country's total methane emissions. By collecting organics through a Source-Separated Organics (SSO) program, that methane can be prevented entirely. Instead, food waste is transformed into compost or renewable energy through controlled processing. Every tonne of organics diverted from landfill avoids roughly one tonne of carbon pollution—the same as driving a car for about 4,000 kilometres.

4.2. Landfill Space Savings

Landfills have a limited lifespan — once they're full, municipalities face difficult and expensive choices: build new ones, expand existing sites, or haul waste long distances. By removing food waste, yard trimmings, and other compostable materials from the garbage, Source-Separated Organics (SSO) programs help extend landfill life, reduce future costs, and lower greenhouse gas emissions.

In Ontario, about 30% of residential garbage is organic material that could be composted or processed instead of buried. When organics are mixed with regular garbage, they take up valuable space and produce methane gas as they decompose. Diverting these materials through an SSO program means fewer truckloads going to landfill each week — and more years before a costly expansion or new site is needed.

For example:

- Simcoe County diverts over 18,000 tonnes of organics each year through its Green Bin program. In 2023, the County reported that since the green bin program started in 2008, it had collected more than 200,000 tonnes of organics, which extends the local landfill life span by approximately 4 years.

- Halton Region estimates that its organics program has extended the life of its landfill by at least 10 years, saving millions in future capital and site-development costs.

- In Owen Sound and Southgate, smaller community-scale rollout is projected to keep hundreds of tonnes of organic material out of landfill each year, helping reduce waste disposal costs and/or volumes.

Saugeen Shores has about 5 years of remaining capacity and is currently undergoing the Environmental Assessment (EA) process to obtain additional landfill capacity under the Landfill Optimization process. Implementing an SSO program would:

- Reduce the total waste volume by 10 to 20 percent, immediately lowering disposal tonnage.
- Help extend the landfill lifespan by about a year, delaying major capital investments and accommodate potential delays in obtaining new capacity (if approved).
- Support the EA process and potential Landfill Optimization project (if approved) through improved site life and reduced operational issues associated with leachate.

Ultimately, diverting Source Separated Organics can significantly reduce the amount of waste going to the landfills. Which in turn provides cost benefits, extended landfill life, and helps meet provincial diversion targets.

Data from neighboring municipalities can be used in calculations to determine estimates Saugeen Shores as it should be relatively similar. Using the number of households for our areas of focus (Saugeen Shores Urban plus Rural: 7,000, Saugeen Shores Urban: 6,000 Urban 5: 16,949, Urban 6: 19,214,), and the kg/residence per year, the estimated tonnage of SSO that could potentially be diverted from landfills has been calculated (refer to Cost Analysis Table in Appendix A).

Ultimately, the diversion rates and quantity depend on decisions Saugeen Shores and other municipalities may make related to the options chosen, allowable materials, frequency of collection, communication, marketing as well as promotion and education materials.

4.3. Cost Savings

Protecting landfill capacity isn't just about saving space — it's about maintaining control over local waste management costs and environmental outcomes. Every tonne of organic waste diverted helps:

- Delay expensive landfill expansions
- Reduce methane generation and leachate production.
- Promote sustainable waste habits that align with Ontario's 70% organics diversion target.

Keeping organics out of the landfill is an effective way for communities like Saugeen Shores to support their long-term waste management system.

The long-term cost savings associated with diverting organics from the landfill include reduced consumption of landfill space, and reduced transportation needs due to the reduced waste. The cost benefit would be realized by each of the SSO options as a whole. The cost savings are based on the current "market value" of landfill space and may not reflect the actual costs realized by each of the municipalities.

As described above and to account in the volume of waste saved directly by SSO diversion, the value of space has been estimated at $128 per tonne. This value is based on GEI's review of an "average" third party cost to dispose of the same mass of waste through direct contact with area service providers. The estimated annual cost savings realized by each of the scenarios would be directly proportional to the SSO diverted at each of the proposed regions:

- Saugeen Shores Urban plus Rural 1,589 tonnes of SSO or $203,392 per year,
- Saugeen Shores Urban 1,362 tonnes of SSO or $174,336 per year,
- Urban 5: 3,847 tonnes of SSO or $492,416 per year, and
  Urban 6: 4,361 tonnes of SSO or $558,208 per year.

5. SSO Diversion Options Review

5.1. SSO Diversion Programs across Southern Ontario

Source-Separated Organics (SSO) diversion programs have become a defining element of municipal waste management across Ontario, forming a cornerstone of the province's waste reduction and climate mitigation framework. By collecting food waste, soiled paper, and other compostable materials separately from general waste, municipalities are reducing landfill volumes, cutting methane emissions, and producing beneficial end-products such as compost and renewable natural gas.

Appendix B contains a comparative matrix of SSO diversion programs for select southern Ontario municipalities. It provides an at-a-glance overview of SSO program features and approaches to achieving SSO collection and processing.

By examining comparable communities—particularly mid-sized and rural municipalities Saugeen Shores can identify scalable models for collection, processing, and community engagement that align with its size and infrastructure. In addition to doing a desktop study of publicly available information, GEI reached out directly to municipalities that were of similar size and geography. Including Owen Sound, Southgate, and Meaford.

5.2. SSO Diversion Programs Comparison

The comparative matrix included in Appendix A provides a consolidated review of SSO programs across a range of southern Ontario municipalities, offering Saugeen Shores a practical foundation for benchmarking and strategic planning. Municipalities examined include Simcoe County, Halton Region, Owen Sound (2025), Meaford, Southgate, and London. By presenting key program attributes—such as collection methods, materials accepted, multi-residential service levels, processing technologies, partnerships, and pilot project activity—the matrix illustrates the approaches that municipalities are adopting.

A key insight from the cross-municipal review is the trend toward organics diversion as a component of modern waste management systems. Large upper-tier municipalities such as Simcoe County and Halton Region employ well-established curbside SSO programs supported by mixed-technology processing systems and extensive promotion and education efforts. Mid-sized municipalities—including Owen Sound, Meaford, and London—demonstrate that SSO programs can be tailored to local conditions, with initiatives such as staged rollouts, targeted multi-residential pilots, regional partnerships, and scalable processing options. Smaller communities, such as Southgate Township, show that municipally operated, low-capital solutions can achieve high diversion performance at relatively low per-tonne costs observed anywhere in Ontario.

There appears to be a relatively low participation rate of SSO collection amongst smaller and rural municipalities. Based on our own review, this is often due to the relatively higher cost of programs due to large collection distance and limited collection volumes in rural areas. This appears to be accepted, even as part of the SSO Policy, whereby SSO collection is not mandated for small municipalities, or mid-size municipalities with low population density.

Collectively, these municipalities highlight several emerging themes relevant to Saugeen Shores. Strong promotion and education is essential for public participation; processing solutions range from aerobic composting pads to anaerobic digestion; multi-residential inclusion is becoming a priority; and partnerships with counties or neighbouring municipalities help stabilize long-term costs. These findings suggest that successful SSO implementation does not hinge on a single program design but on selecting a configuration that aligns with local demographics, infrastructure capacity, and financial considerations.

The analysis of Source-Separated Organics (SSO) diversion programs across southern Ontario demonstrates that municipalities of similar size and capacity have successfully adopted a range of scalable models. Saugeen Shores can draw directly from these precedents to review options that appear most applicable.

5.3. SSO Diversion Program Options

The following options outline a series of practical approaches for consideration.

The primary service area options that have undergone review within this report are:

1. Saugeen Shores, Urban plus Rural,
2. Saugeen Shores, Urban,
3. Shared services with five (5) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, (the “Urban 5” alternative), and
4. Shared services with six (6) urbanized centres; Wiarton, Sauble, Southampton, Port Elgin, Kincardine, Walkerton, (the “Urban 6” alternative).

The primary SSO management options considered for each of the options stated above are:

a) Collection and SSO processing at Saugeen Shores Southampton Landfill (or other property),
b) Collection, temporary storage, and bulk disposal at a third party processor,
c) Collection with direct delivery/disposal at a third party processor.

As a result, twelve (12) different alternatives are considered (i.e., three options with three separate service area options). It must be noted that other member municipalities along with lower tier municipalities may choose to adopt their own programs and therefore may not be subject to the options that consider their involvement in “Urban 5” and “Urban 6” alternatives. With that, the options above are solely for the evaluation of their possible participation and collaboration with the Town of Saugeen Shores. The commitment of the other service areas to partake in SSO collection is not to be inferred due to their inclusion in this Study.

5.4. SSO Collection Considerations

A key determinant of the overall cost and feasibility of implementing an SSO program is the collection model, particularly how organics collection is integrated with existing waste services. A common model in smaller regions is to have the waste and SSO pick-up combined to a single vehicle (ex. Owen Sound and Southgate).

In the local context, BASWR currently provides garbage and recycling collection but has indicated that it is not prepared to expand its service line to include SSO. This may have significant implications for the SSO program design, as collection represents a high-cost component of SSO diversion. As part of the SSO options review, it is recommended that a more detailed review of combined SSO and waste collection be reviewed, including confirmation of BASWSRs ability to offer the service, or by changing the combined waste and SSO collection to a different contractor.

Collection frequency is a critical design element that directly influences both program performance and long-term operating costs. Across Ontario, the most effective and widely adopted model for organics diversion pairs weekly SSO collection with bi-weekly garbage. This structure, used in municipalities such as Owen Sound, Southgate and the County of Simcoe, provides residents with routine removal of odour- and pest-prone organics while simultaneously reducing garbage set-outs and encouraging diversion. Weekly SSO collection is thought to support higher participation rates, minimize summertime nuisance issues, and align with established public expectations around managing food waste. Meanwhile, shifting garbage to every other week significantly reduces collection costs by decreasing fleet hours, fuel use, labour requirements, and route density, thereby offsetting a portion of the cost of adding weekly organics service.

In contrast, some municipalities have adopted an alternating-week collection system where each material stream (garbage, recycling, and in some cases organics) is collected every other week on a rotating basis. While this approach can simplify routing for the hauler and reduce the overall number of collection days, it presents substantial challenges for SSO programs, including odor and pest concerns. Consequently, weekly SSO paired with bi-weekly garbage is considered to remain the most practical model.

5.4.1. SSO Collection Saugeen Shores

The Town of Saugeen Shores is characterized by an estimated 18 kilometers of shoreline along Lake Huron to the west along which the communities of Southampton and Port Elgin have been developed. According to the Statistics Canada Census Profiles, the Municipality had a population of 15,908 persons in 2021, with approximately 25% (3,993 persons) reported to reside in Southampton and 60% residing in Port Elgin (9,619 persons). The reported population does not include the relatively high number of seasonal residents and the influx of tourists during the summer months. Consistent with the Town's tourism industry, the dwelling counts reported by Statistics Canada indicate that a significant proportion of the dwellings within the Town of Saugeen Shores are seasonal.

Overall, the rural municipality covers a land area of approximately 170 km^2, with 6.4 km^2 encompassing the community of Southampton and 8.0 km^2 encompassing the settlement area boundary for Port Elgin. The Town is rather unique when compared to the surrounding jurisdictions in that an estimated 85% of its population is situated within urban communities, with 15% residing in the outlying rural areas. In other words, 85% of the population lives in approximately in about 8.5% of the land area (i.e., the "urban" setting).

Of the reported 8,548 private dwelling units, approximately 20% (or 1,643 units) are occupied by seasonal residents. This results in about 7,000 full-time residential units in the entire municipality. Based on about 85% of the population occurring in Southampton and Port Elgin, this results in about 6,000 residential stops required to service the "urban" areas.

Based on our review, the viability of SSO in rural areas is more limited due to more significant driving distances (higher cost for each pick-up), combined with the fact that rural properties often have less recovery rates due to on-site composting and re-use.

Based on the fact that about 85% of the Saugeen Shores population resides in the "urban" areas of Port Elgin and Southampton, two (2) service scenarios have been analyzed for Saugeen Shores:

1. Saugeen Shores, "Urban plus Rural",
2. Saugeen Shores, "Urban", the areas of Port Elgin and Southampton.

6. Costs For Collecting SSO

6.1. SSO Collection

The costs for each service scenario and for each processing method are provided in the Cost Analysis table in Appendix A. A more detailed discussion of the basis for estimation is provided below.

The collection of SSO has been developed assuming that the waste and SSO could be collected by the same contractor. Based on our review of other operating systems, this appears to be the most typical approach to providing SSO collection. Please note that these are the cost for collecting the SSO only, it does not include for any costs associated with processing or tipping at a processing location.

To estimate collection costs, we have utilized estimation based on reported costs from existing programs. The cost of collection in for the Saugeen Shores service options would likely be in the range of $330,000 to $450,000 per year, extrapolated from costs in Southgate, Owen Sound, and Meaford, respectively. Based on the differences of efficiency for the urban and rural conditions, we have assumed that the cost for collection for the Urban plus Rural scenario will be $65 per stop per year, and $55 per stop per year for the Urban setting.

The Urban 5 and 6 collections of SSO has been estimated by using the costs from existing programs and extrapolating to number of stops. While some savings are expected based on the number of stops, it is important to note that each “urban” area is separated. This separation reduces some of the potential for efficiency (route planning) and administration (dealing with separate jurisdictions). Consequently, we have modified the per unit stop price to reflect these complications. A marginal cost savings is expected for the Urban 6 over the Urban 5 service scenario.

The resultant costs for each scenario are:

- Saugeen Shores Urban plus Rural: $450,000 , or about $65 per stop per year
- Saugeen Shores Urban: $330,000, or about $55 per stop per year
- Urban 5: $850,000 per year, or about $61 per stop per year, and
- Urban 6: $1,000,000 per year, or about $59 per stop per year.

For comparison, cost for operating SSO collection services typically ranges from $45 to $65 per stop, per year, dependent on the density of households and effectiveness of the truck pick-up routes, and whether it is combined with waste collection.

As part of the cost estimate model, savings in waste collection due to the reduced volume/mass pick-up that results from the SSO collection. The actual amount of waste collection savings would be indirectly realized and dependent on collection schedule and contractor operations.

6.2. Green Bin Costs

In addition, collection programs would require green bins (or carts) for each residence. A portion (or all) of the cost of these green bins could be allocated to the residents or covered entirely by the municipalities to promote participation. The costs include an upfront (or one-time) capital cost to supply each residence, followed by an annual cost to replace or provide additional bins. The costs for each scenario are estimated as follows:

- Saugeen Shores Urban plus Rural: $150,000 initial, with $5,000 per year maintenance,
- Saugeen Shores Urban: $130,000, with $4,500 per year maintenance
- Urban 5: $325,000 per year, with $10,000 per year maintenance, and
- Urban 6: $380,000 per year, with $12,000 per year maintenance.

For the purposes of determining on annualized cost for each program, the initial capital cost has been balanced over 20 years and added to the annual replacement budget. The resultant annualized cost for each of these scenarios is:

- Saugeen Shores Urban plus Rural: $17,000,
- Saugeen Shores Urban: $14,500
- Urban 5: $36,000 per year, and
- Urban 6: $42,000 per year.

7. SSO Processing in Saugeen Shores

After the collection of SSO throughout the different alternatives, an SSO processing facility is required. Although the option for processing seems to be an obvious choice, it is important to consider the current plans for Landfill Optimization and the Environmental Assessment (EA) currently under way. While logistically, it could be considered that sharing effort for both the landfill and an SSO processing facility, it is reasonable to expect that dealing with both approvals simultaneously may in fact complicate and/or compromise the EA process. Considerations to how a SSO processing facility may be developed could complicate, or interfere with the Landfill EA process due to the following:

- Unknown location of potential landfill footprint until an EA is completed (if approved),
- Unknown room at the site with potential compensation planting, property line and sensitive receptor setbacks, and site configuration,
- Additional or compounding issues with the study odour and nuisance animals,
- Potential changes to GW chemistry if SSO is implemented prior to landfill.

In addition to these challenges, setting up a processing centre will have significant capital investment that will need to be planned and coordinated. Lastly, the required studies and approvals will have a lead time of two to three years.

Consequently, in the event on-site SSO Processing at the Southampton Landfill is considered, we recommend that this be considered as a longer-term option, to be implemented after the EA process is completed for the landfill itself and the outcome determined (including whether additional capacity is approved).

7.1. Feasible SSO Processing Facility

A key component to the cost would be the complexity and sophistication of the processing systems used for SSO. Currently, the plan considers simple windrow methodology to process the compost. The construction of buildings or more complex processing systems will have a significant impact on the costs. We have assumed that no buildings would be required and the capital costs relate to construction of a windrow pad and ancillary landscaping/grading.

Based on a review of existing models, there is a wide variation in implementation and cost. This cost variance relates directly to the level complexity of the processing systems and ability to coordinate equipment and works with other operations. We have provided a low, high, and average estimate to try to capture the potential costs associated with this option and how much of the effort can be shared with the future development (if approved).

Another considerable fluctuation in the cost of the facility would have been determined by which level of service is being evaluated. Obviously, there will be a need for more facility operations and processing equipment if the facility processes SSO from the Urban 5 route and even more from the Urban 6 route. There would be an expected 2,000 tonnes to 3,000 tonnes of additional SSO processing needed as compared to the Saugeen Shores alternatives.

The estimated cost of operations to process SSO at the proposed facility varies. Based on annual facility operations divided by the anticipated tonnes of SSO that will be diverted, it is estimated that the operational cost rate would be about $110 per tonne of SSO processed. This correlates with similar data collected from the Township of Southgate, the City of London, and the Regional Municipality of York, which have an average operational cost rate of about $115 per tonne of SSO.

Refer to the Cost Analysis in Appendix A for a summary of the Capital Costs and Facility Operational and Maintenance Costs for each of the service scenarios.

Another important factor that goes unaccounted for is that the required size of the processing facility will most likely be different in these scenarios. With more tonnes of SSO being processed, a larger area and more equipment for smooth operation will be required, and with that, the capital cost of the facility will be increased. It is estimated that a processing facility that services the Urban 5 and Urban 6 would likely have capital loan payments that are over double the Saugeen Shores service options estimates.

It is important to note that the space limitations may be realized under the Urban 5 and Urban 6 scenarios at the Southampton landfill. Under that scenario, additional costs may be realized due to more expensive siting and background study requirements that would typically be required.

8. SSO Transfer Station with Bulk Disposal at a Third Party Processor

8.1. SSO Transfer Station

This option reviews the potential for interim collection and storage prior to bulk shipment. This method was reviewed to assess whether costs savings would be realized by shipping larger bulk quantities to a 3rd party processor.

Like the proposed SSO processing facility in section 6 of this report, the size, function and equipment needed for an SSO transfer station varies by each scenario, due to the variance of SSO quantities that would be collected day by day in each level of service. The location of a proposed transfer station would most likely be at the Southampton landfill or possibly any other central landfill to the proposed areas of service.

The transfer station system for bulk delivery would be simple. The roll-off bin method would be an easy and effective way to bulk deliver SSO. This method would involve a large roll-off bin and a truck to haul the bin. To ensure efficiency in the operation of the transfer station, it is recommended that a roll-off bin always be present on-site, (one bin in use for delivery, the other stored at the transfer station to receive incoming loads). Based on quotes, the cost to supply a "40-yard" bin varies from $8,000 to $12,000.

Based on our load estimations and calculations, the following delivery schedule is recommended:

Level of Service	Frequency of Deliveries (Days per Week)	Trucks & Bins Required	Total Weekly Deliveries
Saugeen Shores (both service scenarios)	3	1	3
Urban 6	5	2	10
Urban 5	4	2	8

A transfer station would require the application for an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) from the Ministry of Environment. This process would cost about $10,000 with an engineering consultant (assuming no significant noise or odour study is required).

To support our estimates, we have included the following capital costs:

- Roll-Off Bins
- Construction of Transfer Station, which include for minor upgrades to existing locations, and
- ECA Application

The annual Transfer Station operational costs include:

- Maintenance (upkeep of bins and area), and
- Operations (Staffing for transfers).

These costs have been annualized over 20 years to be comparable with the other options. A summary is provided in the Cost Analysis table in Appendix A.

8.2. Bulk Disposal of SSO at a Third Party Processor

In consideration of this possibility, a quote for weekly disposal of organics from Urban 6 was requested from Walker Industries Inc. Walker provided a quote based on the rate they charge for SSO disposal at their compost processing facility in Arthur. Walker gave the processing rate of $80 per tonne to $110 per tonne of SSO, with variance due to the competitive tender process. With this rate, the cost of disposing SSO can be estimated in all levels of service.

Along with the SSO Processing fees, the capital cost for a roll-off truck would be required (assuming it is not included in the contract). Along with the roll-off truck the following costs have been included for based on the number of trips for each scenario:

- Operator Costs (staffing),
- Fuel Costs, and
- Truck Maintenance

In both Urban 6 and Urban 5 scenarios, more roll-off truck trips (i.e., bulk deliveries) to Arthur are required than there are days in the year. This means that there would need to be one trip per day at minimum, with some days needing two. With this heavy amount of tucking to Arthur, it is concluded that an SSO transfer station is not needed, or that a very small scale “dump and load” platform be built, as there will almost never be any SSO being stored at the transfer station, because it is constantly being hauled to Arthur.

It is noted that this quote is based on weekly collection of SSO and that with bulk disposal, the frequency of deliveries will depend on the demand.

Based on the varying geography within the service area, distance to delivery, and size of trucks, it appears that a bulk SSO depot would not be cost-effective under the current assumptions. It is noted that the relevance of bulk storage and delivery may also be influenced by collection method. Where SSO is co-collected with waste, bulk disposal would become more relevant. It is recommended that if an SSO program be pursued, that the program details be designed in consultation with the collection contractor.

In summary, this alternative doesn’t appear to be practical in the scenarios contemplated.

9. Direct Delivery of SSO to a Third Party Processor

This section evaluates the possibility to deliver the SSO directly to a third party processor after it has been collected. Using similar estimates and concepts previous sections of this report, we can estimate values for the direct delivery and disposal of SSO to a third party. Direct disposal to a third party processor is the most viable of the options for all of the scenarios due to the frequencies and volumes of their disposal where dedicated trucks for SSO collection are used.

This process also contemplates a less formal “bulk” transfer area, whereby half-loads could be mingled on a daily basis to optimize delivery within specific service areas. This assumes that a single truck would have a “full”, or near full load prior to driving from the local service area.

The processing fees for disposal of the SSO would remain the same as described in Section 8 of this report, because the predicted volume does not change.

With direct delivery, more deliveries will be made to a third party processor (such as the Walker Composting Facility in Arthur, formerly AllTreat), relative to the bulk delivery system. This is because there is a loss in ensuring the delivery of full loads, as the trucks will be required to deliver their collected load at the end of the day, regardless of how full the truck may be. Depending on the type of collection service provided (i.e., with, or without waste co-collection), it is reasonable to expect that there may be some amalgamation of loads. We have not considered this to be “bulk storage” based on the fact this would be completed ad-hoc with trucks on route on a daily basis.

Based on review of recent tenders for SSO collection and disposal, a cost range of approximately $70 to $80 per household has been submitted by third party contractors. This is a similar range to our estimates ($73 to $83 per household). These estimates are displayed in the attached table in Appendix A.

Based on the service area scenarios considered, this option appears to be the most cost-effective approach.

10. Analysis & Comparison of The Options

The enclosed table in Appendix A summarizes the comparative cost evaluation of the residential SSO management options considered for the Town of Saugeen Shores.

The best financial and most applicable approach is considered to be collection in the urban area of Saugeen Shores via a 3rd party contractor with direct delivery to a regional area processing facility, with a comparative cost estimate in the range of $73 per stop per year.

The actual costs for implementation would be in the range of $630,000 per year, with indirect and direct savings valued at $192,000 per year. The $630,000 includes annualized costs for the initial purchase of green bins.

Processing in the Town of Saugeen Shores is not considered viable in the short-term, due to the capital expenses, studies and approval process that would be required. Further, SSO processing at the Southampton Landfill site is considered problematic until the EA process for the Landfill Optimization is complete. This is expected to be at least 2 years until completion.

Based on this review, the key component to the SSO management systems is the schedule and nature of the collection system. Currently, BASWR (the waste management contractor) has indicated that they would not be interested in conducting SSO collection for Saugeen Shores. Consequently, it is recommended that the first step in continued investigation into SSO management in Saugeen Shores is consultation with Contractors to determine SSO and/or SSO and waste collection options.

The SSO collection contractor, depending on methodology of collection (for example split or dedicated trucks), may prefer to have bulk shipping in some form. Consequently, it will be important to establish viable contractors as part of the implementation of the SSO program.

In the event the Town wishes to implement a program more quickly, collection with direct delivery to a 3rd party processor is recommended. It is noted that if this program is selected, it doesn't prevent the option for on-site processing to proceed in the future. In other words, the use of Third Party Processing facility could be changed at any time, depending on Contract requirements. For example, an SSO program initially reliant on third party processing could transition to partial or full local processing in the future, should operational experience, regulatory approvals, and funding opportunities support such a shift. Similarly, opportunities for regional partnerships may expand as neighbouring municipalities advance their own organics diversion programs.

While combining collection programs with other Municipal Members may offer cost savings, it is primarily related to the collection side of the equation. This is because the processing costs are essentially on per unit basis, with only minor savings related to efficiency of scale. These savings would be more evident if a new fleet of trucks and separate system were developed. However, based on our review of functioning SSO programs, the most realistic approach to collection would be through use of existing contractors and infrastructure. Therefore, the actual potential for cost savings would be best understood when investigating collection options with actual contractors who would be completing the work.

11. Important Considerations

11.1. Environmental Considerations

Although financial considerations are the most straight-forward way to compare options, other environmental impacts should be considered.

First of all, good management of organic waste results in an overall reduction of greenhouse gases, as detailed below.

i) Methane production from landfills is a result of anaerobic digestion of organics within the landfill. Composting is an aerobic process, and with proper management techniques will result in production of carbon dioxide (CO_2) instead of methane (CH_4) from organic waste. CO_2 is a weaker greenhouse gas than methane and so the production of CO_2 is preferred to methane.

ii) The diversion of organics reduces leachate production in landfills. The anaerobic breakdown of organics creates acidic conditions and when combined with water leads to leachate.

iii) Composting of organics is an aerobic process and does not produce methane from the organics. Instead, the carbon in the organics is converted to CO_2 which is a weaker greenhouse gas than methane and so is preferred to methane.

However, collection and transportation of organics results in the production of CO_2 and other air pollutants from vehicle exhaust and road dust. The efficacy of the program will depend on the geographic density of participants and where the processing will occur.

In summary, reducing food waste, as well as on-property compost and processing of waste that is produced, has the least additional pollution, but is considered to have the least likelihood of participation by the public. It requires effort and cooperation of the general public. SSO curbside collection and processing has been established in the province as an effective method of managing SSO in highly populated and densely populated areas. The use of SSO curbside collection is less common in rural areas, where driving distances relative to product collection increase resulting in relatively high costs per unit of SSO. Where SSO collection occurs in rural areas, the most common processing appears to be at more regional third-party processing sites (Meaford) or local municipally-owned small scale windrow processing (Southgate).

11.2. Policy Considerations

Although some of the proposed urban centres may currently be exempt from mandatory SSO management requirements, Provincial Policy targets for various diversion rates will indirectly require some level of SSO management. Overall waste diversion targets above the Provincial target of 50% inherently require some form of SSO management as SSO is approximately 30% of the residential waste stream.

The management of SSO can also be considered to be a more environmentally sustainable approach to the waste management system. The public perception and "buy-in" to waste management and waste diversion can be enhanced by having a more fulsome program.

In the Town of Saugeen Shores, it is estimated that the IC&I sector produces about 10% of the total organic waste within the municipality. Due to ministry policies, the IC&I sector is not required to be included within SSO programs and will therefore be left out of consideration. This means that with the Town of Saugeen Shores alone, there is approximately 180 tonnes of SSO per year that would be left out of the program. For the purpose of perspective, this is about $23,000 of landfill space per year that could otherwise be diverted.

12. Conclusions & Recommendations

In all scenarios, the implementation of a SSO program would have additional financial cost when compared to the current methods of collection and disposal. The estimates presented throughout this study remain sensitive to collection methodology (such as combined with waste or collection or the use of dedicated trucks), collection schedule (weekly or every other week), transportation distances, contamination rates, and the value of landfill airspace currently occupied by organic material.

It is clear that the provision of SSO collection provides a relatively significant increase in diversion and provides maximum environmental benefit in urban areas, since collection routes and recovery are maximized.

The Town is rather unique when compared to the surrounding jurisdictions in that an estimated 85% of its population is situated within urban communities, with 15% residing in the outlying rural areas. In other words, 85% of the population lives in approximately in about 8.5% of the land area (i.e., the "urban" setting). This population profile lends itself to consideration of a service scenario for the urban only areas of Saugeen Shores.

The analysis indicates that the potential costs for each of the service area scenarios investigated and the SSO management options are within a similar range. While combining collection programs with other Municipal Members may offer cost savings, it is primarily related to the collection costs. Therefore, the actual potential for cost savings would be best understood when investigating collection options with actual contractors who would be completing the work.

Based on this review, the key component to the SSO management systems is the schedule and nature of the collection system. Consequently, it is recommended that the first step in continued investigation into SSO management in Saugeen Shores is consultation with Contractors to determine SSO and/or SSO and waste collection options.

The most financially viable option and application option at this time appears to be the collection of Saugeen Shores Urban via a third party contractor and delivery to regional, or third Party Processor, with a comparative cost estimate in the range of $73 per stop per year.

The cost estimate for implementation would be in the range of $630,000 per year, with indirect and direct savings valued at $192,000 per year. The $630,000 includes annualized costs for the initial purchase of green bins. These estimates and subject to changes based on market conditions. Consequently, it is recommended that contractor quotes be obtained to confirm actual costs.

The Saugeen Shores Urban option with 3rd Party Processor also aligns with ease and schedule of implementation. Based on the use of an existing processing system, no capital costs nor approvals process time is required. In Saugeen Shores a rapid implementation is preferred, consequently the delivery to a 3rd Party Processor should be included in discussion with the collection contractor.

Once the SSO program is established, we recommend it be reviewed on a regular basis, to see if opportunities arise for shared services with neighbouring areas and/or changes to the processing methodology would be beneficial.

In summary we recommend the following steps be completed if SSO is deemed applicable by the Town:

- Include the findings of this Study with other waste management initiatives in a waste system wide approach via any updates to the Long Term Waste Management Study.
- Immediate: Establish details with relevant third party contractors regarding collection schedule, methodology, and costs (potentially leading into a Tender/Contract process) in both of the Town of Saugeen Shores service scenarios.
- Short term: With relevant contractor(s), confirm pricing for 3rd party processing at regional facility.
- Medium Term (and on-going): Explore opportunities for partnering with local municipalities to improve contract pricing and/or efficiencies.
- Long Term (Once Landfill EA Process is complete): Review options for processing in the Town of Saugeen Shores.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

GEI CONSULTANTS CANADA LTD.

Matthew Nelson, P.Eng., P.Geo.

Appendix A Residential SSO Management Options - Cost Analysis

Residential SSO Management Options – Cost Analysis

RESIDENTIAL SSO MANAGEMENT					Savings		SSO Collection		SSO Delivery to Processing		SSO Facility		Additional Cost For SSO Collection and Processing			
Option	Level of Service	Number of households	Tonnes of SSO	Landfill Space Saved Per Year (m^3)	Landfill Space Cost Savings Per Year	Waste Pickup Savings Per Year	Collection Operation Costs per Year	Residential Bins Annual Cost	Delivery Operation Costs per Year	Annual Processing/Tipping Fees	Facility Capital Cost (Annualized over 20-year)	Facility Operations & Maintenance Costs Per Year	Annual Cost For The Town	Cost Comparison at 20 Years For The Town	Additional Cost For Saugeen Shores Household/year	Additional Cost For Tonne of SSO Diverted In Saugeen Shores/year
Collection & SSO Processing at Saugeen Shores Landfill	Saugeen Shores – Urban Plus Rural	7,000	1,589	2,648	-$203,392	-$20,000	$450,000	$17,000	$0	$0	$144,000	$300,000	$687,608	**$13,752,160**	**$98**	**$433**
	Saugeen Shores - Urban	6,000	1,362	2,270	-$174,336	-$18,000	$330,000	$14,500	$0	$0	$144,000	$255,000	$551,164	**$11,023,280**	**$92**	**$405**
	Urban 5 Alternative	14,000	3,178	5,297	-$406,784	-$40,000	$850,000	$36,000	$0	$0	$245,000	$767,000	$609,511	**$12,190,214**	**$87**	**$384**
	Urban 6 Alternative	17,000	3,859	6,432	-$493,952	-$50,000	$1,000,000	$42,000	$0	$0	$245,000	$865,000	$596,586	**$11,931,716**	**$85**	**$375**
Collection, transfer station & bulk disposal to 3rd Party	Saugeen Shores – Urban Plus Rural	7,000	1,589	2,648	-$203,392	-$20,000	$450,000	$17,000	$202,000	$181,000	$32,000	$45,000	$671,608	**$13,464,160**	**$96**	**$423**
	Saugeen Shores - Urban	6,000	1,362	2,270	-$174,336	-$18,000	$330,000	$14,500	$171,700	$153,850	$32,000	$40,500	$518,214	**$10,396,280**	**$87**	**$380**
	Urban 5 Alternative	14,000	3,178	5,297	-$406,784	-$40,000	$850,000	$36,000	$369,000	$424,000	$32,000	$52,000	$539,371	**$10,819,414**	**$77**	**$339**
	Urban 6 Alternative	17,000	3,859	6,432	-$493,952	-$50,000	$1,000,000	$42,000	$416,000	$480,000	$32,000	$55,000	$537,597	**$10,783,936**	**$77**	**$338**
Collection with direct delivery to 3rd Party	Saugeen Shores – Urban Plus Rural	7,000	1,589	2,648	-$203,392	-$20,000	$450,000	$17,000	$155,000	$181,000	$0	$0	$579,608	**$11,592,160**	**$83**	**$365**
	Saugeen Shores - Urban	6,000	1,362	2,270	-$174,336	-$18,000	$330,000	$14,500	$131,750	$153,850	$0	$0	$437,764	**$8,755,280**	**$73**	**$321**
	Urban 5 Alternative	14,000	3,178	5,297	-$406,784	-$40,000	$850,000	$36,000	$352,000	$424,000	$0	$0	$510,391	**$10,207,814**	**$73**	**$321**
	Urban 6 Alternative	17,000	3,859	6,432	-$493,952	-$50,000	$1,000,000	$42,000	$390,000	$480,000	$0	$0	$507,546	**$10,150,916**	**$73**	**$319**

Appendix B - Comparison of SSO Programs

Municipality	Program Type / Status	Materials Accepted	Multi-Residential Coverage	Pilot Project (Multi-Residential)	Processing Type	Pick-up Schedule	Collected With Garbage Yes/No	Collection Programs (ie.bins/carts auto or manual)	Collection Contractor	Notes (Partnership + Key Program Features)
Toronto (City)	Full SSO (citywide Green Bin)	Food waste, soiled paper, diapers, menstrual products, pet waste, litter	Yes — mandatory	Ongoing pilots for older apartments	AD	Weekly		Carts	Collected by the City of Toronto Waste Management Services	City-wide mature program; plastic liners permitted; biogas converted to RNG used in city fleet; leader in high-density participation initiatives.
Durham Region	Enhanced SSO — active July 2024	Food waste, paper, diapers, incontinence items, pet waste/litter	Yes — varies by LAM	Active pilots in Oshawa & Whitby	AD	Weekly		Bins (priced per bin size)		Province-aligned expanded program (2024); certified compostable liners only; adds diapers + pet waste; data sharing with York.
York Region	Full SSO (via local LAMs)	Food waste, paper, diapers, sanitary, pet waste, bedding	Varies (e.g., Markham full)	Condo retrofit pilots (Aurora / Richmond Hill)	AD / Composting hybrid	Weekly		Bin		Regional coordination model; expanded acceptance; local collection by LAMs; testing advanced odour controls and multi-res engagement.
Halton Region	Core SSO	Food waste, napkins; No diapers/pet waste	Limited	Pilot study Oakville 2025	Composting (aerobic)	weekly		Carts	Miller Waste Systems	Focus on contamination control and education; plastic liners prohibited; pilot for townhome expansion planned 2025.
Hamilton (City)	SSO (restricted)	Food waste, napkins; No diapers/pet waste	Yes	Small multi-unit pilots	Composting	Weekly			City services	Older system emphasizing low contamination; no plastics; studying new bag limits and AD feasibility.
Peel Region	SSO (food only)	Food waste, soiled paper; No diapers/pet waste	Varies	Multi-res pilot Brampton 2023–25	Composting	weekly		Carts	Peel Region City Services	Mature food-only system; contamination audits underway; evaluating long-term expansion to include pet waste.
Niagara Region	SSO (partial expansion)	Food waste, paper, pet waste; No diapers	Partial	High-rise pilot St Catharines 2024	Composting	weekly	Yes	Bins. But they also allow substiture containers	GFL Environmnet Inc for Grimsby, Lincoln, Pelham, Tharold, Wainfleet and West Lincold. Miller Waste Systems for Fort Erie, Niagra Falls, Niagra-on-the-lake, Port Colborne, St. Catharine and Welland.	Pet waste accepted; diapers garbage; shares processing best practices via Regional Waste Forum; exploring curbside optimization.
Region of Waterloo	SSO (pet waste accepted)	Food waste, paper, pet waste, litter, bedding; No diapers	Limited	High-rise pilot Kitchener 2024	Composting	weekly	No	Wheeled Cart based system starting in 2026	Emterra Environmental (Starting 2026)	Accepts pet waste; diapers excluded; outreach through Waste Whiz; joint organic waste study with Niagara 2024.
Guelph (City)	SSO (pet waste inclusion)	Food waste, paper, pet waste; No diapers	Yes	Centralized cart-room pilot 2024–25	AD (City-owned)	weekly	No	Automated		City-owned AD produces RNG & compost; strong research ties; expanding outreach to multi-res buildings.
London (City)	SSO (launched 2024)	Food waste, paper; No diapers/pet waste	Rolling expansion	100-building pilot 2025	Composting → future AD	weekly		Carts		New citywide program; pet-waste inclusion under review for 2025; future AD conversion under study.
Simcoe County	SSO (expanded)	Food waste, paper, pet waste, animal bedding; No diapers	Varies by LAM	Condo pilots (Collingwood & Midland)	Composting	weekly		Automated, carts	Contractor	Shared processing network with BioAg; compostable liners mandated for pet waste; regional outreach alignment.
Barrie (City)	SSO (automated 2025)	Food waste, paper, pet waste; No diapers	Varies	Multi-res pilot 2025	Composting	weekly		carts	Emterra Environmental	Automated cart rollout 2025; coordinated communication with County; targeting 65% diversion.
Orillia (City)	SSO (since 2012; expanded 2019)	Food waste, paper, pet waste, litter; No diapers	Yes (multi-res + institutional)	Retrofit pilot 2024	Composting (Simcoe facility)	weekly	Yes with divided trucks	bin	Mid Ontario Disposal	Long-established leader in SSO; high compliance; joint regional processing; compostable liners only.
Windsor / EWSWA	SSO (launch Oct 2025)	Food waste; expanded (diapers/pet waste) TBD	Phase 1 single-family	Multi-res pilot 2026	TBD (Composting → future AD)	Weekly		Bins	Miller Waste Systems	Launch Oct 21 2025; shared governance model; preparing multi-unit phase.
Owen Sound (Grey Co.)	SSO Started June 2025	Food waste, paper, pet waste, litter; No diapers	Partial	Active downtown pilot	Composting (Midwestern BioAg)	weekly	Bi-weekly with garbage, on the other weeks it is alone.	manual	Miller Waste Systems	Expansion 2025; shared composting facility with BioAg; model for rural coordination.
The Blue Mountains	Pilot planned (2025 study)	Food waste only; No diapers/pet waste	Limited households	Feasibility 2026	Composting	weekly		Bins	Miller Waste Systems	County-supported research 2024–25; exploring shared collection model with Collingwood.
Meaford	SSO (2017 – expanded)	Food waste, paper, pet waste, litter; No diapers	Yes (small buildings)	Condo retrofit 2025	Composting (Regional) to all treat in Arthur	Bi-weekly			Miller Waste Systems	High participation; compostable liners required; regional service contract.
Hanover & West Grey	Limited SSO (drop-off only)	Food scraps only; No pet waste/diapers	None	Depot pilot 2025	Composting	No curbside				Shared feasibility for future curbside program; capacity planning underway.
Grey Highlands	No curbside SSO yet	Food waste (depot); No diapers/pet waste	None	Phase II pilot 2026	Transfer-Station Composting	No curbside				Preparing joint procurement for curbside launch; data sharing with neighbouring LAMs.