# CHIPPEWAS OF GEORGINA ISLAND FIRST NATION SUMMARY REPORT

# CIF-SMALL PROGRAM PROMOITION AND EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION #615.12





Prepared By: Kerry-Ann Charles Environment Co-ordinator

**DECEMBER 2012** 

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This project has been delivered with the assistance of Waste Diversion Ontario's Continuous Improvement Fund, a fund financed by the Ontario Municipalities and Stewards of blue box waste in Ontario. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the views of the author(s), and Waste Diversion Ontario and Stewardship Ontario accept no responsibility for these views.

©2012 Waste Diversion Ontario and Stewardship Ontario

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, recorded or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photographic, sound, magnetic or other, without advance written permission from the owner.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.	Executive Summary4
2.	Introduction
	2.1 Community Profile5
	2.2 Program Overview5
3.	Background
	3.1 Waste Management System6
	3.2 Waste Management Performance
	3.3 Program Challenges7
	3.4 Goals and Objectives7
4.	Program Management and Measurement
	4.1 Approach9
	4.2 Baseline9

#### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation first introduced the recycling program into the Community about 8 years ago. The program was fairly difficult to implement as the service provider contracted required the separation of all materials and there was no curbside pick-up. Over the past few years the program evolved into a curbside pick-up, comingled program. Although this evolvement has occurred, our current recycling program still is not very effective. It is believed that the ineffectiveness of the program has a great deal to do with the lack of Promotion and Education within the program as there has been little to none.

In the development of our Waste Recycling Strategy in in 2011, it was estimated that there is only a 6.1% diversion rate occurring, which is well below average for the WDO municipal grouping as well as in comparison with other First Nations in Ontario. At this time there was no indication of the participation rate but the contractor had identified that it was very low. Although the Band Council would like to see a successful Recycling Program in the community it has not been on the priority list and there has never been a budget allotted for P&E. This has contributed to high contamination rates, low participation rates and low diversion rates as stated above.

We do not currently receive any monetary benefits from our recycling program and in fact the program is a huge cost to the First Nation and increasing participation could lead to higher costs. This is due to transportation issues which are a huge barrier in terms of contracting a service provider to haul our recyclables to a MRF for processing, having to work with a ferry schedule during the Spring, Summer and Fall seasons and airboats and an ice road during the Winter months. These transportation issues along with low tonnages make servicing Georgina Island undesirable.

In order to increase participation and diversion as well as reduce contamination the First Nation decided to negotiate with the service provider and revamp the recycling program and re-launch it. We have invested in a compactor which is situated on the Mainland side at our Marina site which recyclables are transported to on a weekly basis during Ferry season. With this new change it will now require residents to dual stream their recycling. In order to implement this program Council has realized the need for P&E.

At the time of funding acceptance the First Nation did not have a Communication Plan in place as we did not know that this was one of the requirements to access the funding. Due to this requirement, the utilization of the funding was delayed as the First Nation developed its plan. With the funding support from the Continuous Improvement Fund the re-launch of the recycling program is well underway.

Being that the re-launch of the program with dual stream occurred in April 2012 it is hard to gauge at this point how successful the program is as we only started to

document participation rates at the start of the re-launch. It is also hard to gauge diversion rates as well at this time as our second waste audit is due to be completed Spring 2013 as one was conducted in Fall 2011.

As is with any new program there are wrinkles to iron out and without information for comparison it is hard to come to conclusions about the success. The Refuse Collection Contractor although has seen an increase in participation with the P&E that has been circulating within the Community about the program and many of the residents assure the Administration that they are participating in the program. As well the tonnage numbers received for 2012 from our current service provider BFI Canada indicate that the program is working.

#### 2. INTRODUCTION

# 2.1 Community Profile

The Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation is located both on and off the east shore of Lake Simcoe and is approximately 100 km north of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). Georgina Island First Nation Reserve No. 33 consists of three separate islands and two mainland access points. The three islands (Georgina Island, Snake Island and Fox Island) lie approximately 3 km off the southern shore of Lake Simcoe.

The main population of the reserve resides on the largest island, Georgina Island. Today, approximately 80 households or 200 members of roughly 700 band members permanently reside on the island's land mass of 15 km², which is 4.5 km long and 3.2 km wide with an area of 1,415 ha/ or 4,399 acres. There are a total of 220 cottages on Georgina Island, some of which are accessed year round.

The second largest island is Snake Island covering an area of approximately 135 ha/333 acres and has 227 cottages, and Fox Island is the smallest at 20 ha/49 acres with 52 cottages. Neither Snake Island nor Fox Island has year round member residents or major infrastructure.

Although The Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation consists of the three (3) Islands the CIF funding received was only utilized for the Promotion and Education and re-launch of the recycling program for Georgina Island with consideration for expansion to both Snake and Fox. There is although curbside recycling pick-up for both Snake and Fox but it is not an organized program.

#### 2.2 Program Overview

The recycling program was introduced into the First Nation Community roughly eight (8) years ago. The program was fairly difficult to implement and expensive, as the service

provider contracted required the separation of all materials and there was no curbside pick-up or any public awareness and education in regards to the program. Also due to the difficulty in transporting the materials there have been no real options for negotiations for service providers. This has led to high contamination rates, low participation rates and a high cost to the First Nation. Over the past few years the program has evolved into a curbside pick-up, comingled program. Although this evolvement has occurred, our current recycling program has still not been very effective.

#### 3. BACKGROUND

# 3.1 Waste Management System

The First Nation currently has a weekly curbside collection service for both the household waste as well as the recycling. Mondays are regulated as household waste pick-up days and Thursdays are recycling pick-up days. There is currently a Waste Management By-law which limits household waste set out for pick-up to two (2) tagged bags. This service is conducted by a private contractor whom up until May 2012, had disposed of the recycling year round in four (4) forty (40) yard bins stored at the Landfill Site on the First Nation. These bins are rented and serviced on an on call basis through BFI Canada. The First Nation pays a fee for the collection and removal of the materials from the Island by the tonne. Tipping fees and contamination fees as well as a monthly rental fee for each of the bins used for storage is also paid and none of the revenues received by BFI Canada from the sale of these materials is seen by the First Nation.

Aiming to increase the success of the recycling program and minimize costs the First Nation looked for other options in terms of services providers with little success due to our unique situation of being an Island Community. With the current servicing any significant increase in participation would significantly increase costs to the program, in which funds are just not available.

Over the past year the First Nation has worked with BFI Canada to come up with a feasible option to minimize costs for the anticipated growth of the program and in May 2012 purchased a thirty-five (35) yard compactor which is now located on the mainland at our Marina site. In purchasing the compactor the program is no longer a comingled program and residents need to separate their paper products from the rest of their recyclables for pick-up and disposal. During the Spring, Summer and Fall months the recyclables are now transported to the mainland site and placed in the compactor and the paper bin which are serviced by BFI on an on call basis with no extra charges and unlimited removal. This option has also allowed us to implement recycling at our Marina site which was not an option before due to limited services provided. (Signage has been created to notify patrons that recycling services are now available). During the Winter

months there is a single forty (40) yard bin in which the recyclables are stored and is also utilized as a drop off depot year round.

# 3.2 Waste Management Performance

Being that the re-launch of the program with dual stream occurred in April 2012 it is hard to gauge at this point how successful the program is as we only started to document participation rates at the start of the re-launch. It is also hard to gauge diversion rates as well at this time as our second waste audit is due to be completed Spring 2013 as one was conducted in Fall 2011.

# 3.3 Program Challenges

Being an Island Community there are many challenges that we face in regards to our Waste Management Program. Not only do we have the difficulty in successfully negotiating services from contractors due to our unique transportation situation but our landfill sites life expectancy at this time is roughly estimated at 10 to 15 years and will significantly decrease in time if the recycling program is not improved. It has been predicted that with the anticipated growth, by the year 2020, our waste generation will grow from approximately two-hundred and eighty (280) tonnes per year to approximately three-hundred and twenty-five (325) tonnes per year with one-hundred and twenty (120) of that tonnage being recyclable materials that can be diverted. This has alarmed Chief and Council and has motivated the push to revamp the current program and focus on the promotion and education of the residents and cottagers to participate in the program.

#### 3.4 Goals and Objectives

In 2011 we received funding through CIF to develop a Waste Recycling Strategy which was completed April 2011, and is currently being implemented. Within that strategy the top initiative for the Recycling Program was the implementation of a Public Education and Promotion Program. It is stated in the WRS that these types of programs "are crucial for ensuring the success of local recycling programs". In February 2012 the Communication Plan was finalized and was given the go ahead for implementation by Council. With implementing the P&E Program the goals and objectives are as follows:

#### Goal

Implement the communication plan that will guide the re-launching of the Blue Box Recycling Program which will take place April 2012. This shall be accomplished by creating effective and efficient Promotion and Education strategies that will increase participation rates, increasing diversion rates and lower contamination rates.

# **Objective**

- 1) Aim to double the participation rates for residents and cottagers by the end of 2013. According to our Refuse Contractor the current participation rate is approximately thirty percent (30%). This will be achieved through community based social marketing tactics such as incentive and recognition programs as well as the distribution of various media such as calendars, fridge magnets, website updates etc.. The media that will be used will have educational content with a cultural aspect to it.
  - Recycling Calendars were developed and handed out in early April 2012 door to door to all residents and cottagers a like and the First Nations website has been updated on a monthly basis with the calendar as well as other recycling program information. Clear recycling bags were purchased in bulk and each resident received ten (10) free bags. The bags are offered for purchase at the Administration Building for ten (10) cents apiece to cut down on costs for the Island community and make it more convenient. It is hard to identify at this time although if participation rates have been increased as there was no baseline information for comparison upon re-launch of the program and participation has just started being tracked as of April 2012. Calendars as well as fridge magnets are set to be handed out door to door again early Spring. We have also ordered decals of our newly created recycling logo that are placed strategically throughout the Community and are used as give aways during Community events.
- 2) Aim to decrease the contamination rates by ten percent (10%) by the end of 2013. According to an audit that was conducted in the Fall of 2011, the current contamination rate is approximately twenty percent (20%). This will be achieved through the distribution of various media such as calendars, fridge magnets, newsletters, radio announcements, website updates etc..that will identify acceptable blue box materials and directions as to how to properly place them out for pick up or drop off at the depot.
  - ➤ During our Earth Day Celebration and Recycling Program Re-launch held on April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2012, booths were set up within our Community Centre by various services providers. Each service provider communicated information about the various programs offered within the First Nation (OES, HHHW, OTS, BFI Canada). BFI Canada specifically communicated information on accepted recyclable materials and the proper recycling procedures. There have also been monthly radio announcements as well as quarterly newsletters. Again, it is difficult to identify at this time as to whether or not the contamination rate has decreased since the launch of the new program as the next waste audit to be conducted will not take place until Spring 2013.
- 3) By the end of 2013 aim to increase the tonnage of blue box materials collected by one hundred percent (100%). Currently recyclables collected per year amount to only seventeen (17) tonnes so a collection of thirty-four (34) tonnes is the target. This will be achieved through objectives one (1) and two (2).

With the Tonnage numbers that have been received from BFI Canada it would appear that the implementation of the P&E Program is having an effect as the tonnage has increased from seventeen (17) tons to almost twenty-two (22) tons and this does not include paper products. Although until a comparison is made from the baseline participation rate that was created since the re-launch of the program this information may be inconclusive. Same goes for contamination rates, until the second waste audit has been performed numbers are not conclusive as they may be higher leading to higher tonnages.

#### 4. PROJECT MONOTORING AND MEASUREMENT

# 4.1 Approach

Due to the short life span left on the landfill site, as well as the anticipated growth for the First Nation, Council has deemed the improvement of the recycling program of great importance. Although they would like to see increased participation and diversion rates it is also of great importance to them to keep the cost of the program stagnant. With the help of CIF we have been able to implement the Communication Plan and re-launch the program using various forms of P&E. We have also negotiated with our current service provider to keep the costs of the program the same regardless of the anticipated increase of participation.

#### 4.2 Baseline

As stated earlier in this report, as part of the re-launch of the program we started to collect information on participation and will use this information in the coming year as a comparison as we continue to develop and distribute P&E for the program. We will also be able to identify contamination rates once the second waste audit has been completed in the Spring. Although the tonnages are higher for 2012 compared to recent years which is a good sign that the P&E program has been successful, until the participation and contamination rates are looked into further we can just speculate.