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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The University of Toronto (“U of T”) is a large multi-building, multi-facility community that has approximately 60 thousand students, staff and faculty occupying several major city blocks with over 140 buildings that generate waste and recycling materials. This study audits representative samples of waste from various buildings and facility types on campus and, as much as possible, compares the findings to last year’s study. At the same time it audits new areas to better understand the composition and quantities of the solid waste generated.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the solid non-hazardous waste audit is described as follows:

• to comply with the Ministry of the Environment’s (“MOE”) 3R’s Regulation, specifically Part X of Ontario Regulation (“O. Reg.”) 102/94 – Waste Audits and Waste Reduction Workplans (“O. Reg. 102/94”) which requires educational institutions to conduct waste audits and prepare waste reduction plans on an annual basis,

• to determine the current annual waste diversion rates for U of T resulting from existing waste reduction, reuse, and recycling programs,

• to identify and quantify the composition and point of generation of waste at U of T, and

• to identify any additional opportunities for waste reduction and diversion, which may exist at U of T.

1.2 Scope

Generally stated, the scope of work for this project was as follows:

• to collect data pertaining to the waste collection practices and one day waste audit data of select buildings at U of T, and select compactor scale waste loads audited at a transfer station;

• to determine the total quantity of waste diverted from landfill through current reduction, reuse, and recycling initiatives by auditing files provided and

• to complete a report on the waste audit’s findings and prepare a Waste Audit Summary and a Waste Reduction Action Plan.
2.0 WASTE AUDIT RESULTS

2.1 Methodology

Waste categories were established prior to the audit based on the MOE’s requirements for source separation at Educational Institutions:

- Corrugated Cardboard
- Mixed Paper
- Mixed Containers
- Polystyrene
- Wood
- Metal
- Yard Waste
- e-waste
- Special Plastics
- Organic Waste

In coordination with the waste management supervisor and caretaking department, 24 hr samples of bagged waste were kept aside the day before the audit. Each area of the building was designated with a different colour tab. The waste was audited by two qualified staff persons using containers to keep materials separate, a conversion of quantity counts to weight for containers, a portable scale, and relevant safety gear. The source separated containers, paper towels and organic waste bins were also audited to verify the volume to weight conversions. Extra safety supervision was provided on the site during the audit of laboratories. The audit was performed outdoors during the fall of 2005; therefore, Envirovision considers that this constitutes an indicative sample of the activities and waste types generated during the regular school year.

The compactor scale loads of waste were audited at the National Waste transfer station in Bolton, Ontario, with emphasis placed on qualitative observation and large and special items that were perhaps overlooked at the 24 hours sample level in the buildings. Observations were made for furniture, electronics scrap metals, construction and contractor waste, and source separated recyclables that should not have been thrown in the garbage by staff. Many pictures and even some weights were noted as well as other interesting observations.

Supplier provided annual tonnages were re-checked to the best of our ability in the form of weighing a week’s accumulation of bottles and cans collected by the city and sampling the weights of totes used in food was and mixed containers programs as well as select contracted cardboard locations.
2.2 Sources of Waste Generation

A review of U of T activities identified the following sources of waste generation:

• Office/Administration
• Washrooms
• Cafeteria
• Laboratories
• Classrooms, hallways, and public areas
• Washrooms

2.3 Waste Quantities, Composition and Distribution

The waste type, composition and distribution at U of T were determined by performing an audit of all solid non-hazardous waste generated at the facility over a twenty four hour period and with select off site auditing of compactor scale waste loads. The total waste quantities diverted from landfill through current reduction and recycling initiatives and the total waste shipped to landfill from May 2005 to April 2006 were provided by U of T.
The solid waste generated at U of T’s St. George Campus was divided in the following generation areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUT Radio (CI)</td>
<td>91 St. George Street</td>
<td>Office/Administration, Washrooms, Cafeteria, Hallways, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Institute (CB)</td>
<td>112 College St M5G 1L6</td>
<td>Cafeteria, Washroom, Laboratories, and Hallways, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College (UC)</td>
<td>15 King's College Circle</td>
<td>Office/Administration, Cafeteria, Washroom, Hallways, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Donelly Centre for Cellular and Biological Research (C.C.B.R.)</td>
<td>160 College St. M5S 3E1</td>
<td>Cafeteria, Washroom, Laboratories and Hallways, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Building (HS)</td>
<td>155 College St. M5T 1P8</td>
<td>Office/Administration, Cafeteria, Washroom, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry Building (DN)</td>
<td>124 Edward Street M5G 1G6</td>
<td>Office/Administration Cafeteria, Washroom, Laboratories, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Building (MB)</td>
<td>170 College Street M5S 3E3</td>
<td>Office/Administration, Cafeteria, Washroom, Laboratories, Classrooms and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spadina Crescent - 1 (SP)</td>
<td>1 Spadina Crescent M5S 2J5</td>
<td>Office/Administration, Cafeteria, Washroom, Laboratories, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Rotman School of Management (RT)</td>
<td>105 St. George Street M5S 3E6</td>
<td>Office, Washroom, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields Inst for Research in Math Science (FI)</td>
<td>222 College Street M5T 3J1</td>
<td>Office, Washroom, and Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Continuing Studies (CS)</td>
<td>158 St. George Street M5S 2V8</td>
<td>Office, Washroom, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan Physical Laboratories (MP)</td>
<td>255 Huron Street M5S 1A7</td>
<td>Office, Washroom, Cafeteria, Laboratories, Classrooms, and Public Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the key aspects of *O. Reg. 102/94* is for waste generators to get a good understanding of the areas of their operation that generate the most waste, how it is generated and what the composition is. In so doing, one can be aware of where to focus the recycling and waste reduction efforts.
During the one-day waste audit conducted in the fall of 2005, the areas generating most of the waste by weight are as follow:

- CIUT: 2.90 kilograms
- Best Institute: 32.95 kilograms
- University College: 93.7 kilograms
- C.C.B.R.: 119.25 kilograms
- Health Science Building: 67.05 kilograms
- Dentistry Building: 292.6 kilograms
- Mining Building: 25.7 kilograms
- Spadina Crescent: 26.55 kilograms
- Joseph L. Rotman School of Management: 30.0 kilograms
- Fields Inst for Research in Math Science: 9.7 kilograms
- School of Continuing Studies: 6.0 kilograms
- McLennan Physical Laboratories: 60.65 kilograms

During the waste audit, a total of approximately 755.4 kilograms of waste was audited. Spread sheets showing the individual waste categories and the weight of each category generated from all areas of U of T are included in Appendix 1.

Based on the total amount of waste sorted, the percentage of waste generate by each building were:

- CIUT: 0.38%
- Best Institute: 4.30%
- University College: 12.22%
- C.C.B.R.: 15.55%
- Health Sciences Building: 8.74%
- Dentistry Building: 38.15%
- Mining Building: 3.35%
- Spadina Crescent: 3.46%
- Joseph L. Rotman School of Management: 3.91%
- Fields Inst for Research in Math Science: 1.26%
- School of Continuing Studies: 0.78%
- McLennan Physical Laboratories: 7.91%
Based on the total amount of waste sorted, the areas of the buildings audited within U of T generating the greatest quantities of waste were:

- **CIUT**
  - Office and Administration Area 44.83%
  - Washroom 43.10%

- **Best Institute**
  - Laboratories 42.19%
  - Cafeteria 26.56%

- **University College**
  - Washroom 45.36%
  - Cafeteria 28.98%

- **C.C.B.R.**
  - Laboratories 51.49%
  - Hallways, Classrooms, Public Space 33.79%

- **Health Science Building**
  - Cafeteria 30.57%
  - Classroom 26.26%

- **Dentistry Building**
  - Laboratories 53.40%
  - Cafeteria 11.21%

- **Mining Building**
  - Office and Administration Area 38.72%
  - Public Space 18.87%

- **Spadina Crescent**
  - Laboratories and Public Area 54.43%
  - Office and Administration Area 22.60%
Based on the total amount of waste sorted, the largest primary categories of waste generated during the audit were:

- **CIUT**
  - Paper Towels 37.9 %
  - Mixed Container 22.4 %
  - General Waste 22.4 %

- **Best Institute**
  - General Waste 60.2 %
  - Mixed Container 16.2 %

- **University College**
  - Paper Towels 41.1 %
  - General Waste 34.9 %

- **C.C.B.R.**
  - General Waste 62.5 %
  - Paper Towel 15.8 %
• Health Sciences Building
  o General Waste 43.5 %
  o Paper Towel 14.8 %

• Dentistry Building
  o General Waste 80.9 %
  o Paper Towel 7.2 %

• Mining Building
  o General Waste 77.6 %
  o Paper Towel 8.6 %

• Spadina Crescent
  o General Waste 45.2 %
  o Mixed Paper 22.8 %

• Joseph L. Rotman School of Management
  o General Waste 45.8 %
  o Paper Towel 36.7 %

• Fields Inst for Research in Math Science
  o General Waste 41.2 %
  o Organics 29.4 %

• School of Continuing Studies
  o General Waste 38.3 %
  o Paper Towel 28.3%

• McLennan Physical Laboratories
  o General Waste 54.9 %
  o Paper Towel 23.6 %
NOTES FOR OFF SITE AUDITS AT TRANSFER STATION

Please refer to photographs.

October 31, 2006

Medical Sciences Building (MS) - 1 King's College Circle M5S 1A8

- 1 electrical appliance
- 2 scrap metal light fixture
- 14 plastic buckets
- 2 bags pizza boxes 3 kilograms
- 6 bags Styrofoam
- 2 bags bottles & cans approx 12 kilograms
- several black bags animal bedding approx 300 kilograms
- several bags (black) contractor drywall scraps
- 1 toilet
- several bags of yard waste

Spadina Crescent 1

- 1 complete couch
- 1 bag paper towel
- many bags of mixed waste rich with bottles & cans
- 1 bag of large commercial containers (cafeteria waste)

November 6, 2006

C.C.B.R.

- 2 bags of plastic bubble wrap
- 20+ bags of Styrofoam approximately 25 kilograms
- 1 computer
- 1 bag of shrink wrap
- 3 bags of plastic waste (aliquots and test tube holders)
- 2 bags of bottles & cans probably taken right from a recycling bin
- 20 bags of paper & fibers taken from recycling bins over 340 kilograms
- The remainder was mixed (gloves, labels, containers)
New College - 300 Huron Street M5S 2Z3

- 2 hanging light fixtures
- Copper wiring & conduit 6 kilograms
- Construction waste (drywall, insulation, paint cans) placed by contractor
- 1 bag of large recyclable plastic yogurt containers source separated
- some organics (including several pumpkins)
- 1 coffee maker
- 1 desk drawer
- 1 chair
- plenty of cardboard & fiber material mixed in
- 1 desk drawer
- 1 chair
- 1 large cylindrical plastic tube
- various bottles & cans mixed in the load note they were source separated over 20 kilograms
- 4 bags of Styrofoam
- 1 brand new broom!

November 17, 2006

Health Science Building & Ont. Inst. for Studies in Education/UnivT (OI) - 252 Bloor Street West M5S 1V6 (Both these loads were somewhat mixed together at the transfer site)

- 9 bags Styrofoam (peanuts & boards)
- approx. 30 bags of paper & fiber over 200 kilograms
- 1 wooden box 14 kilograms
- shoes
- 1 large plastic ethanol container
- 1 bag of yard waste
- some miscellaneous bags of source separated containers and fiber probably from OISE.
3.0 DIVERSION PROGRAMS & WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

3.1 Waste Diversion Programs

Recycling and reuse programs have been initiated at U of T for the following materials:

**Recycled**
- Mixed Fiber (mixed paper) and paper towels
- Metal
- Wood
- Yard Waste
- Pallets
- Corrugated Cardboard
- Toner Cartridge
- Batteries
- Fluorescent Lamps
- Foam Packaging (Polystyrene)
- Organics (Food Waste)
- Mixed Containers (Bottles and Cans)
- Tires
- e-Waste (electronic equipment), Special Plastics and Transparencies
- Concrete

**Reused**
- Furniture, equipment and supplies, office supplies, clothing, books, etc.

The amount of waste diverted from landfill due to the above initiatives is presented in Table 1 entitled “Waste Diversion Summary (May 2005-April 2006)” and found on the following page.
Table 1: Waste Diversion Summary (May 2005-April 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Category</th>
<th>Quantity (metric tonnes)(^A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycled</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Paper</td>
<td>788.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>116.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>73.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Waste</td>
<td>28.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallets</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated Cardboard</td>
<td>265.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toner Cartridge</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorescents</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polystyrene</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>1,172.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles and Cans</td>
<td>230.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Waste and special plastics</td>
<td>39.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recycled</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,806.56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reused</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>41.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reused</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recycled + Reused</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,847.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^A\) - Based on the information provided by U of T.

3.2 Waste Disposal Systems

Approximately 2,263.44 tonnes of general waste was generated by U of T from May 2005 to April 2006.
3.3 Current Annual Diversion Rate

Table 2: Waste Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Management</th>
<th>Quantity (metric tonnes)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposed (general waste)</td>
<td>2,263.44</td>
<td>44.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reused</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled</td>
<td>2,806.56</td>
<td>54.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generated = Disposed + Reused + Recycled</td>
<td>5,111.25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Based on the information provided by U of T.

Based on the total amounts of waste generated and materials recycled and reused, the current annual diversion rate through existing programs at U of T is 55.72%. This percentage could be increased if U of T chose to include other reuse programs such as milk, egg and bread trays, etc. To be consistent with past record keeping these considerations are not part of the scope of this study. Also, there are countless vendors and departments in such a large community as U of T that it is difficult to track individual reuse programs although we acknowledge that they do exist. Furthermore, the projection section of the waste reduction and recycling workplan summary has been left blank as per discussions with U of T staff so that they may fill it in as appropriate to their objectives.

As part of fulfilling the O. Reg. 102/94 requirements, institutions are required to identify who is responsible for implementing each action that will lead to further improvements in the waste reduction programs. Given the large and complex nature of the U of T, these issues were discussed at various site meetings and involved various people at the departmental, faculty, facility and business unit level.
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

U of T is a leader and a winning institution in its field when it comes to waste reduction and recycling, accepts a wide range of materials for recycling, and the depth and breadth of the programs is impressive. The data used to calculate diversion rates is as accurate as can be and it has been checked, re-checked and makes use of conservative estimates. As previously mentioned, although other programs for reuse have been excluded, they would only further add to the impressive numbers. In the spirit of continuous improvement this report provides the following recommendations. The U of T does have some work to do in order to achieve the 60 % diversion rate as required by provincial guidelines. Approximately 60 % of the landfill waste contains recyclable materials with existing programs.

Based on the findings of our solid non-hazardous waste audit conducted at U of T, the following conclusions and recommendations are intended to maximize U of T’s waste diversion potential:

1. In 2005, U of T sent approximately 2,263.44 metric tonnes of waste to landfill and diverted approximately 2,847.81 metric tonnes of waste from landfill through recycling and reuse. This represents a diversion rate of approximately 55.7 %.

2. According to O. Reg. 102/94, the Waste Audit Summary (Appendix 2) or the Waste Reduction Workplan (Appendix 3) must be posted at U of T in a place where employees/students can review it. Furthermore, according to O. Reg. 102/94, when the summary is posted, the workplan should also be available for review for any of U of T’s employees/students who may requests it.

3. A copy of the waste audit and reduction workplan must be retained on file for at least five years. Other reports and studies done in the past should also be available for review and incorporated in future audits for the sake of comparison and to track progress. O. Reg.102/94 audits should be conducted annually.

4. Make use of multi-compartment containers for waste collection and recycling as much as possible. This practice is excellent. Given the large size and numerous buildings and departments, there is still a presence of “solitary” waste bins on campus. If an individual is carrying a recyclable material on their person, he/she is more than likely to throw it in a convenient waste can near by than to carry it for long stretches looking for a recycling centre. We recommend eliminated lonely waste bins and only having waste bins that are attached or close to recycling containers.
5. In general, public areas (i.e. classrooms, hallways) generate more waste and have lower capture rates of materials.

6. Given the huge size of U of T, both from a geographical footprint point of view and the large numbers of faculties, schools, colleges, administrative and business units, it is important for all of these different communities within the greater community to be aware of what the programs are, who to contact for help or questions and to have as much consistency as possible across the campus.

7. The full waste load audits at the transfer station as shown in the attached tables revealed a very important observation about sample size and procedure. The twenty four hour samples, primarily of bagged waste kept aside by caretaking, were not indicative of large recyclable items and/or full bags of source separated recyclables that were observed in the compactor scale audits. Had this extra step not been taken, the capture rate of a given material would have been greatly skewed. More work is needed to supply depots, especially in the classroom.

8. The twenty four hour samples of bagged waste kept outside by caretaking were not representative of large recyclable items, such as wood or scrap metal or full bags of recyclables that can accidentally be thrown in the compactor. We recommend a compactor scale added to properly assess the above.

9. Outside garbage bins represent a significant proportion of waste generated. Informal observation reveals a high percentage of recyclable materials. An audit to quantify this will be helpful in establishing an outdoor recycling system.

ENVIROVISION INC.

Mihaela Draghici, B.Sc.
Environmental Consultant
Figure 1: Waste Audit Summary
University of Toronto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Generated</th>
<th>Waste Reused</th>
<th>Waste Recycled</th>
<th>Waste Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Waste Generated**: 5,111.25 T
- **Waste Reused**: 4,375.01 T
- **Waste Recycled**: 2,806.56 T
- **Waste Disposed**: 2,263.44 T
Figure 2: Waste Increase/Decrease (%)
University of Toronto

- GENERATED: 16.83%
- REUSED: 13.48%
- RECYCLED: 22.23%
- DISPOSED: (17.50%)
Figure 3 - Waste Diversion Summary (%)
University of Toronto

General Waste: 54.91%
Recycled Waste: 44.28%
Reused Waste: 0.81%
Figure 4 - Recycled Waste Diversion Summary (%)  
University of Toronto
Photograph 1 - Medical Sciences compactor

Photograph 2 - OISE compactor
Photograph 3 - Earth Sciences compactor

Photograph 4 - Medical Sciences compactor
Photograph 5 - Spadina Crescent 40 yard, open bin

Photograph 6 - Earth Sciences compactor
Photograph 7 - New College compactor

Photograph 8 - New College compactor
Photograph 9 - New College compactor

Photograph 10 - CCBR compactor
Photograph 11 - CCBR compactor

Photograph 12 - Spadina Crescent 40 yard, open bin
Photograph 13 - Spadina Crescent 40 yard, open bin

Photograph 14 - Medical Sciences compactor
Waste Reduction Workplan Summary - Industrial, Commercial and Institutional Establishments (As required by Ontario Regulation 102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company / Institution: University of Toronto</th>
<th>Type of Establishment</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Enrollment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Reno Strano</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Over $3 million</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address:</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>O. Reg. 964 Class A,B,F</td>
<td>Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>No. of Units</td>
<td>Retail Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period: May 2005-April 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sq.m.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposed last year 2,263.44 Tonnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sq.m.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waste Reduction Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Category</th>
<th>Quantity (Tonnes)</th>
<th>Proposed Action to Reduce, Reuse or Recycle Material</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction (Tonnes)</td>
<td>Reuse (Tonnes)</td>
<td>Recycling (Tonnes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hereby certify that the information provided is complete and correct, and the establishment complies with all the requirements of Ontario Regulation 102/94.

Signature of Authorized Official: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Category</th>
<th>Generated</th>
<th>Reused</th>
<th>Recycled</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Year</td>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td>Increase /</td>
<td>Base Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(May 2004 -</td>
<td>(May 2005-</td>
<td>(Decrease)</td>
<td>(May 2004 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Paper</td>
<td>1,163.46</td>
<td>941.97</td>
<td>(221.49)</td>
<td>759.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>100.42</td>
<td>116.81</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>95.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood + Pallets</td>
<td>84.14</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>(5.64)</td>
<td>70.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Waste</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>(20.53)</td>
<td>48.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>96.38</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>(55.13)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated Cardboard</td>
<td>253.28</td>
<td>283.69</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>231.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toner Cartridge</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>(7.52)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>(4.25)</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorescent Lamps</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foam Packaging (Polystyrene)</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics (Waste Food)</td>
<td>910.07</td>
<td>1,272.23</td>
<td>362.16</td>
<td>910.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Containers (Bottles &amp; Cans)</td>
<td>402.18</td>
<td>396.76</td>
<td>(5.42)</td>
<td>293.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Waste (Electronic Equipment) and Special Plastics</td>
<td>102.02</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>(35.34)</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (incl. paper towels)</td>
<td>1,170.07</td>
<td>1,785.85</td>
<td>615.79</td>
<td>1,170.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,375.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,111.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>736.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.83</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(17.50)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recycled Content of Materials (Bought or Sold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Percentage of Recycled Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ledger- purchase material containing recycled content</td>
<td>10-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper- purchase material containing recycled content</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard- packaging material with post-consumer recycled content</td>
<td>10-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bottles, Glass Containers and Aluminum Cans-purchase material containing post -consumer recycled content</td>
<td>10-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood-packing material with post-consumer recycled content</td>
<td>10-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-Based on the average percentage of recycled content obtained from available website publications.

Note: Recycled-content material is an item that contains recovered materials. Recovered materials include both pre-consumer and post-consumer wastes. Post-consumer material comes from previously used business or consumer products. Pre-consumer material is basically manufacturing waste.

I hereby certify that the information provided is complete and correct, and the establishment complies with all the requirements of Ontario Regulation 102/94.
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