



Municipality of the District of Argyle

Item: December 12, 2023

Date: Extended Producer  
Responsibility

### *Vision statement*

*Argyle is the community of choice to invest, live and play.*

### *Mission statement*

*Argyle invests time & talent in growth opportunities in fishing, tourism, and renewable energy sectors.*

*Argyle provides affordable taxation while providing safe and healthy communities and strives to engage and inform our residents on decisions that affect them most.*

*Argyle provides high class, accessible recreational and cultural facilities and helps celebrate its unique heritage and culture and welcomes new residents to our region.*

### **CAO's Recommendation:**

That the Municipality of the District of Argyle opt into the EPR program before the January 1, 2024, deadline. The EPR is an NSFMs priority project, come to fruition and is intended to benefit all municipalities.

### **Suggested motion:**

Move that the Municipality of the District of Argyle opt in as a member municipality to the Extended Producer Program.

### **Background:**

Background information was provided in the frequently asked questions document and the presentation at this meeting, both of which led and represented by Waste Check, who have long advocated for this program for Nova Scotia. In the end, the Extended Producer Responsibility is simply shifting the burden to pay and manage recycling collection and repurposing to those responsible for its creation – that is the producer of the product itself. Argyle will add nothing further here.

### **MGA considerations:**

The EPR program is a provincially led program to benefit municipalities, the MGA is less relevant here, as provincial regulations and legislation would override.

### **Financial considerations:**

---

Collection costs (budgeted) for fiscal year ending March 31, 2024 are as follows:

\$403,000 for three streams of collection (recycling, waste, and compost). A simple 1/3 refund calculates at \$134,333.

Recycling fees are estimated at \$50,000, half paid by MODA and half by the solid waste authority.

Overall, the order of magnitude in cost avoidance could approach **\$195,000**, and this figure, if Argyle was to continue paying, would increase by about 4% per year. Please note this is an estimate to provide Council an idea of the value of this policy change.

### **Pros and Cons of suggested action:**

---

#### **Opt-in.**

##### Pros

- Savings in the amount noted above would be experienced annually by the municipality.
- The producers of these packaging items have already built in the cost of recycling in their product, so the customer (the resident) is essentially paying twice for one service.
- “forcing” the producer to pay for recycling shall also ‘force’ the supplier to find more economic ways to package product, this could result in reduction of waste altogether.

##### Cons

- The producer shall be paying and may require additional control or work performed by the municipalities.
- A contract between the producer and the municipality, if applicable, will have to be negotiated, managed, and renewed, hopefully to mutual benefit.
- Producers may be motivated to select waste related packaging versus recycling materials to avoid costs. Presumably this would be managed by the provincial government.

#### **Opt-out.**

While there are downsides (potentially) to opting into EPR, the benefits would far outweigh the cons. This issue has been analysed by NSFMM and our waste management education experts and all push for this solution, understandably so.