Appendix 6: Green Cart Size Analysis

The following table provides a more indepth analysis of the three piloted green cart sizes. This information was used to support the Administration's recommendations of the 240 L cart size for city-wide food and yard waste services.

Cart Size	Benefits	Drawbacks
120 L	 Satisfactory capture rates of food waste (overall captured 39% of food waste in this scenario) Smaller cart size is easy to maneuver. Smaller cart size takes up less curb space. Lowest cost per cart. 	 Lowest capture rate of yard waste (74%). Unable to meet seasonal yard waste capacity requirements for all households. Survey showed more instances of issues with messiness in carts and frozen/sticking waste in this scenario vs. larger carts. Presented most operational challenges with carts blowing/falling over and freezing/sticking material. 31% of survey respondents in this scenario felt this cart was too small, and 6% felt it was too large.
240 L	 Best capture rates of all scenarios for food waste (50%). Satisfactory capture rate of yard waste (86%). Good maneuverability. Minimal issues operationally. Sufficient capacity for seasonal yard waste volume increases with weekly collection for majority of households. 	 May not meet seasonal yard waste capacity requirements for all households. Slightly larger curb space requirement than 120 L cart. Slightly less maneuverability than 120 L cart. May be more capacity than some households require year-round. 15% of survey respondents felt this cart was too small, and 24% felt it was too large.
360 L	 Best capture rate of yard waste (97%). Able to meet yard waste capacity requirements for households with large seasonal volumes. May not need to be collected as frequently. 	 Not as effective at capturing food waste (30% capture rate). May be more difficult to maneuver when full. Takes up more curb space. 50% of survey respondents felt this cart size was too large, and 1% felt it was too small. Highest cost per cart.