

Workshop Evaluation
Blue Box Waste Diversion Program Planning Study
Public Forum #5 Kingston
January 13, 2003

Total responses – 17

1. How would you rate the overall content of this workshop?

Poor			Average			Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			1	3	8	5

Comments:

- Lots of good material

2. How would you rate the workshop format?

Poor			Average			Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			2	3	10	2

Comments:

3. How would you rate the quality of the workshop materials provided?

Poor			Average			Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	1		2	3	8	3

Comments:

- Far too wordy!

4. The intent of this workshop was to provide an opportunity for people to contribute their ideas and opinions to the Blue Box Waste Diversion Planning Study. How effectively do you feel this was achieved?

Poor			Average			Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			1	4	7	5

Comments:

- Very good input from all
- Depending on the “reporter”

5. Other comments:

- Echo prevented 50% of what I heard from staff presentation, but keep up the good work-and give us more notice next time
- Good length, good introductory presentation
- Wonderful opportunity to share ideas
- Very worthwhile education, thank you
- Seemed to be a small group

- Slides before workshop should be on screen for longer-difficult to digest content in the time available

Topic #1

The goal of the Blue Box Waste Diversion Program is to increase the diversion of municipal Blue box materials from waste. In order to measure whether the program is achieving this goal, Stewardship Ontario has been asked by the Minister of the Environment to identify ways to measure its success. The measurement that is being proposed is recycling efficiency rate. This recycling efficiency rate will measure the volume and weight of recyclables that are diverted from household garbage into the blue box as a result of the program.

In your view, will this rate, and the related waste audit measures, enable the program to meet its goal?

A) Why or why not?

- A beginning
- Not unless there is more education and more products taken in the blue box. Also, the companies must establish markets for the haulers of the recyclables or it will go to landfill via a more expensive route.
- Query: not sure process picks up Mfg./sales decision maker who chooses to market product in a non-recyclable package
- Yes-good way to start
- Some history of use
- No because there is no identified goal
- “Efficiency rate” takes away impact of changing material economy
- Concern over wording. Should be capture rate, not efficiency rate
- Could subtract efficiency rate from 100 (%) to stress how “inefficient” we are at present
- Program “goal” is unclear
- Goals should be “lofty” even if they are unattainable. If there is no penalty for not reaching a goal, it should be set high
- Yes, audits are necessary but there is room for negotiation on method of measure
- Reduction-measured by reduced waste and recycling per household
- No. Many people are trying to eliminate their garbage output all together. Comparing what is in garbage and could be recycled with what is recycled fails to measure a community’s success at reducing its garbage production overall. For example, if I refuse to buy meat on Styrofoam and only buy meat wrapped in butcher paper, I am reducing my garbage (which is good) but by your measure, the municipality would get more “points” for putting plastic into my blue box. This means that overall this program and measurement system is not measuring two of the four “R’s” including “refuse” and “reduce”. In my mind, we have to address this as a priority.
- I think we need to measure total garbage output (garbage and recycling) and work to reduce that. We need to force industry (send their packaging back to them) to reduce packaging and not package more and more non-recyclable packages. Right now industry seems to produce more and more in non-recyclable packaging and

- to switch products from recyclable to non-recyclable materials (orange juice containers, meat containers, etc.)
- This needs to be some thing that the general public, not people who come to workshops like tonight's ("the converted"), can easily understand
 - Should be used in conjunction with other forms of product stewardship (beer store has a 95-96% return rate)
 - Could compare municipalities performance to their neighbours and rank best to worst
 - Clear garbage bags
 - Report back to the community
 - How would this apply to e.g.: Tim Horton's, householder, stores, and industry? All different?

B) Are there other performance measures that you feel should be used?

- Litter reduction
- Deposit half-back
- Measure of target
- Print success stories
- Redemption programs e.g.: Quebec, New Brunswick, but not in Ontario!
- Clear garbage bags
- Product life-cycle analysis-energy costs, etc.
- Measurement of consumer knowledge
- Process must be capable of change and growth*
- Depository system should be looked at and measured
- Set target for litter reduction
- Provincial averages
- MPMP measures
- Reduction of garbage or kg/capita to reflect success of reducing garbage
- Some way to incorporate a material growth factor
- Kilograms of garbage per household should be captured for diversion

Topic #2

Through the Blue Box Waste Diversion Program, obligated companies will pay 50% of the net costs of residential recycling. One key objective for this funding is to improve municipal Blue Box programs in Ontario. Funds will be allocated to municipalities based on the efficiency of the Blue Box program (efficiency will be determined by the range, weight and volume of material they collected and marketed, with adjustments for program size and population density).

- a) What can you and your community do to improve the performance of the Blue Box program in your community?
- Education (or drivers too!) leave notes?
 - Perhaps a note that says good job (cover notes in plastic)
 - Educate the public
 - Education of drivers-rewards for good performance
 - Education of public
 - Containers for recyclables on the streets (sidewalks)
 - Business blue boxes
 - Print success stories
 - Increase promotion and education
 - Continue measuring capture rates through waste audits
 - Full user pay for garbage
 - Improved performance could result in increased cost e.g.: if we eliminated rules for blue box, we could increase capture but collection would be slower resulting in increased cost
 - “Buddy your blue box” program=fewer stops for collection trucks if neighbours placed boxes in central locations
 - Make the program more convenient and easier for residents
 - Educate drivers to be more tolerant and diligent
 - Install boxes/containers in malls and large businesses
 - Use clear garbage bags so content can be easily checked
 - Bigger containers-i.e. bags and bag limits for garbage
 - Recycling facility tours
 - Transfer depots
 - Utility fee
 - Curb side waste audits, quarterly with published results-and suggestion for improvement (to those surveyed)
 - Utilize data in “best practices” and turn it into a multi-media campaign for schools
 - Pay for more than one bag of garbage
 - Accountability of councillors, mayors to not just use waste and recycling as an election platform (“football”)
 - Report cards on performance could be published

- It is unfair to burden municipalities with this, what are they supposed to do if there is no market for #3 or #7 plastics, or coloured glass? Should they have to pay for their disposal?
 - Does this mean that the more efficient you are, the more money the government gets or the less efficient you are the more money you get to help you do better?
- b) Are there other ways/approaches you can think of to encourage better performance, or a fairer funding formula?
- Money for building materials
 - Compost
 - Reuse centres
 - Biodegradable bags
 - Full user pay
 - Waste audits
 - Best practices-establish “best” or “better” way to collect and/or process materials
 - Research into alternate diversion streams including compost
 - Establish reuse centres
 - Research and upgrade of equipment
 - Research into biodegradable containers
 - Market development initiatives
 - Awards for recyclable containers for packaging producers
 - Mark identifying recycling family package is in
 - Recycling, re-use site development
 - Multi-residential solutions for recycling and diversion
 - Create a website with municipal “best practices”
 - Education via flyers in quarterly tax bills
 - Campaigns to educate citizens to reduce (in grocery stores?)
 - Rewards for neighbourhoods diversion success
 - Ideas for ways to reuse products e.g.: wine bottles to wine making stores, plastic bags to dog owners
 - Monthly “good weather” curb side furniture, etc. “help yourself”
 - Special days for certain products e.g.: a white/fine paper day so that fine paper is accumulated in one place and marketed as fine paper-a giant shredder day

Topic #3

The Waste Diversion Act focuses on the importance of public awareness and education. The proposed education and public awareness program for Blue Box Waste Diversion includes an annual \$1.3 million contribution of newspaper advertising from the Canadian Newspaper Association and the Ontario Community Newspaper Association.

In addition to this newspaper advertising can you suggest other education and public awareness initiatives that would help to increase the diversion of the recyclables from household waste?

A) What kinds of thing should this “efficiency and effectiveness fund” invest in?

- Advertise good recycling habits
- More use of informing which products are recyclable
- Driver (of collection trucks) could place stickers on boxes to remind owners of correct/incorrect materials
- Offer tours of recycling facilities
- Program of awarding those who do a good job of recycling
- Radio ads and interviews
- Educate public on products made from recycled materials
- More visible recycling labels on containers
- Education programs at schools, grocery stores, hospitals, businesses, etc.
- Increase the number of waste reduction weeks
- “Green pages” in the phone book to identify 3 R’s possibilities
- Good web site
- Billboards
- Ads on trucks
- Stickers for blue boxes
- Lottery for perfect capture rate households
- TV ads to recognize impacts of visuals
- School programs
- Short radio spots
- Cable TV ads
- Internal competition between districts-e.g. Capture rate in Pittsburgh vs. Countryside, waste audits
- Reward system for good recyclers and for improvement based on audits
- Education aimed at multi residence units
- Community organization involved in curb side audits
- Make it a social event
- Provide a report card
- Follow-up curb side audits to collect data that will enable residents to evaluate improvements
- Continuing of childhood education
- Education of community leaders
- Education aimed at littering

- Mandatory environmental education in elementary schools
- Education of public for -HHW in
 - paper
 - calendars
 - radio
 - web site
 - television
- Benefits of recycling (environmental)
- Supermarkets advertising what are recyclable in stores
- Logos for recycling must be more clear on packaging
- Offer money to local community groups to put information in their newsletters
- Programs will be most successful street by street

Other Comments:

Rural Municipality Issues:

Don Eady, Councillor Township of Horton (Renfrew) runs their landfill as a business (population of 2500)

- Gets paid \$5200/year to be chairman of the waste council
- His travel budget is \$1000/year and he spent \$350 to come to this meeting
- \$41/tonne for operations
- They are running out of space in their existing landfill, which was supposed to last until 2013 (indications that landfill will be full by 2004)
- They are hoping to increase their recycling efforts by 28.3% through education in 3 public meetings
- They put the community on “alert” regarding the capacity of the landfill
- Recycling increased from 9% to 11% of all diverted waste last year
- They do not have curb side collection, there is a recycling “campus” at the landfill site, including a reuse area (no charge to residents)
- Composting is their next target
- They may be able to extend the landfill to 2008 if they keep increasing their diversion rate
- They are saving money into reserves for a new Certificate of Approval for expansion of existing landfill
- They have had 9 public meeting over the last year on this issue
- He feels that the province has a doubled standard for recycling, as populations of under 2500 are not required to have curb side pick-up but populations of over 5000 must have curb side pick up-what does this say to the public in small municipalities?
- Inspectors are not consistently checking all recycling facilities (esp. in small communities)
- There should be a short-cut for expansion of existing landfill sites, they should not have to complete a full EA
- Found the Waste Management Expo in Peterborough to be very good
- Large municipalities have large budgets to travel to other municipalities to “see what everyone else is doing”, some even have a dedicated staff member for this purpose
- They should have meeting at landfill sites to learn from each other (e.g.: gull and bear control)

Rene Jeaurond, General Manager of RARE (Recycling Alexandria) (population of 10,000, including surrounding townships)

- They had a \$10,000 budget for education last year and they did not use all of it
- A number of landfill sites in his jurisdiction are unofficially closed (cannot afford to officially close them due to high cost of standards)

- Next year they will have to divert waste to outside municipalities
- The existing sites are all built in pits with no liners
- They implemented a 2 bag limit per week (issued tags)
- You can buy additional tags at \$3/ea.
- Recycling literally doubled as a result of this
- Composting also went up
- Give out free blue boxes to residents (no limit on number)
- Spent 45 to 50 thousand dollars on recycling efforts last year
- \$55/tonne operating costs
- More volume translates to lower operating costs, therefore it is expensive for small municipalities to run recycling facilities
- It is difficult for people to come up with the \$25 000 bond when tendering bids in small municipalities
- Could there not be an “insurance” bond from government that would allow this fee to be waived (similar to what is happening in the Municipal electric area (MEARIE))?
- This would reduce the net cost for all participating in the tender and would lower operational costs
- More money could be spent on education
- If there was a little profit in the operation, then a better quality of employee could be hired (drivers and pick-up people make about \$8/hr.)