

**Workshop Evaluation
Blue Box Waste Diversion Program Planning Study
Public Forum #1 Toronto
December 12, 2002**

Total responses – 15

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

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

Comments:

- A bit longer to provide essential info would have been helpful.
- Good breakdown of questions
- Great start.
- First two questions difficult to address adequately in the time provided.
- Good – but I felt some info was missing or it was assumed we might know.

2. How would you rate the workshop format?

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

Comments:

- OK for me, but for the less well-informed some of the concepts were difficult to grasp.
- Questions a bit hard to understand.
- You should move people between groups for each topic.
- A full round table of introductions would help at the beginning so we know who else is there – networking opportunities.

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

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

Comments?

- Too late.
- Didn't have time to review.
- The stuff is a little behind the times, I thought.
- N/A – Not soon enough!
- Appreciate time constraints, try to distribute info ahead of time.
- Need time to read and absorb.

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	5	7	1

Comments:

- Topic questions were too complex – more background understanding is needed.
- Crummy venue – too cold, no refreshments, poor acoustics.
- Low attendance is a problem. Some people were very uninformed – I think many of the concepts and environmental principles should not get lost in the process.
- The LCBO beverage industry **MUST** implement a deposit-return system. Remove these from the blue box and work on other items.
- But we kept going off topic!
- Some fine-tuning is required of questions – before this goes “Public”
- Generally OK. Need to focus on topics. Try to keep people off their soapboxes!
- A little more time would be better!
- It would be nice to see more of the ‘general public’.
- Should have had more advance notice to read materials
- Should have had more advance notice of meeting.
- Opinions presented were good. Direction of questions and their issues need clarifications up front.
- A simple refreshment – cookies and coffee would go a long way.

Topic #1

There are a number of ways that the performance of the blue box system can be measured – tonnes recycled each year, kilograms recycled per household, the recovery rate of specific materials, etc. The Blue Box Waste Diversion Program will track all of these. But what the Program plans to TARGET is reducing – each year – the amount of blue box material that is (inappropriately) set out by householders as garbage (i.e., currently being sent to landfill).

A) Is this the best target?

- What about material shifts e.g., glass to plastic – as a way to set targets?
- Currently proposed blue box performance measures are OK.
- Consistent standard programs are needed across the province (e.g., collection of a wider range of plastics)
- Focus on existing blue box materials – add other products/materials in future years
- Target as proposed does measure behaviour change, which is good. Yes, measure capture by material also.
- Target recyclables (e.g., wine bottles) that are put out for recycling but end up in landfill – improving efficiency and markets
- Hoping to expand from households – educational institutions
- Are we considering an aftermarket? If not, should we consider prohibiting its sale in market?
 - i. Only being implemented in BC
 - ii. Recyclability? Green glass, milk containers, plastic film
 - iii. Can we increase efficiency of current recyclables?
 - iv. Target should always ultimately be 100%
 - v. Are we using past experience and successes?
- Per household not practical or result in a ‘real’ number – percent of what’s generated
- Is there a way to rethink many packaging merchandise?
 - i. Merchandiser content control or recycled content control
 - ii. Packaging design rethinking? Can we affect institutions that teach design?

B) Do you have some ideas for better targets?

- 100% by 2010
- Enforce meeting targets
- Can we target areas with no markets and ‘force developments of markets’ e.g., tetrapak
- Plastic film and bags as a major product of concern.

Topic #2

Under the current Waste Diversion Program plan, municipalities will be paid based on the total tonnage (and volume) of material collected/marketed, and not on their specific program costs. The model takes account of the fact that large urban programs generally have lower costs per tonne than smaller programs in rural areas and the north, and so a number of factors are built into the formula to compensate for these kinds of impacts. Generally the model benefits programs that: increase the capture rate of materials and adds new materials.

- a) Are these the right kinds of signals to encourage municipalities to recycle/divert more materials and to become more efficient?
 - 50% funding will encourage greater investment in materials recovered by municipalities
 - this clearly provides incentives for municipalities to increase diversion
 - it is a municipal business issue – not a public issue
 - general agreement with this approach
 - Including the specific size and geography of a municipality is an important factor
 - Issue that we aren't reducing our waste – priority in 3R's
 - Yes, this is the right signal!

- b) Are there other ways/approaches you can think of to encourage better performance, or a fairer funding formula?
 - Should be incentive for overall reduction (not just diversion)
 - Could be awards/rewards to public to encourage participation
 - Municipalities should also receive recognition for high diversion efforts
 - Municipalities should exchange information on approaches that encourage high diversion and efficiency (through facilitated process or organization)
 - Bonus for reducing garbage instead of increasing recycling
 - Should provide incentives to get poor programs to improve
 - Can we also reward for our reduction of waste, not just how much they collect
 - Problems with 3R's – are we rushing the rethink/reduce formula?
 - But might be a problem with economics? What if people can't purchase materials? What about backyard composting?
 - Difficulty for municipalities to educate consumers

Topic #3

The Waste Diversion Program plan includes a “set aside” (starting in 2004) where up to 10% of the funding from industry to municipalities each year is placed in a Fund that invests in projects that are intended to make current recycling programs more efficient and to help add new materials more cost effectively. Municipalities would still receive the funding, but it would be on a somewhat competitive basis – i.e., the best ideas/programs (for reducing costs/improving performance) would get more funding.

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

- Fund to support education in reduce-reuse
- Reuse (e.g., Georgetown) (paints, office quality paper, etc.)
- Awards program (e.g., secret blue box – spot checks)
- Equipment upgrades (e.g., sorting machines)
- Training and regulatory programs (e.g., senior citizens; at work)
- In-school programs
- Frequency of collection
- Re-measuring efficiency and effectiveness - Should measure more than just diversion per capita or cost per tonne. It should also measure environmental impacts and investment
- Market development is important
- Investment in new technology
- Greater public accessibility
- Support for cash prizes of RCO waste minimization awards
- Capital investment in new program ideas
- Industry, without municipal partnerships, should be able to access these funds as long as it has a potential benefit to the recycling system
- Public education and promotion in multiple mediums
- Multi-residential recycling programs

B) Should the Program allocate some funding to directly reward the “top performing” programs?

- YES!!!
- If frequency does improve performance.
- Yes, and should also be a fund to help those that need improvement that municipalities can apply for.
- Yes, and also provide incentives to improve

Topic #4

The Waste Diversion Act focuses on the importance of the 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.

- A) In addition to this newspaper advertising, can you suggest other education and public awareness initiatives that will achieve the result of increasing diversion of recyclables from the landfill?
- Use the schools
 - Clarification: \$1.3 million from CAN should not be considered “voluntary”
 - Tie promotion to other existing seasonal promotions/events - Waste Reduction Week, Environment Week, Earth Week, Spring Cleaning, Halloween, Christmas, etc.
 - Should be use of TV ads, also
 - Needs to be standard promotion across the province (generic) – recognizing that municipal programs vary as for what they collect
 - Stickers/easy to read contact for blue boxes, etc.
 - In school education, but problems with high schoolers
 - Websites/mass media/province-wide
 - Neighbourhood cleanups
 - Multilingual/visual mediums with a cultural reflection
 - Community groups/grassroots organizations (e.g., gardening groups with composting)
 - More points of opportunity – provide more opportunities to educate
 - Waste calendars
 - TV, radio
 - Special events, e.g., Toronto EcoDays
 - Community groups, networks, coordinator groups
 - Brand-sponsored weeks
- B) Are you satisfied with how your municipality currently communicates with you about the Blue Box program? What media do they use and is it effective? What could they do differently that would increase your satisfaction?
- We need to tie recycling to other, bigger issues, particularly climate change
 - Use of celebrities (e.g., Cameron Diaz driving low emission vehicle)
 - Municipalities should use marketing/advertising firms
 - More emphasis on social marketing (e.g., Doug Mackenzie Moore)
 - Not using the municipality well enough/going outside municipality (e.g., TorCo vs. Toronto)
 - Customer service improvements
 - Information kits on refusing items

- No feedback for consumers (how well recycling works – results of others/end products)
- Confusion – language issues
- Generally OK – recognize group is ‘the converted’!
- Too much text – more pictures