

Workshop Evaluation
Blue Box Waste Diversion Program Planning Study
Public Forum #5 London
January 11, 2003

Total responses – 9

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

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

Comments:

2. How would you rate the workshop format?

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

Comments:

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				1	4	3

Comments:

- Rate this as excellent for the few people that attended – But overall ineffective to get feedback from Ontario residents

5. Other comments:

- Not sufficient meeting notification
- This entire program is dependant on provincial government leadership
- Some confusion between “blue box” limitation vs waste diversion in total
- London municipal waste management people absent

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?

- “Consistent” year to year, decade to decade package and waste changes do affect proposed system
- Use standard protocol - WDO is an interim program
- Examine making it mandatory to give us targets and best practices
- Aylmer – all garbage was sorted – no sampling
- Windsor - \$3/day – user pay works well
- Audit system in place would support estimates for recommended measure – doesn’t consider changing package choices, population
- Include multi-residential apartments in this assessment
- Are the provincial Reg. 101 and 103 requirements for businesses to do work audits and plans going to be enforced?
- Look at full costs of recycling

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

- Quality Measures – doing Blue Box correctly; efficiency issue because of higher contamination
- Set-out – affects efficiency
- Efficiency Measures – implement
- Issue: How much do we spend to get last tonne out
- Need for consistency of recyclables
- More boxes to separate?
- More incentives
- Can tetra paks, wood chips, etc. be incorporated into collection
- Collect bi-weekly more cost efficient
- Add incentives
- Have to open bags to know what is in them
- There will be more expense to collect what’s still in garbage
- Cost to increase diversion, monitor costs to justify additional collectibles
- Full cost accounting at tipping sites

-

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?

- Incentives, including user pay
- Processing locally
- More materials
- Education – keep it very simple/short
- Educate school children (targeted)
- Convenient, simple, uniform
- Our recycling depot not convenient – not everyone has a car
- Another box at curb for composting
- More multi-residential recycling
- Communicate better
- Reduce residual at MRF – educate citizens; performance measurement for contracts to improve efficiency of MRFs
- Bag tag to affect diversion
- Improve performance of Blue Box:
 - Reduce pickup frequency (test)
 - One side of street pickup (test)
 - Shared neighbour pickup approach (test)
 - Co-collection (test)
- City has no control over private waste collectors

Obligated companies will set aside 10% of the 50% funding that they will pay toward Blue Box programs in Ontario in an Efficiency and Effectiveness Fund. Municipalities will apply to this fund for special projects to help them improve their Blue Box program.

b) What type of projects should this fund invest in?

- User pay increases diversion
- Identify challenges – distance
- Programs to educate people in the workplace (social marketing)
- Blue Box – more materials: milk cartons, plastic poly-covered juice boxes (done in Toronto)
- Research new technologies and local business opportunities
- Focus on apartment buildings/multi-residential
- Challenge

- Struggle with non-recycling buildings
- Bill 103 is not enforced for apartment buildings, so 15% of apartment buildings do not participate
- * Province should enforce

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?

- Check list item in box to reduce contamination
- Educate children, employers
- Standardized pickup will cut cost of advertising, etc. from province
- Face-to-face interaction – partnerships with community
- Challenges with municipalities – tax breaks
- Education on costs of recycling to the homeowner
- Work with companies like Try Recycling, which is looking for customers
- Hold a contest, like “Super Cycler” in the US. A highly publicized campaign, where “Super Cycler” would visit homes randomly on Mondays to check on their recycling accuracy. If not correct, their names would be broadcast on local radio. If correct, they would win \$500.
- Political leadership needed to set regulations, provide advocacy
- Raise awareness of children – knowledge of how much paper would cost it a parent didn’t recycle (feedstock is imported from other places)
- TV and radio education is more effective, but also more expensive
- Make public the cost of not recycling – educate through schools
- Make systems consistent, to get more broad-based educational messages. Currently, promotion/education done in one municipality can misinform people in other communities (e.g. Toronto Star has a broad readership beyond Toronto)
- Municipal forums/committees so municipalities can communicate and coordinate
- Use communities newspapers for awareness/education
- Face-to-face education, especially in multi-residential
- Good web site
- Inserts in newspapers
- Motivation using economic arguments
- “Un-do” some of the educational messages used in the past, since some recycling systems have changed
- Residents need assurance that what they are doing helps and does not go to landfill