

E&E Project Evaluation Form

****Please be advised that completed evaluations are made available publicly and are posted on Stewardship Ontario's E&E Fund web site****

Project Name/Number/Priority area: Northern Ontario Blue Box Program Technical Advisor, Project 157/ Cost Containment

Lead Sponsor/competed by/date: City of Greater Sudbury/Clayton Sampson/January 29, 2009

Project Duration: 17 months

Total project value: \$180,000

E&E funding amount: \$180,000

Section 1 –To be completed by Project Applicant

1) What were the Project Goals and Objectives (as per the E&E Application and/or Contract)?

The project goal was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of recycling programs in Northern Ontario (NO).

The objectives were the provision of a support position for Northern Ontario programs to provide assistance with program improvement and to act as a catalyst for sustained, improved recycling program self management in Northern Ontario.

2) Were the goals and objectives met? (and if not why not?)

In general the goals and objectives were met. Initial indications are showing that work directly associated with project 157 is beginning to demonstrate some efficiency and effectiveness with programs. The project did provide for a dedicated support position for NO programs and the work carried out through the project did assist many programs to improve their program performance and operation.

3) Summary of Project Accomplishments (i.e. what did the project do/achieve?):

The following are a summary of some of the accomplishments of the project

- 30 operating programs visited throughout Northern Ontario;
- 10 program advisory reports provided;
- 11 municipalities considering blue box programs were visited;
- 7 northern program project applications approved (E&E and CIF), valued at \$189,000;
- 5 possible northern program project applications being considered

4) Summary of Project Limitations (*e.g. is there anything that should have been done differently?*)

The project did experience some limitations in its operation. The main limitations are outlined below:

- Limited time frame for the project. 17 months is a short window to undertake the work outlined for this program. Projects were not initiated until the last third of the project (due to the time required to develop), and as such are not completed by the end of this project. A longer time frame for this project (2 to 3 years) would have been better.
- The evolution of the E&E fund to the CIF resulted in a change of focus for the project and due to the timing of the transition, resulted in some delay in application of the objectives.

5) What do you consider to have been the key “lessons learned” from this project? Does your project/activity represent a “best practice”?

There were a number of lessons learned from this project:

- Proactive program site visits result in needed information exchange and development of project applications. They also foster good will (all site visits were well received and appreciated).
- Current communications efforts to provide information to small programs has had limited success. Due to the lack of staff resources, information distributed is often overlooked and as a result awareness of key points is low.
- There is a desire to improve programs, but additional resources (information, financial and staff) are needed
- There is an openness for multi-municipal cooperation in efforts.
- Most programs are doing a good job within the constraints which they operate in.

6) What specifically are municipal staff doing with the experiences and data from this project? Do you have plans to apply these lessons in your program? Please explain how.

This project was multi-municipal in nature and has provided opportunities for many municipalities in NO to undertake projects and/or improve the efficiencies of their recycling programs.

7) Has your municipal council been informed about the project and its results?

N/A

8) Do you think there are opportunities to share/replicate the successful elements of this project with other Ontario programs? If yes, how and where?

The nature of this project was multi-municipal, and it did provide for information exchange between municipalities and allow for program improvements and project development.

9) Did this project result in either reduced costs per tonne of Blue Box waste recycled and/or increased Blue Box tonnes diverted? (Please explain)

The general indications are that the answer is yes. The projects being completed should result in lower costs and increased diversion. The table below lists the active projects and anticipated results.

Project #	Municipality	Description	Estimated Result
CIF 100	Black River-Matheson	Establish recycling depots and develop P&E strategic plan.	Expected to increase tonnage capture by 15 to 20%
CIF 101	West Nipissing	Enhancing depot locations with P&E	Estimate to increase tonnage capture by 10%
CIF 102	Thunder Bay area (Conmee, Gillies, Neebing, O'Conner, Oliver-Paipoonge, Shuniah Twps.)	Multi-municipal cooperative recycling plan development	Long term to increase capture rates. Short term will be to cooperate on program improvements and utilize economies of scale to keep costs low.
CIF 110	Fort Frances	Recycling transfer facility evaluation	Provide for cost savings for material haulage to MRF (estimate \$5,000/year) and increase capture up to 5%.
CIF 116	Seguin Township	Enhancing recycling program with P&E	Increase capture of materials by 15%
CIF 129	Timmins	Evaluations of recycling collection and transfer options	Provide for long term cost efficiencies or savings (maintain current cost levels over the next contract cycle)
CIF 136	Lake Superior North Shore (Red Rock, Nipigon, Schreiber, Terrace Bay)	Evaluation of cooperative recycling program implementation.	Implementation of a cost effective programs for municipalities.

Section 2 –To be completed by Stewardship Ontario (and reviewed by applicant)

9) Did this project do what it set out to do? If not, what were the reasons/ barriers?

Yes. The only real drawback was the limited time frame (17 months), established to align the end of the contract period with the official conclusion of the E&E Fund. It took a little time to build recognition for the position and original estimates for time required for visit and visit prep were aggressive and perhaps overly optimistic. While the position was able to visit a large number of programs and generate an even large base of contacts, more time would have been useful to more fully engage municipalities and develop and implement project ideas. The concept of a support person appears to have been well received and very productive.

10) What are the key learnings from this project? Are there any next steps? What is being done to share the results?

This is not a project in the classical sense, it is the development of numerous opportunities within a given (Northern) sector of the municipal field. Learnings are expected to arise from a number of projects facilitated by this position under both E&E and CIF. More directly, the advisor employed under this project used the full body of E&E reports, as well as his strong municipal recycling background, to convey program info and learnings to the numerous clients and contacts approached as part of the site visit and reporting procedure.

11) Was the project good value for the money (e.g. were there measureable program or system cost reduction benefits, cost effective tonnage increases, etc?)

Good value, principally where the position conveyed and facilitated better practices (municipal cooperation, program optimization) to remote communities.

12) Does this project represent “best practices”? If yes, explain.

In this case the Northern support person was tasked with spreading best practice info and promoting project development on the basis of these best practices.

Term of E&E project – 17 months

Projected cost for next year - \$0, project complete

Did this project have a direct impact on the cost of Blue Box recycling? (Please explain)

A statistical or performance review of tonnes or cost is not offered here for a number of reasons: the data for the main years of impact (2008 and beyond) will not be available and verified for a few months yet; 30 municipalities were visited directly, and; 7 additional funded projects were approved as a result but outcomes are pending. Northern Ontario blue box performance will be monitored through the WDO datacall and outcomes from specific projects monitored over time.

Total project cost - \$180,000

E&E contribution – \$180,000

Other Cash/in-kind contributions -

14) Other Comments?

The purpose of the project was to act as a catalyst for change and improvement across all Northern Ontario programs. The main purpose was to promote better practices with an understanding that limited staff resources in the north resulted in a lack of attention to blue box issues. To the extent that northern personnel were engaged, were willing to receive program reports, and in some cases applied for funding for project work, the implementation of a Northern Ontario Blue Box Program Technical Advisor was successful given the relatively brief engagement.