

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: Mechanical Sorter Upgrade / PN 179/ MRF
Rationalization

Lead Sponsor/competed by/date: Quinte Waste Solutions May/2008

Project Duration: 2006 - 2007

Total project value: \$291,500.00 + GST

E&E funding amount: \$145,500.00+ GST

Actually spent: \$11,400 – \$5,400 of that paid by E&E Fund

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)?

- i. retrofit a mechanical OCC separator into an older existing MRF
- ii. increase processing speed, capacity, efficiency
- iii. increase storage
- iv. allow for viewing of the setup
- v. report on return on investment
- vi. conduct before and after fibre audits to show usefulness of sorter

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

No, the project ran into numerous structural retrofit design complications and lack of management time to complete the work. As a result QWS moved on to consider an entire new MRF as a solution to wider problems and determined that the retrofit would not make sense.

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

To date the preliminary site examination, pre-installation fibre audit, outline of structure change needs, outline of installation process/footprint, design of OCC separator layout installation have been completed.

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

This project discovered that there were many difficulties in retrofitting into an older MRF, the need for structural alterations was greater than originally anticipated delaying the design work. Meeting safety, public viewing and fire suppression requirements were taxing.

Also a dedicated individual to supervise the program directly would have been beneficial, rather than management attempting to add it to their responsibilities.

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

The project was originally based on the notion that mechanization made sense in a “best practices” perspective. However, for the reasons outlined in the response to the previous question, it was not possible to carry forward with the project.

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.

It is our intention to design and build a new MRF, this will eliminate retrofit issues and enable mechanization.

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

Yes a resolution was passed to end the project.

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?

Yes as per 4. Via reports, etc.

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)

No as it wasn't completed.

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?

According to the original project application, the objective of this project was for QWS to install a mechanical sorter for OCC which would have speeded up fibre sorting. This in turn would have created additional storage space/processing capacity allowing QWS to offer its competitive processing/tip-rebate pricing/marketing service to a wider group of potential clients, possibly lowering net cost.

The project was postponed indefinitely due to the reasons outlined by the proponent in the previous section.

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

In addition to those learning identified by the proponent above, it would have been worthwhile to include a feasibility study to determine whether the retrofit required for this project was technically feasible. Surprisingly, neither the proponent, the funder, or the peer reviewers addressed this issue in the original project application.

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?)

The E&E Fund's approved contribution to this project was \$145,500 – only \$5,400 of which was spent. The work that was carried out may provide Quinte with some assistance in planning for their new MRF.

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

One of the main arguments for this project was that it would enable QWS to offer its competitive processing/tip-rebate pricing/marketing service to more municipalities. This argument is in line with the “Blue Box Recycling Enhancement and Best Practices Assessment Project”, which considers it to be a best practice for neighbouring municipalities to cooperate with respect to collection and processing, as it generally results in economies of scale and program efficiency.

Ultimately however, a first and necessary step for QWS is perhaps to establish exactly where its program currently stands and where it is headed by developing and implementing an Up-to-date Plan for Recycling, also a fundamental best practices as identified by the Best Practices report.