

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:

Project 36: Focused Delivery for Multi-Family Recycling (Part 1)

Project 197: Multi-Residential Recycling: Optimizing Recycling Performance by Using a Focused Delivery Framework (Part 2)

Lead Sponsor/competed by/date:

City of London, February 2009

London Property Management Association (LPMA) – \$10,00 in-kind contribution (Part 2)

Project Duration: November 2004 – March 2009

Total project value: \$60,000

E&E funding amount: \$30,000 + GST

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)?

Project 36:

To collect data on all of London's multi-residential buildings. The data would consist of 1) estimated performance data (kg/unit captured) for each building, and 2) a description of building characteristics (number of units, storage facilities for recycling and garbage) and recycling program attributes (number of carts, levels of contamination, etc.)

Project 197:

Phase 1: To analyze data collected in Project 36 and identify key barriers to recycling and potential strategy to remove barriers

Phase 2: To implement pilot projects at up to ten buildings to test strategies to remove barriers

Phase 3: To complete a cost-benefit analysis of the strategies and to review program financing options

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

The goals were met

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

E&E 36 was completed in March 2006 and succeeded at collecting information about recycling performance and characteristics of London's buildings. E&E 197 completed the following tasks:

- analyzed the data collected in E&E 36
- identified key barriers to increased recycling in multi-residential buildings
- implemented three key test strategies in buildings to remove barriers and monitored the building before and after to determine the impact on kg/unit capture, levels of contamination, and levels of stream mixing (visual observations). The strategies tested were:
 1. adding more space to recycle, i.e., adding capacity
 2. making recycling more convenient (setting up more, and more conveniently located recycling points)
 3. testing two versions of a recycling poster
- reviewed the cost and benefits to the strategies that were tested

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

Only strategy #1 showed results that were significant. Testing the other strategies became problematic because it became apparent that some of the buildings did not have enough capacity to recycle more and so the results were affected by this more than the implementation of the strategy. If this project were to be replicated, test buildings must have more than adequate capacity to store recyclables before any changes are implemented.

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

Adding more space to recycle has a linear impact on recycling quantities captured. The results indicate that there is a ratio of approximately 1 tonne of recyclable captured per year for each cart in the multi-family system. Cost/benefit analysis suggests that adding carts will increase the amount recycled and depending on revenue can provide a reasonable payback period.

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.

Data collected in projects 36 and 197 indicates that London requires approximately 1,500 – 1,700 95 gallon carts to reach a capacity level of 1 cart for each 10 residential units. Stewardship Ontario’s Blue Box Best Practices report suggests that the ratio used by Toronto (13 carts for every 100 units) is a best practice. London’s goal of 1per 10 is not at this level, but is part of a continuous improvement strategy to meet best practices. London expects to move forward with increasing the number of carts in their program in 2009-2010.

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

No. London will advise Council in the future when extra carts are added.

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, London staff has shared results through presentations at a number of workshop and is active on the Multi-Residential Working Group (MRWG) – previously funded through E&E Fund and now through the CIF. The CIF MR Support Project is reviewing programs to determine how results from the London study may enhance performance in other programs. Programs that do not have sufficient capacity will be reviewed to increase this performance indicator.

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 project did not as it was a pilot project of a few buildings, however program changes to be implemented based on the project findings are expected to increase Blue Box tonnes diverted. Depending on the number of new tonnes diverted and average revenue, the additional tonnes may result in new costs or cost savings.

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 agreement for project 36, the goal of the project was to implement a methodology to classify multi-residential buildings into categories of recycling performance, in order to significantly enhance the uptake of communication initiatives and infrastructure changes. The project's objectives were to:

- 1) Develop a classification system to identify buildings according to: a) performance level: high, medium or low and b) barriers to performance: high, medium, or low;
- 2) develop targeted action plans specific to each classification; and
- 3) develop a methodology for transfer to others to "take a reading" of their program.

In addition to the final report, the deliverables from the project were specified as:

- A database of London buildings indicating both performance levels and specific barriers at each building.
- A diagnostic tool for use by municipalities to analyze the 'health' of the recycling program at individual buildings (i.e., classification scheme to help target promotional materials to overcome barriers).

The goal of project 197 was to efficiently increase the capture rate of recyclables from multi-res buildings in the City of London via the removal of on site barriers to recycling and possibly through financial incentives. The project objectives are as follows:

- i. To further identify, analyze and prioritize barriers to recycling.
- ii. To identify, analyze and apply mechanisms to remove barriers to recycling.
- iii. To investigate service fee options linked to recycling performance

Generally speaking, the goals and objectives of both projects were met.

Under project 36, London visited 600 buildings three times each and have a record (estimate) of how much was recycled at these buildings on each of those weeks. Extensive site visits and interviews with approximately two thirds of superintendents were also carried out.

However, project 197 could not properly evaluate the strategy of improving recycling convenience or increasing promotion and education. Buildings targeted for recycling pilots must already have adequate recycling capacity (or be given additional recycling capacity and allowed to stabilize) before other recycling strategies can be properly evaluated.

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

The key learnings have been summarized by the proponent above and include the following 2 points:

- The lack of recycling capacity in the multi-family sector should be addressed first and foremost before other strategies aimed at increasing capture are considered, tested, or implemented

- Approximately one tonne of recyclables is captured per year for each cart in the multi-family system

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?*)

This was a relatively inexpensive investment that produced valuable findings.

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

These projects constitute an effort to determine some best practices and preferred approaches by better understanding the characteristics of London’s MF buildings, and addressing at least one best practice (recycling capacity).

13) Other Comments?

The amount of time required to complete the project reports (almost 5 years since the first project was implemented) was considerable. One of the main reasons for this was the limited amount of time available to municipal staff to complete this project. In this sense, the allowance for project management resources under E&E Fund’s successor, the Continuous Improvement Fund, is much welcomed.