

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: Improving the Consistency of Multi-Residential Diversion and Cost Analysis and Reporting / PN 201 / Multi-Family

Lead Sponsor/competed by/date: AMRC and Essex-Windsor Solid Waste Authority / August 2007

Project Duration: May 2006 to August 2007

Total project value: Project was originally approved for \$28,350. Actual value was \$15,400 + 20 days in-kind from municipal steering group valued at \$600/day = Total: \$27,400

E&E funding amount: \$15,400

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 goal was to develop a methodology to report and summarise multi-residential (MR) program parameters. By using existing multi-residential cost and diversion data, the objective was to develop a consistent methodology for tracking and reporting MR program information.

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

Yes, to the extent that a standard template or methodology for reporting consistent multi-residential program costs was developed and tested by a number of MR programs. The template was demonstrated to be usable by a range of MR programs (e.g., fully contracted, partially contracted, municipally-owned MRF, contractor-owned MRF, etc.).

No, to the extent that not all programs were able to use the template to report program costs.

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

- Developed and tested a standard template for reporting and recording multi-residential program costs
- Identified and verified 'default' mechanisms for deriving and reporting certain less 'direct' program costs, such as contract administration, promotion and education.
- Compared and verified reported diversion data with derived values (from waste audit results).

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

No

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

The key lesson is that it is possible to derive unit costs (per tonne, per unit, per building) for multi-residential programs. In some cases these costs are relatively accessible (i.e., large costs such as MR collection or processing contract are known, multi-residential tonnage is tracked). In other cases, these costs would need to be derived using, for example, waste audit data, on board scales.

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.
NA

7) Has your municipal council been informed about the project and its results?
Not yet

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 explained in the report.

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

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 application, the goal of this project was to develop a methodology to report and summarize MR program parameters. This was to be achieved by analyzing existing multi-residential diversion and cost data from eight programs to develop consistent methodology for tracking and reporting MR program information.

A template for reporting consistent multi-residential program costs was developed and tested by five programs. The template is available for public use. Three of the original eight programs who had committed to testing the template were not able to do so due to time constraints.

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

The project yielded the following key learnings:

- Programs must have the ability to isolate or segregate the major multi-residential program costs (MR collection contract, MR processing contract) from their curbside program costs. This would be the case if their multi-residential recycling program is tendered separately or the contractor is required to segregate MR program pricing from curbside. Failing this, an approximation of these costs could be made by apportioning them, based on proportion of multi-residential tonnage to curbside tonnage – provided this tonnage is tracked.
- Estimates of the MRF residue attributable to the multi-residential program were made based on relative tonnage, using the overall MRF residue rate. However, given that MR material is known to be generally more contaminated than curbside material, the derived cost is likely too low.
- In the absence of actual collected tonnage data (both recycling and waste) and measured MRF residue attributable to MR material, E&E audit results should be used as a default diversion rate
- For those programs that have ‘all inclusive’ collection and processing contracts (i.e., one price for all recyclables irrespective of source), or that cannot presently segregate curbside tonnes from MR tonnes, different options on how they might go about completing the template are suggested.
- Cost results from the five municipalities who completed the template are as follows

	Total MR costs ¹ per tonne (\$)	Total MR costs ¹ per building (\$)	Total MR cost ¹ per unit (\$)
Cost range	\$156 - \$249	\$727 - \$2392	\$10 - \$26

Note: Total costs includes {Collection [collection + P&E + Capital depreciation costs] + Processing Processing contract costs + Operating costs for municipally-owned MRFs + Capital depreciation costs for municipally owned MRFs}}

Next steps are as follows:

- Need to weigh the need for verifiable, standardised multi-residential program baseline information on costs against the level of effort and resources needed to acquire it for the remaining programs.
- If it is determined that further effort should be made, options presented in the report on how to proceed should be taken up
- Consideration would need to be given to how potential costs resulting from some of the options would be managed, as this has been cited as concern by some of the programs.

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 research project that was not intended to result in system cost savings or tonnage increases. The goal was to develop a tool that would track MR program progress in achieving such system savings.

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

The recently completed *Blue Box Program Enhancement and Best Practices Assessment Project* reports that it is important for the performance of multi-residential buildings currently being serviced by municipal programs to be measured and monitored. The development of the MR reporting template and the identification of the barriers to completing the template provide municipalities with important and useful tools to ensure this measurement and monitoring takes place.

Total project cost – \$15,400

E&E contribution – \$15,400

Other Cash/in-kind contributions – 20 in-kind days from municipal reps valued at \$600/day