Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB)

July 8, 2009 (5:30 PM) Meeting Minutes

| MEMBERS PRESENT: | Chris Cobb, Dickie Heckler, Sarah Hill-Nelson, Beth Johnson, Matt Lehrman, Daniel Poull, Laura Routh, Brian Sifton |
|------------------------|--|
| MEMBERS ABSENT: | Simran Sethi, Cindy Strecker |
| STAFF PRESENT: | Tammy Bennett, Cynthia Boecker, Kathy Richardson, Bob Yoos |
| COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: | Commissioner Aron Cromwell |
| GUESTS PRESENT: | Charlie Sedlock, Hamm Waste Services |
| PUBLIC PRESENT: | Joanne Bergman |

Call Meeting to Order (Daniel Poull, Chairperson) Take Roll Call to Determine Quorum of Members

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Motion and second to approve the June 10, 2009 minutes (Hill-Nelson/Lehrman). Vote: Motion was passed unanimously.

Welcome Charlie Sedlock of Hamm Company

Charlie Sedlock, the Hamm Company Waste Services Manager, discussed the life expectancy of the Hamm landfill in Perry, KS and answered questions from SAB. Currently the Hamm landfill serves a population of approximately 600,000 which brings in 480,000 tons of waste per year. If the tonnage per year remains the same the landfill's life expectancy is 80 years. Charlie Sedlock also informed the Board that the biggest change for landfills in the near future will be how facilities handle methane gas. Hamm has been researching options on handling methane gas (i.e. flaring or extracting for fuel use). These options are very expensive. Currently the methane gas at the Hamm landfill is passively vented. There may be stimulus money to help fund methane recapture systems. Hamm will be looking into this.

The Board asked Charlie Sedlock if Hamm would be interested in operating a recycling service. Charlie Sedlock remarked that Hamm is a family and employee owned business and that if there is a service in the waste sector with a reasonable rate of return they would consider starting this service. Hamm currently does not have any recycling contracts. Charlie Sedlock also commented that Hamm would not be competitive due to the low rates for service that the current curbside recycling businesses in Lawrence offer.

The Board also asked Charlie Sedlock what the cost for a transfer station with a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) handling both trash and recycling would be versus hauling waste to the landfill. Charlie Sedlock informed the Board that capital for a transfer station with a MRF is very

costly (12 to 15 million). He also explained that pound for pound the City of Lawrence system is currently doing the best for its money.

Commissioner Aron Cromwell stated that he is interested as well as Commissioner Mike Dever in changing the way that the City of Lawrence handles recyclables. These proposed changes would likely occur within the next 12 to 24 months. The following are three suggestions:

- implement a conventional curbside recycling program operated by the City or outside contractor
- 2. divide the City into sections and assign sections to current curbside recycling businesses
- 3. add multiple unmanned collection points throughout the City for all recyclable materials Commissioner Aron Cromwell added that any change to the current system will need to be economically feasible.

Stimulus Money Update

Cynthia Boecker, Assistant City Manager, informed the Board that the City of Lawrence is eligible to receive \$858,600 through the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant. Items approved by the City Commission to be funded by the Block Grant included a Sustainability Coordinator position. This new position is proposed to be a county employee jointly funded by the City of Lawrence and Douglas County. The Sustainability Coordinator would analyze existing facilities and recommend ways to reduce energy use and review sustainability issues. The position would spend approximately 40% of their time on County energy issues, 40% on City energy issues, and 20% on other sustainability initiatives. The City of Lawrence will have to spend the grant money 18 months from notification of the award. Currently the City is waiting for this notification.

SAB offered ideas on job responsibilities for the Sustainability Coordinator. They also suggested that there be a national search for this position.

Cynthia Boecker also announced that the City of Lawrence received notification in June of another EPA grant opportunity, the Climate Showcase Community Grant. This grant focuses on greenhouse gas emission reduction. The grant proposal is due on July 22nd. Cynthia Boecker informed SAB that Jeff Severin, the Director of the KU Center for Sustainability, approached the City with the idea of a joint partnership between KU and the City for this grant proposal. It would be modeled after the Boulder, Colorado outreach and education program for their university students. KU and the City plan to apply for \$100,000. Award announcements will occur on or after January 2010.

Recycling Report Update

Bob Yoos, the City's Solid Waste Manager, informed the Board that the *Evaluation of Waste Diversion Strategies for Lawrence 2009 Update* report (attached) which was emailed to SAB last month is a response to the City Commission and City's Manager's Office request for an update of the waste diversion strategies and costs presented in 2004. The update report will be placed as a future City Commission agenda item. Bob Yoos answered questions regarding updated costs, feasibility of a PAYT system, and possibility of citing more drop-off recycling containers.

Laura Routh asked if the recent Douglas/Jefferson Counties Solid Waste Management 5-Year Plan Update could include SAB recommendations, 2008 recycling survey results and other citizen comments. Bob Yoos and Charlie Sedlock are both on this Solid Waste Management Committee and clarified that the 5-Year Plan Update was finalized and approved by the County Commission a few months ago. They also noted that their meetings are open to the public and SAB members are welcomed to attend. Next year's review will be in April/May 2010.

Conversation in a Box

Hillary Noonan was not present at this meeting to provide an update regarding the Conversation in a Box.

Water Quality Report

Tammy Bennett, the City's Assistant Public Works Director, clarified the question that arose at the last Board meeting in regards to the Utilities Department's Water Quality Report results. They are reporting the range that the City measured from the lowest detected to the highest detected. These are not regulated ranges. The maximum contaminant level is the first column.

Waste Reduction & Recycling Report

Kathy Richardson announced that the City's Waste Reduction and Recycling Division will be hosting the 9th Annual Lawrence Energy Conservation Fair and Sustainable Homes Tour on Saturday, September 12th. The planning meeting for this event was well attended and staff received a lot of great suggestions. Kathy Richardson noted that Transit is offering a free ridership day on September 12th. Staff would also like to thank Daniel Poull for volunteering to be the Sustainable Homes Tour guide.

The WRR report was emailed to SAB (attached).

Guest comments and miscellaneous

There were no comments.

Meeting adjourned 7:45 p.m.

Next meeting: September 9th, 2009 at 5:30 pm.

Attachments:

- Evaluation of Waste Diversion Strategies for Lawrence Report
- Waste Reduction and Recycling Division Report

EVALUATION OF WASTE DIVERSION STRATEGIES FOR LAWRENCE 2009 UPDATE

Introduction

The city's Sustainability Advisory Board asked the Solid Waste Division in 2008 to commission a survey on recycling. Those results were reviewed by the City Commission. The City Commission and City Manager's Office requested an update of the waste diversion strategies and costs presented in 2004.

The Solid Waste Division looked at waste diversion strategies for Lawrence in 2004 and concluded in that report that the current recycling strategy should be continued and expanded on. Recycling opportunities, both public and private, had achieved a 34 percent recycling rate in 2003 which was believed to be the highest in the state and higher than typically achieved utilizing curbside collection of recyclables. Specific recommendations in the 2004 report were:

- 1. Support for a statewide beverage container deposit law ("bottle bill") which would remove glass, plastic and aluminum beverage containers from the waste stream:
- 2. Expand newspaper, cardboard and office paper recycling programs to additional entities (such as schools) and provide additional drop-off sites;
- 3. Increase recycling of wood waste at the city's compost facility; and
- 4. Increase public education on waste reduction.

Recycling Program Expansions Since 2003

Paper recycling through city programs has increased from 1,461 tons in 2003 to 2,111 tons in 2008. Two mixed paper drop-off sites were added to the city drop-off program in 2007 and five additional mixed paper sites were added in 2008. The total number of city-operated drop-off sites for paper increased to eleven in 2008.

Brushy waste and tree trimmings were added to yard waste collections in 2008 and are converted to compost or mulch.

Two electronics drop-off events were provided in 2008. More than 56 tons of electronics were diverted from the landfill by 1,189 participants.

Waste reduction has been a focus for educational events by city staff. The staff is a sponsor for the annual Earth Day event and has sponsored the Lawrence Energy Conservation Fair as well as attended numerous other events or organizational meetings.

A survey of Lawrence residents was commissioned in 2008 to gather input to help better understand the recycling needs of the community. Seventy-three percent (73%) of those surveyed indicate they currently recycle utilizing the mix of public and private recycling opportunities.

Evaluation of City-Operated Curbside Collection of Recyclables

Currently five privately operated businesses offer curbside collection of recyclables in Lawrence. Three of these have been in operation since 2003 or longer. A sixth has recently applied for registration to collect recyclables from the curbside in Lawrence. Residents can choose whether to subscribe to these services for a monthly fee. Several levels of services offered at varying price points (generally \$7-16 per month) are available from these businesses.

Recently the Sustainability Advisory Board requested an update on curbside collection of recyclables. The Board specifically wanted to see an evaluation of city-wide curbside collection provided by the Solid Waste Division or city-wide curbside collection provided by private providers.

Cost estimates were developed for providing curbside collection of recyclables utilizing city resources. Curbside collection could be provided primarily to 20,000-22,000 one to four-unit houses (out of approximately 37,800 total housing units). Larger complexes are typically served by containers (dumpsters) and not suitable for curbside collection. Some neighborhoods would not be able to receive curbside collection of recyclables because they too are served by containers (e.g. Oread Neighborhood) due to the high density of housing and parking needs.

Materials collected for recycling would likely be fibers (newspaper, mixed paper, etc.), steel and aluminum cans, and plastic (PETE, HDPE) containers. Staff does not recommend the curbside collection of glass due to negative markets and high cost of handling.

Cost

Two cost estimates were developed (see attachments) for curbside collection: one for a city-operated collection and operation of a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) for processing (sorting, baling, contaminant removal, loading onto transport trailers, etc.) and one for city-operated collection and direct daily transportation to the Deffenbuagh Industries Material Recovery Facility in Edwardsville, Kansas. That is the only MRF in the area. Estimates for both scenarios were developed for weekly or biweekly collection of recyclables (see table below).

COST COMPARISONS FOR CITY-OPERATED CURBSIDE COLLECTION OF RECYCLABLES

| | | City-operated M | <u>RF</u> | Transport to Edwardsville MRF | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| | Collection frequency: | Weekly | <u>Biweekly</u> | Weekly | <u>Biweekly</u> | |
| Cost/year (d | over 7 years) | \$3,704,005 | \$2,830,604 | \$3,516,952 | \$2,406,389 | |
| Cost/house | hold/year (1) | \$168 | \$129 | \$181 | \$121 | |
| Cost/house | ehold/month | \$14.00 | \$10.75 | \$15.11 | \$10.10 | |

(1) City-Operated MRF: AVERAGE COST PER YEAR (attachment i) plus AVERAGE COST PER YEAR (attachment ii) divided by 22,000

Transport to Edwardsville: AVERAGE COST PER YEAR (attachment i) plus AVERAGE COST PER YEAR (attachment iii) divided by 22,000

Note: Typically fewer recyclables are collected with biweekly collection than with weekly collection

While the lowest cost estimate is for collecting recyclables biweekly and transporting the recyclables to Edwardsville, that alternative carries more uncertainty. Volatile fuel prices could increase that cost significantly as the miles driven per vehicle are more than doubled. Vehicles will have to be replaced more frequently due to higher mileage and increased wear and tear. More personnel and vehicles may be needed because a significant portion of the work day will be dedicated to driving to and from the MRF rather than collecting recyclables. Perhaps the greatest risk is that we would be dependent on a privately owned facility that may not always want our recyclables or may ask for payment for taking those recyclables. Since we would be delivering loose, unprocessed recyclables with a high possibility of contaminants in relatively small loads, the operators of the MRF may not find our material desirable, especially in a down market such as we are in now. The result would be that we have no market for our recyclables and would instead find ourselves with an accumulation of recyclables and likely discontinuing their collection. We would also receive much lower revenues due to delivering unprocessed, loose recyclables.

Benefit

The single greatest benefit would be that of convenience to the household but they would pay the monthly rate to receive that benefit. Currently, we estimate that 2,000-3,000 households choose to pay one of the five privately-operated collection businesses for the convenience of having their recyclables collected at the curbside.

It is important to remember, but often misunderstood, that a great deal of the material that would be collected with a curbside collection program is already being collected through existing programs in Lawrence. A curbside collection program would greatly reduce the

amount of material being collected at the Wal-Mart Community Recycling Center, the 12th and Haskell Recycling Center, by private curbside recycling businesses (they would be out of business), and through the city-operated drop-off facilities.

The actual increase in material recycled with a city-operated curbside collection program is likely to be less than 2,000 tons in addition to the 20,414 tons recycled in 2007. The additional tonnage would largely be paper that is not currently being recycled.

Contracted Curbside Collection of Recyclables to a Private Provider

The city could choose to put out a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a private provider for curbside collection services. A private company should provide turnkey services taking responsibility for collection, processing, marketing and also customer service responsibilities. There are several large companies within the region that have the capability of providing such services.

There are currently five privately owned small businesses that provide curbside collection of recyclables to customers that choose to subscribe to their services in Lawrence. These businesses utilize existing drop-off sites (Wal-Mart, 12th and Haskell Recycling Center, Lonnie's recycling, and city-operated drop-off sites) to deposit the recyclables they collect. It is staff's opinion that none of these small proprietors would have the resources to provide turnkey service to 22,000 households.

Staff also believes that if a program for curbside collection were to be pursued, the option of using a qualified private provider would be the preferred option. The provider would assume all costs and risks and the city would have a known cost depending on what was agreed on in a contract. It is likely that the costs would be lower than if the city operated the program because large recycling providers already have personnel, equipment, infrastructure, implementation experience and more leverage in recycled materials markets.

Issues and Concerns

Recycling Markets

Markets for recyclables, similar to the stock market, can be highly volatile. Currently recycling markets are at historic lows. For this reason, it is not good policy to develop programs expecting revenues for sales of recyclable materials to pay for the programs. In fact, some markets, glass for example, are negative meaning that one must pay to get rid of the material. Many communities have discontinued collection of glass. Mixed paper is also a dead market currently. Paper mills are not purchasing mixed paper at this time due to low demand for products.

Customer Satisfaction

It is difficult to predict what the level of customer satisfaction would be with different recycling scenarios. The 2008 Recycling Survey revealed that 72 percent of Lawrence citizens currently recycle which is a very high number. It also indicated that 59.6 percent of citizens would pay \$6.00 per month for curbside collection of recyclables. However, as the price went above \$6.00, willingness to pay went down. Only 45.2 percent were willing to pay \$9.00, 21.8 percent were willing to pay \$12.00 and 15.5 percent were willing to pay \$15.00.

The 2007 Citizen Survey indicated 86 percent of residents were satisfied with residential trash service which was termed a very high rating.

Variable Rate Pricing for Residential Trash

Variable rate pricing, commonly referred to as "pay-as you-throw" (PAYT) is used in many communities. Under PAYT, residents are usually charged by the number of cans or bags they set out for collection. PAYT is most common in communities faced with long hauls to the nearest disposal site or those with relatively little space left in the local landfill, both of which can create very high disposal costs.

Commercial collection rates in Lawrence are already under a variable rate system since the monthly fee is based on the size of dumpster and the frequency of collection for each customer. Those rates are set to include the cost of providing current recycling services to commercial entities.

Residential rates are the same for each ratepayer but they cover much more than the cost of trash disposal. They also pay for bulky item collection, tire collections, white goods collection and Freon recovery, residential recycling drop-off sites, the household hazardous waste facility, yard waste collection and composting, a portion of the electronics collection events, and waste reduction and public education and outreach efforts.

There is almost no direct correlation with the amount of material disposed of in the landfill and the monthly residential trash rate. In 2008, actual disposal fees were ten percent (10%) of the residential fee. The other 90 percent supported the personnel and equipment necessary to provide scheduled collection to each home, the above mentioned recycling programs, and overhead and administration costs.

Reliability of Analysis

The Solid Waste staff has confidence that the analysis options and estimates of costs contained in this report are reasonably reliable. However, detailed estimates for construction and real estate costs were not conducted. In addition fuel costs are predicted to be potentially highly volatile in the future. If curbside collection of recyclables or variable rate pricing options were to be considered further, we would recommend a third party analysis be provided by a professional solid waste consultant that would focus on the feasibility of curbside recycling and PAYT including, but not limited to:

- cost:
- benefits;
- and implementation.

Plans for Increased Waste Diversion

Source Reduction

The Solid Waste Division supports and encourages product stewardship to reduce materials in the waste stream such as a state-wide beverage container deposit law (bottle bill) which would create take-back programs that would remove beverage containers from the waste stream reducing collection, disposal and recycling costs, and reduce litter. Stores that will take back used electronics or other goods are other examples of product stewardship.

Public education and outreach programs have been put into place although funding was reduced in 2008 due to fiscal restraints. We hope to expand on these when possible.

Recycling

The Division is continuing the increase in paper recycling through city drop-off sites and commercial collection programs. Current market constraints have slowed the expansion.

Additional electronics collection events are planned for 2009.

Public education is seen as a key to increased recycling as more people become aware of existing recycling opportunities and the positive environmental benefits from recycling.

attachment i

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR CURBSIDE COLLECTION OF RECYCLABLES

(Present year 2009 dollars; cost of debt or bonds not included)

Note: Does not include costs of a Materials Recovery Facility or transportation to a nearby Material Recovery Facility (MRF)

| | , , , | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| COLLECTION COSTS | Weekly Collection | Biweekly Collection |
| Start-Up Costs | | |
| Collection vehicles | \$4,000,000 \$200,000 ea. plus 3 standby | \$2,200,000 \$200,000 ea.plus 2 standby |
| Field Supervisor vehicles | 66,000 3 vehicles @ \$22,000 ea. | 44,000 2 vehicles @ \$22,000 ea. |
| Recycling containers | 900,000 45,000 @\$20 ea. | 1,360,000 68,000 @ \$20 ea. |
| Miscellaneous | 50,000 Computers, radios,etc. | 45,000 Computers, radios,etc. |
| Operations facility/land | 750,000 Office, parking, crew area | 750,000 Office, parking, crew area |
| SUBTOTAL | \$5,766,000 | \$4,399,000 |
| Annual Operational Costs | | |
| Operator I | \$1,064,000 19 @ \$56,000 incl/benefits | \$616,000 11 @ \$56,000 incl/benefits |
| Field Supervisor | 180,000 3 @ \$60,000 incl/benefits | 120,000 2 @ \$60,000 incl/benefits |
| Laborer | 90,000 2 @ \$45,000 incl/benefits | 90,000 2 @ \$45,000 incl/benefits |
| Administrative Support position | 45,000 \$45,000 incl/benefits | 45,000 \$45,000 incl/benefits |
| Collection vehicle fuel | 210,834 \$14,040 fuel/collection vehicle | 111,618 \$14,040 fuel/collection vehicle |
| Collection vehicle maintenance | 174,600 \$9,700 maint. ea. | 106,700 \$9,700 maint. ea. |
| Supervisor vehicle fuel/maintenance | 9,000 \$2,000 fuel; \$1,000 maint. ea. | 6,000 \$2,000 fuel; \$1,000 maint. ea. |
| Recycling container replacement | 160,000 8,000 @ \$20 ea. | 160,000 8,000 @ \$20 ea. |
| Education/promotion | 30,000 Newspapers, radio, fliers, etc. | 30,000 Newspapers, radio, fliers, etc. |
| Utilities, overhead | 12,000 Gas, electrical, custodial, etc. | 12,000 Gas, electrical, custodial, etc. |
| Miscellaneous | 25,000 Uniforms, office supples, etc. | 25,000 Uniforms, office supples, etc. |
| Contingency | 75,000 Unexpected expenses | 75,000 Unexpected expenses |
| SUBTOTAL | \$2,075,434 | \$1,397,318 |
| TOTAL COSTS OVER 7 YEARS | \$20,294,038 | \$14,180,226 |
| AVERAGE COST PER YEAR | \$2,899,148 | \$2,025,747 |
| Assumptions | | |
| | nulti-family complexes of 3 or more units): 22,000 | |
| One person collection vehicle with cu | | |
| Cost of fuel/gallon (in dollars) | 3.18 (Source: Department of Energy | /EIA. December. 2008) |
| 3 | (====================================== | , , |

Actual collection time/day (hours) 7 Stops/route/day - weekly: 320

Collection vehicles/day - weekly: (hybrid vehicles) 17

Stops/route/day - biweekly: 300

Collection vehicles/day - biweekly: (hybrid vehicles)

Four routes/week/collection vehicle

225 miles/week/collection vehicle = 11,700 mi./yr.

Collection vehicle gets 3.0 mpg on route

Costs amortized over 7 years

attachment ii

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY

(Present year 2009 dollars; cost of debt or bonds not included)

CAPITAL COSTS

| Processing Building | | \$1,040,000 | In addition to office/crew area |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|---|
| Supervisor vehicle | | 22,000 | 1 vehicle @ \$22,000 |
| Processing Equipment | | 900,000 | Balers, forklifts, conveyors, etc. |
| Miscellaneous | | 25,000 | Computer, safety equipment, etc. |
| | SUBTOTAL | \$1,987,000 | • |
| Annual Operational Costs | | | |
| Laborers | | \$270,000 | 6 @ \$45,000 incl/benefits |
| Supervisor | | 60,000 | 1 @ \$60,000 incl/benefits |
| Administrative Support pos | sition | 45,000 | \$45,000 incl/benefits |
| Processing equipment ma | intenance | 20,000 | Fuel, lubricants, moving parts, etc. |
| Supervisor vehicle fuel/ma | intenance | 3,000 | \$2,000 fuel; \$1,000 maint. |
| Utilities, overhead | | 48,000 | Gas, electric, custodial, etc. |
| Contingency | _ | 75,000 | unexpected expenses |
| | SUBTOTAL | \$521,000 | |
| TOTAL COSTS OV | ER 7 YEARS | \$5,634,000 | |

\$804,857

Assumptions

Cost of fuel/gallon (in dollars) 3.18

AVERAGE COST PER YEAR

Costs amortized over 7 years

attachment iii

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF RECYCLABLES TO A NEARBY MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY (MRF)

Closest MRF is the Deffenbaugh facility in Edwardsville, KS

(Present year 2009 dollars; cost of debt or bonds not included)

| ADDITIONAL COSTS | Weekly Collection | | Biweekly Collection | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Start-Up Costs | | | | |
| Collection vehicles | \$600,000 | \$200,000 ea. | \$400,000 | \$200,000 ea. |
| Collection vehicle replacement | \$3,300,000 | 20 @ \$220,000 ea. (0.75 cost*) | \$1,815,000 | 11 @ \$220,000 ea. (0.75 cost*) |
| SUBTOTAL | \$3,900,000 | | \$2,215,000 | |
| Annual Operational Costs | | | | |
| Operator I | \$168,000 | 3 @ \$56,000 incl/benefits | \$112,000 | 2 @ \$56,000 incl/benefits |
| Collection vehicle fuel | 205,810 | \$9,707 fuel/collection vehicle | 113,195 | \$9,707 fuel/collection vehicle |
| Collection vehicle maintenance | 100,000 | \$5,000 maint. ea. | 55,000 | \$5,000 maint. ea. |
| Turnpike tolls | 33,280 | One trip/day | 18,304 | One trip/day |
| Contingency | 25,000 | Unexpected expenses | 25,000 | Unexpected expenses |
| SUBTOTAL | \$532,090 | | \$323,499 | |
| TOTAL COSTS OVER 7 YEARS | \$7,624,627 | | \$4,479,495 | |
| AVERAGE COST PER YEAR | \$1,089,232 | | \$639,928 | |

Assumptions with transportation of recyclables to a nearby MRF

Households participating (excludes multi-family complexes of 3 or more units): 22,000

One person collection vehicle with curbside sorting

Cost of fuel/gallon (in dollars) 3.18 (Source: Department of Energy/EIA, December, 2008)

Actual collection time/day (hours) 6 Stops/route/day - weekly: 275

Additional coll. vehicles - weekly: 3 (hybrid vehicles)

Stops/route/day - biweekly: 250

Additional coll. vehicles - biweekly: 2 (hybrid vehicles)

Four routes/week/collection vehicle

Additional 280 miles/week/collection vehicle = 14,560

mi./yr.

Collection vehicle gets 5.4 mpg on highway
Turnpike toll per round trip \$8.00

Costs amortized over 7 years

^{*} Collection vehicles replaced every 4 years (allocate 0.75 of cost to 7-year analysis)



Waste Reduction and Recycling Division Report for the Sustainability Advisory Board (07/08/09)

FIBERS REPORT

| OLD NEWSPAPERS (ONP) Newspaper Tons Revenue Current YTD 285.12 \$7,090.36 Prior YTD 351.69 \$44,771.82 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$24.87 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$127. OFFICE WASTE PAPER (SOP) Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. MIXED WASTE PAPER (MIX) Mixed Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Prior YTD 602.32 \$77,221.93 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$40.70 Avg. price/ton thru June 2008: \$128. OLD Newspapers (ONP) Tons Revenue Current YTD 285.12 \$7,090.36 Prior YTD 351.69 \$44,771.82 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$24.87 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$127. OFFICE Waste Paper (SOP) Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. MIXED WASTE PAPER (MIX) Mixed Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | | | Revenue | |
| OLD NEWSPAPERS (ONP) Newspaper Tons Revenue Current YTD 285.12 \$7,090.36 Prior YTD 351.69 \$44,771.82 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$24.87 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$127. OFFICE WASTE PAPER (SOP) Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. MIXED WASTE PAPER (MIX) Mixed Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | | | • | |
| Newspaper Tons Revenue Current YTD 285.12 \$7,090.36 Prior YTD 351.69 \$44,771.82 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$24.87 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$127. OFFICE Waste Paper (SOP) Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. Mixed Waste Paper (MIX) Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: | \$40.70 | Avg. price/ton thru June 2008: | \$128.21 |
| OFFICE WASTE PAPER (SOP) Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. Mixed Waste Paper (MIX) Mixed Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | Newspaper Current YTD | 285.12 | \$7,090.36 | |
| Sorted Office Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 21.91 \$1,971.90 Prior YTD 16.80 \$3,631.30 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: \$90.00 Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: \$216. Mixed Waste Paper (MIX) Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | Avg. Price/ton thru June 2009: | \$24.87 | Avg. Price/ton thru June 2008: | \$127.31 |
| Mixed Paper Tons Revenue Current YTD 139.63 \$966.30 Prior YTD 94.64 \$8,646.87 | Sorted Office Paper Current YTD Prior YTD | 21.91 16.80 | \$1,971.90 \$3,631.30 | \$216.15 |
| | Mixed Paper Current YTD Prior YTD | 139.63 94.64 | \$966.30 \$8,646.87 | \$91.37 |

| <u>TOTAL</u> | YTD | TONS | REVENUE |
|--------------|-----|----------|--------------|
| | | 1,087.72 | \$36,119.07 |
| Prior YTD |) | 1,065.44 | \$134,271.92 |

Markets for June and July have all risen slightly due to generation being down domestically. Predictions are that prices may rise slightly or remain the same for the rest of the summer, and drop again in the fall.

HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW) PROGRAM REPORT

| Month | HHW Drop-Offs | Battery Bags in Mail | Appt No Show | Home- bound | Saturday Collection | Abandoned Waste | Orphan Waste | SQG Inventory | SQG Drop-off | Product Reuse Appt |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| January | 153 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 13 |
| February | 106 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| March | 183 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 25 |
| April | 180 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 49 |
| May | 214 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 68 |
| June | 285 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 44 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 74 |
| July | | | | | | | | | | |
| August | | | | | | | | | | |
| September | | | | | | | | | | |
| October | | | | | | | | | | |
| November | | | | | | | | | | |
| December | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 1121 | 19 | 95 | 0 | 86 | 19 | 0 | 68 | 65 | 244 |

COMPOST PROGRAM

The new electronic gate at the Compost Facility is operational and working great. Sixty three (63) landscapers have signed up and were issued access fobs.

On June 1st, brush in bundles is no longer accepted curbside for Monday yard waste collection. Brush will be allowed if placed out at the curb in a cart, can or compostable paper yard waste bag.

YARD TRIMMINGS COLLECTION: YEAR TO DATE

| | January 2009 | February 2009 | March 2009 | April 2009 | May 2009 | June 2009 |
|--|------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Total Tons collected curbside | NA | NA | 1,210.53 | 1,013.77 | 1,138.74 | 1,081.67 |
| Commercial YW received | 1.9 | 17.1 | 180.20 | 171.2 | 213.7 | 155.5 |
| Other YW received (Christmas Trees) | 28.06 (2,245 trees) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total tons this month | 29.96 | 17.1 | 1,390.73 | 1,184.97 | 1,352.44 | 1,237.17 |
| Average Preferred Container Compliance | NA | NA | 98.9% | 99.3% | 99.5% | 99.7% |