



# FOWRD

Future of Wisconsin's Recycling Development



# Genesis of FOWRD

- ▶ Senator from northern WI approached PW Director in Tomahawk
  - ▶ Asked to learn about city's recycling program & its dramatically increased recycling rate
  - ▶ Asked to meet with others from the recycling industry to discuss WI program
- ▶ PW director called AROW president to ask for assistance
- ▶ AROW president called representatives from COR, SWANA and WCSWMA
- ▶ Meeting was scheduled with the senator



# The meeting



- ▶ Discussion topics:
  - ▶ To learn more about recycling
  - ▶ Understand problems/issues with recycling program
  - ▶ Understand ways to improve recycling rates
  - ▶ Understand ways to make program more sustainable
- ▶ Industry group offered to work on a report and solutions
  - ▶ Wanted to make sure any recommendations/ideas were well thought out
  - ▶ FORWRD was born



# Formation of FOWRD

- ▶ Not a subsidiary or formal part of any one group
- ▶ Meeting attendees wanted to include a wide variety of industry professionals from across the state
- ▶ Represent public & private sector
- ▶ Began meeting April 2015
  - ▶ Alan Albee (Eagle Waste), Mike Tolvstad (City of Tomahawk), John Welch (WCSWMA/SWANA), Jennifer Semrau (BOW/Winnebago Co.), Gerry Neuser (Manitowoc Co.), Lynn Morgan (Waste Mgmt.), Pennie Pierce (Hilltopper), Rebecca Mattano & Meribeth Sullivan (Waukesha Co.), Joe Van Rossum (SHWEC), George Hayducsko (COR/Dunn Co.); Meleesa Johnson (Marathon Co.)



# FOWRD mission/vision & guiding principles

- ▶ *In an effort to improve the quantity and quality of recyclable materials from residential, commercial, institutional and industrial sources, any revised statute or regulation should reflect waste generation trends, encourage innovation, allow adaptability to a changing marketplace, secure a consistent funding mechanism for local recycling programs, reward performance through accountability measures and maximize the amount of materials diverted to productive use.*
- ▶ Guiding principles
  - ▶ Equitable grant program that rewards excellence and provides a pathway for marginal programs to move toward excellence
  - ▶ Streamline process for reporting
  - ▶ Allow room for innovation and flexibility
  - ▶ Objective
  - ▶ Best utilization of recycling fee money...
  - ▶ Framework for program evaluation...equitable
  - ▶ Incentive for consolidation



# Main points of work...

- ▶ \$7/ton Recycling Fee must stay in DNR recycling program & DATCP Clean Sweep
- ▶ Define “recycling”—multiple definitions in WI statute
- ▶ Create new understanding of what “success” in recycling means
- ▶ Evaluate the formula for grant distribution
  - ▶ Explore per capita funding
- ▶ Explore how to truly consolidate
- ▶ Develop new
  - ▶ Method of distributing grant dollars
  - ▶ Metric for evaluating a successful program that moved away from a weight-based system
  - ▶ Scoring system that focused on continuous improvement and innovation



## Recycling-defined by FORWD (and NRC)

“Recycling is a series of activities by which material that has reached the end of its current use is processed into material utilized in the production of new products.”



# The Challenge of Change...

- ▶ Politics
  - ▶ Formula
  - ▶ Success, Weight & Glass
  - ▶ Winners
  - ▶ Losers
  - ▶ Highlighting inefficiencies in system (back to politics)
- 





# The biggest problem...

- ▶ Cities of similar size and demographics, from the same county, receive significantly different grant funding and report a wide range of recycling costs. Example below is real-life and taken from DNR 2015 Recycling Grant spreadsheet.
  - ▶ City A has a population of 25,833, has a per capita recycling expense of \$48.81, reports collecting 160 pounds per capita of recyclables and received \$7.58 per capita funding or \$195,831 in 2015
  - ▶ City B has a population of 17,550, has a per capita recycling expense of \$37.94, reports collecting 154.90 pounds per capita of recyclables and receives \$3.75 per capita funding or \$65,778 in 2015



# Demonstrating Continuous Improvement Components-Curbside

- ▶ Rural Curbside Recycling Incentive
- ▶ Access
- ▶ Recycling Opportunity (gal reflects container or bag sizes)
- ▶ Education spending/capita
- ▶ Recycling Performance (option 1) # per capita (banned items from NR544.17 Table 1, plus mixed paper)
- ▶ Enforcement



# Demonstrating Continuous Improvement Components-Rural Drop Off

- ▶ Access (avg hours/week/site)
- ▶ Education spending/capita
- ▶ Recycling Performance (option 1) # per capita
- ▶ Enforcement



# Innovation: 1 Point Per Additional Innovation Item-Up to 10 Items

- Consolidation of two or more programs (means dissolution of one or more RUs)
- Additional service options: At least once weekly drop-off access for residents (drop-off services may mean standard recycling, universal wastes, etc.)
- Multi-family housing recycling program for >4 unit facilities
- Coordinated business/commercial
- Special event recycling
- Food surplus management/reduction of food waste programming
- Optional diversion programs: Non-landfill banned recycling & beneficial use programs (must be RU run/operated program & cannot use figures from industry in RU)
- Home composting program
- Yard waste composting
- "Other" optional items collection or education opportunities (as approved by DNR)

<u>Component of A Successful Curbside Recycling Program</u>	Points per component										Component Weighting	
	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5			
<b>Access</b>	Monthly or less				bi-weekly				weekly		4	
<b>Recycling Opportunity (gal reflects container or bag sizes)</b>	<10 gallons		10-20 gal		21-35 gal		36-65 gal		>65 gallons		2	
<b>Education spending/capita</b>	\$0.00-\$0.11	\$0.12-\$0.23	\$0.24 - \$0.35	\$0.36-\$0.47	\$0.48-\$0.59	\$0.60-\$0.71	\$0.72 - \$0.83	\$0.84-\$0.95	\$0.95 & over		3	
<b>Recycling Performance (option 1) # per capita</b>	<10#	11#-25#	26#-50#	51#-75#	76#-100#	101#-125#	126#-1150#	151#-175#	176# and over		3	
<b>Enforcement</b>	No program				Complaint driven				Active enforcement		2	
<b>Innovation</b>	<b>1 point per additional innovation up to a total of 10 items</b>										1	
	<i>Not to exceed 10</i>	Consolidation of two or more programs (means dissolution of one or more Rus)										
	<i>List is not all-inclusive</i>	Additional service options: At least once weekly drop-off access for residents (drop-off services may mean standard recycling, universal wastes, etc)										
		Multi-family housing recycling program for >4 unit facilities										
		Coordinated business/commercial										
		Special event recycling										
		Food surplus management/reduction of food waste programming										
		Optional diversion programs: Non-landfill banned recycling & beneficial use programs (must be RU run/operated program & cannot use figures from industry in RU)										
		Home composting program										
		Yard waste composting										
		"Other" optional items collection or education opportunities (as approved by DNR)										



# The Recommendations -

- ▶ The entire \$7 per ton should be allocated for recycling, Clean Sweep grants and recycling administration (DNR & DATCP Clean Sweep)
- ▶ Recommendation in year 1 for creating a software program that makes reporting online and streamlined (\$1 million)
- ▶ Recommend up to \$1.5 million for DNR & DATCP staffing
- ▶ Status quo for \$20 million and to keep municipalities at par; then use \$10-\$12 million (and additional surplus) for distribution using Continuous Improvement scores
- ▶ All “excess” or growth above 5 million ton goes into additional recycling funding for municipalities (revenue projections verses actual) matrix money
- ▶ Municipality cannot receive a grant larger than costs
- ▶ Consolidation would not be mandatory, but rather encouraged through innovation points
- ▶ Remove glass from landfill ban from **commercial sources**
- ▶ Revise NR544 Table 1
- ▶ Include **mixed papers in landfill ban**
- ▶ Develop method of having **MRFs enjoy greenhouse gas credits**
- ▶ Standardized estimating of per capita recycling weights that can be adjusted



# Bolder Recommendations



- ▶ Consolidation of RUs under 2,500 in population
  - ▶ Develop templates for intergovernmental agreements for consolidation that streamline the process, including standards for how revenues and costs are distributed, how programs are administered and stipulations for duties and responsibilities for all parties.
- ▶ Fund \$20 million using a 10-year rolling average of total RU costs to allocate a per capita sum
  - ▶  $(\text{total WI RU costs}) / (\text{total WI RU population}) = \text{per capita sum to RUs}$
  - ▶ Fund additional \$10 million for innovation grants using Continuous Improvement metric

A dark grey arrow points to the right from the left edge of the slide. Below it, several thin, curved lines in shades of blue and grey sweep across the left side of the slide.

# Boldest Recommendations

- ▶ Fund entire \$30 million using Continuous Improvement metric scoring system