# CRANKING UP RECYCLING IN TEXAS 

New insights, proven resources
Scott Mouw, Senior Director of Technical Assistance Justin Gast, Technical Assistance

## -THANK YOU-



## We work across the system... across the country...



STATE and LOCAL
HAULERS


MRF

BRANDS

## RESIDENTS



466 communities impacted by Partnership work (19 million HH)
~400,000 carts More than $\$ 27 \mathrm{MM}$ of new infrastructure and more than 115 MLBS of new recyclables diverted.
...growing access to resources and data.

## A FEW OF OUR PARTNER CITIES



COLUMBIA, SC


SANTA FE, NM


FLORENCE, AL


ATLANTA, GA


CUYAHOGA CO., OH


ST PAUL, MN


GREENVILLE, SC


CHICAGO, IL


EMMET CO.,MI


PORTLAND, ME


RICHMOND, VA


MEMPHIS, TN

- We work with cities to fight contamination, boost participation, and recycle with carts.
d National scale with projects in 466 communities.
- Project-based collaboration with all stakeholders in the recycling system: haulers, MRFs, communities, state offices and end-markets.


## What do we

## know?

## 47\% 60\%

of Americans don't automatically have curbside recycling.
2016 SPC Access Study
of packaging is not being recovered in the home.

The Recycling Partnership

## Half plus half equals A WHOLE LOT OF OPPORTUNITY.

## Location of Recyclable Packaging Tonnage

 (Estimate)Tonnage of Recyclable Packaging MILLION TONS


## How Much Recyclable Packaging Is Left in Single Family Homes?

Hypothetical Example
US Single Familly Households Unrecovered Packaging
MILLION TONS


## Total of 22 Million Tons



## IT TAKES A TEAM TO DELIVER TONS

Preserving the environment is the responsibility of everyone: the government, the public, nonprofits and businesses.


## COMMUNICATIONS

## EDUCATING WITHIN A MRFSHED

Residents should hear the same recycling message no matter where they live, work or play.

Communities that provide information online and their accepted materials list is the same as what their MRF accepts.

A MRFshed is defined as a group of communities that funnel material into the same MRF.

## MRFshed Report

## MRFshed REPORT

Understanding Materials Acceptability within a MRFshed and the Communication/Education Efforts Around those Acceptable Materials.

PREPARED BY THE RECYCUNG PARTNERSHIP C2O17

THE RECYCLING PARTNERSHIP

Examined the commonality and differences amongst communities providing recyclable material to the same MRF:

- How similar are the acceptable materials lists from each of the communities funneling material into the same MRF?
- How are communities communicating those acceptable materials lists (words, images, both, other)?
- Staff researched all 68 municipal websites associated with the two respective MRFsheds.

More than 1.3 million single-family households and a combined population of more than 4.6 million are represented by study.

## MRFshed Report

## HOW WAS STUDY CONDUCTED:

- Recent research from the Foodservice Packaging Institute, the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc., and others, shows residents are becoming more reliant on the Internet to find answers to their recycling questions, especially from city, county or a recycling company's website.
- Research also tells us 60 percent of all current Internet searches are done using either one or two keywords. Depending on the content being sought, the average resident/consumer may spend as little as 15 seconds on a given webpage seeking information before they abandon the site.
- Research was conducted via a simple online search. Using the community's name and 'recycling,' as keywords, staff timed how long it took to obtain the necessary information, completely ending a search if it took two minutes or more to locate information.


## MRFshed Report - Columbus, OH (Rumpke)

RECYCLING FACILITY PROCESSES
30 TONS/HR

NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES SERVED BY MRF
42

POPULATION SERVED BY MRF
1,312,588

COMMUNITIES STUDIED THAT OFFERED A CURBSIDE SERVICE
40

SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS SERVED BY MRF

## 429,399 HH

COMMUNITIES STUDIED THAT ONLY HAD A DROP-OFF OPTION 2

Graph 2: How many clicks
to obtain information?


20 municipal sites had recycling information that could be found in an average time of 13.15 seconds.

## MRFshed Report - Columbus, OH (Rumpke)

Graph 3: Did communities' acceptable materials
lists differ from what MRF accepts?


Plastics (1)
Telephone Books (2)
Mixed Paper (6)
Paperboard Products (7)
Clean Pizza Boxes (8)
Cartons (9)
Aerosol Cans (9)
Catalogs (11)
Envelopes (14)

|  | 1 | $\mid$ | $\mid$ | 12 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## PLASTICS CONFUSION

19 of the 22 communities had lists that contained more than just \#1 PET and \#2 HDPE. For example:

- Seven stated the acceptance of all plastic containers labeled \#1-\#7.
- Seven others stated all plastics \#1-\#7 are accepted, though plastic take-out containers, butter tubs, yogurt containers and bags are not.
- Five communities stated the acceptance of "HDPE \& PETE Plastics (\#1 thru \#7)."


## MRFshed Report - Chicago (Waste Management)

| MRF HANDLES APPROX. | POPULATION SERVED BY MRF | HOUSEHOLDS SERVED BY MRF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117K TONS/YR | 3,295,754 | 893,474 HH |
|  |  |  |
| TOTAL COMMUNITIES STUDIED | COMMUNITIES STUDIED THAT | COMMUNITIES STUDIED THAT |
| 26 | $21$ | $1$ |
|  | MUNICIPALITIES THAT DID NOT COLLECTION INFORMATION | DE GARBAGE AND RECYCLING |
|  | 4 |  |



18 municipalities had websites where it took an average of 10.18 seconds to find dedicated recycling information.

## MRFshed Report - Chicago (Waste Management)

Graph 7: Did communities' acceptable materials list differ from what MRF accepts?


## MESSAGING CONFUSION

- Most notable differences concerned plastics. Three of the communities link directly to Waste Management brochures from 2007 and 2008, which state that all plastics \#1-\#7 are accepted. Two other communities also noted the acceptance of \#1-\#7 plastics, with one jurisdiction stating that plastic six-pack rings are accepted curbside.
- As for other materials, one community listed the acceptance of empty paint cans, though Waste Management's educational materials do not, while another listed the acceptance of aluminum foil and trays, metal lids and plastic take-out containers and buckets, though the RORR site does not display these items.
- One community's acceptable materials list lacked the inclusion of cardboard, paperboard and cartons.

THE RECYCLING PARTNERSHIP

## MRFshed Report

## CONCLUSIONS:

- Of the 68 communities studied for this project, 40 provided online recycling information (59 percent). Unfortunately, 24 of those communities (60 percent) provided acceptable materials lists different from what their designated MRF accepts.
- Basic recycling information should be at a resident's finger tips (what to recycle and when to recycle) and information regarding what to recycle should be consistent throughout every community within the same MRFshed.


## RECYCLING INFORMATION

IN A MRFshed
Residents should hear the same recycling message no matter where they live, work or play.


As shown in this research, there is a
disconnect amongst communities and
MRFs regarding what is and is not
recyclable and there is little consistency MRFshed to educate residents in a similar fashion.


O
PARTNERSHIP


## MRFshed Report

## WHAT CAN BE DONE:

- States could be facilitating forums where municipalities/solid waste authorities, haulers and MRF operators within a given MRFshed come together to create the MRFsheds common suite of materials, a list that could then be used with every community providing recyclable material to the MRF for that territory.
- Communities need to keep messaging simple, using clear images/icons paired with simple wording. Municipalities also need to be consistent with that messaging across all electronic and print forms of communication and make sure that message is in harmony with the MRF's operations.
- EPA should undertake studies that show the benefits of educating around a common suite of materials, most notably whether or not such an education approach helps lessen confusion for residents.

RECYCLING INFORMATION
IN A MRFshed

Residents should hear the same recycling message no matter where they live, work or play.

As shown in this research, there is a disconnect amongst communities and MRFs regarding what is and is not recyclable and there is little consistency
amongst communities within the same MRFshed to educate residents in a similar fashion.
 THE RECYCLING
PARTNERSHIP

## GETTING TO A

## COMMON SUITE

## Gather Key Facts

Simple messaging takes work.


THE RECYCLING
PARTNERSHIP

## Getting to a COMMON SUITE



## Getting to a COMMON SUITE

## SHARED ACCEPTABLE ITEMS:

| Fiber | Steel <br> OCC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Can |  |
| Pizza Boxes |  |
| Newspaper | Plastic |
| Magazines | PET Bottles \& Jars |
| Office Paper | HDPE Bottles \& Jars |
| Junk Mail | Other Drink Bottles (e.g. Juice in \#7) |
| Cartons (gable top | Other Food bottles \& Jars |
| containers like milk, | (e.g. items in \#3,4,6 or 7) |
| orange Juice, etc) | Other Household bottles \& Jars |
| Paperboard Boxes | (e.g. \#3 shampoo bottle) |
| Kraft Bags | Non-bottle HDPE Containers \& Lids |
| Glass | Other Tubs \& Lids |
| (e.g. tubs that are \#3,4,6,or 7) |  |
| Bottles and Jars | PP Bottles |
| Aluminum | PP Containers \& Lids |
| Can |  |

## TOP 5 PROHIBITIVE:

1) Plastic Bags
2) Needles
3) Tanglers (rope, hose, cord, wire)
4) Textiles
5) Scrap Metal

## Getting to a COMMON SUITE



No Propane Tanks

No Plastic Bags (return to retail)

No
Hypodermic Needles

No Clothing or Linens (use donation programs)

No Tanglers (no hoses, wires chains, or electronics)

## GETTING TO A

## COMMON SUITE

## Cuyahoga County, OH

## CONTAINERS

## 4 MRFs

## Yịi ${ }_{\text {People }}^{1.3 M}$

## 500k <br> Single Family Homes <br> \#



1 cart/bin mix program

$\underset{\text { programs }}{2}$
3 with no curbside

34 7 bin/bag mix programs
x 14 blue bag programs

| 34 | 1 cart/bin mix program |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{12}{8}$ | 2 bin programs |
| 0 | 3 with no curbside |
| 34 | 7 bin/bag mix programs |
| 6 | 14 blue bag programs |
| $\%$ | $32 \text { cart }$ <br> programs |



59
Local
Governments
.

## .

## HAULERS



## Key Metrics - Pathways to Improving Performance

- Tonnage by type of service e.g., curbside, multi-family
- Units served
e.g., how many households served by curbside; how many units served by multi-family program, etc.
- Participation/Set-out

Or other usage metrics for drop-off, etc.

- Commodity Capture Rates
- MRF Commodity Profile and Blended Value
- Contamination Rates


## Critical Performance Metric: Pounds per Household Served



Tons collected in program


Number of Households (HH) served by program

* Concept can be extended to other services/programs - e.g. pounds per unit served in multifamily programs


800 pounds
of recyclables available in HH

## Gaps <br> Solutions

## NO CURBSIDE or DROP-OFF AVAILABLE

 All 800 pounds lost to trash
## CURBSIDE OPT-IN

All 800 pounds in most homes lost to trash

- ESTABLISH SERVICES
- ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION
- CREATE UNIVERSAL AUTOMATIC ACCESS

CURBSIDE IN BINS; INCONVENIENT DROP-OFF •CONVERT TO CARTS
600 pounds lost to trash

- INCREASE ACCESS TO DROP-OFF


## CURBSIDE IN CARTS, DROP-OFF ESTABLISHED

 NO EDUCATION- USE MULTIPLE OUTREACH TOOLS

CURBSIDE IN CARTS, STRONG DROP-OFF GOOD EDUCATION

- ANALYZE OPPORTUNITIES
- TARGET OUTREACH

200 pounds lost to trash

## Set-Out and Participation

Week 1 Collection Cycle


Week 2 Collection Cycle


## Set-out Rate 50\%

5 out of 10 homes on average

Set-out Rate 70\%

7 out of 10 homes on average

What is the Total PARTICIPATION Rate?

## How Much Recyclable Material is Available?



Recyclables
Recyclable Portion of Waste
$\square$ Total Recyclables in a Household


## Twin Challenges: Trash in Recycling and Recycling in Trash



Trash in the Recycling:

- ASSESS through Capture Studies and by talking to MRF
- ADDRESS through smart, targeted outreach


Recycling in the Trash:

- ASSESS through Capture Studies
- ADDRESS through smart, targeted outreach


## Capture Rates: Measuring Recyclables Still in the Trash



## Capture Rates: How It's Done



## Example of Capture Rate Data

## Pounds/Household/Year

| Material Type | All HH Recyclables | Garbage | All Recycling | Bagged Recycling | Loose Recycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recyclable Paper | 472.7 | 138.5 | 334.3 | 32.0 | 300.8 |
| Cardboard | 122.6 | 22.0 | 100.5 | 3.9 | 98.5 |
| Mixed Paper | 343.1 | 114.0 | 229.1 | 27.7 | 198.2 |
| Aseptic \& Gabletop | 7.1 | 2.4 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 4.1 |
| Recyclable Metal | 49.8 | 21.6 | 28.2 | 3.4 | 24.9 |
| Aluminum Cans | 21.0 | 6.8 | 14.2 | 2.3 | 12.1 |
| Aluminum Foil \& Trays | 5.4 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.9 |
| Steel Cans | 23.4 | 10.5 | 12.9 | 1.0 | 11.9 |
| Recyclable Glass | 180.0 | 42.9 | 137.1 | 14.2 | 120.5 |
| Glass Containers | 180.0 | 42.9 | 137.1 | 14.2 | 120.5 |
| Recyclable Plastic | 124.0 | 58.5 | 65.5 | 7.8 | 58.5 |
| Clear PET Containers | 44.7 | 16.5 | 28.2 | 3.7 | 24.8 |
| Other Containers \& Small Rigids | 51.6 | 30.1 | 21.5 | 2.3 | 18.8 |
| HDPE Natural Bottles \& Jars | 6.1 | 1.7 | 4.4 | 0.7 | 4.1 |
| HDPE Colored Bottles \& Jars | 12.8 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 1.0 | 6.3 |
| Bulky Rigid Plastics | 8.9 | 4.7 | 4.1 | - | 4.5 |
| Grand Total | 826.57 | 261.46 | 565.11 | 57.34 | 504.74 |

Total Capture for participating HHs, excluding bagged material: 61\%

THE RECYCLING
PARTNERSHIP

## From Participating Capture to Whole City Capture

| Recycling Pounds Generated Per HH <br> (Estimate provided by Capture Study) | 826.57 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Households Served By Program | 176,000 |
| Total Tons of Recyclable Material Available from Households <br> (\# of pounds * \# of HHs = Total Pounds/2000 = Total Tons) | 72,738 |
| Actual Tonnage Collected in Curbside Program | 38,000 |
| Available HH Recycling Not Collected | 34,738 |
| Whole City Capture Rate of Household Recyclables <br> (Tonnage Collected/Tonnage Available) | $52 \%$ |

## Data from your MRF - Blended Value and Contamination

| Commodity | Assumed Material Comp. \% | \$/TON* |  | VALUE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ONP | 19.0\% | \$ | 48.00 | \$ | 9.12 |
| Mixed Paper | 19.4\% | \$ | 57.00 | \$ | 11.06 |
| OCC | 16.5\% | \$ | 150.00 | \$ | 24.75 |
| PET | 5.5\% | \$ | 289.00 | \$ | 15.90 |
| 3-7 Plastic | 1.5\% | \$ | 20.00 | \$ | 0.30 |
| HDPE-Natural | 0.6\% | \$ | 584.00 | \$ | 3.50 |
| HDPE-Color | 1.45\% | \$ | 291.00 | \$ | 4.22 |
| MRP | 1.45\% | \$ | 60.00 | \$ | 0.87 |
| Aluminum | 1.25\% | \$ | 1,300.00 | \$ | 16.25 |
| Steel Cans/Ferrous Metal | 3.00\% | \$ | 164.00 | \$ | 4.92 |
| Aseptic | $0.00 \%$ | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Glass | 17.00\% | \$ | (30.00) | \$ | (5.10) |
| Residue-Trash | 12.75\% | \$ | (70.00) | \$ | (8.93) |
|  | 100.00\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | Blended Rate: |  |  | \$ | 76.86 |

THE RECYCLING
PARTNERSHIP

## Measuring Contamination

- Feedback from MRF - Periodic audits and reports
- Capture studies - Can measure weight and occurrence

| All Households |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Material Type | Top 5 by weight | Top 5 by occurrence | Weight |  | Occurrence |  |
|  |  |  | \% of recycling | $\mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{hh} / \mathrm{mo}$ | \% of HHs | \# of HHS |
| Food | 1 |  | 2.7\% | 1.4 | 23\% | 30 |
| Paper Contaminants | 2 | 2 | 2.1\% | 1.1 | 72\% | 95 |
| Plastic Bags \& Film | 3 | 1 | 1.6\% | 0.8 | 78\% | 103 |
| Metal Contaminants | 4 | 4 | 1.3\% | 0.7 | 45\% | 59 |
| Rigid Plastic Contaminants | 5 | 3 | 0.7\% | 0.4 | 62\% | 82 |
| Other |  | 5 | 0.6\% | 0.3 | 23\% | 31 |
| Yard Waste |  |  | 0.6\% | 0.3 | 7\% | 9 |
| Textiles \& Shoes |  | 5 | 0.5\% | 0.3 | 23\% | 31 |
| Tanglers |  |  | 0.5\% | 0.2 | 2\% | 3 |
| Electronics |  |  | 0.4\% | 0.2 | 5\% | 6 |
| Glass Contaminants |  |  | 0.4\% | 0.2 | 8\% | 11 |
| C\&D Waste |  |  | 0.1\% | 0.1 | 3\% | 4 |
| HHW \& Household Chemicals |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.0 | 5\% | 6 |
| Disposable Diapers |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.0 | 1\% | 1 |
| Recyclable Materials |  |  | 88\% | 47.0 | 100\% | 132 |
| Contaminants |  |  | 12\% | 6.1 | 100\% | 132 |
| Total |  |  | 100\% | 53.2 | 100\% | 132 |

## What Do MRFs Tell Us?

## Most expensive contaminants

1. Refuse
2. Film
3. Tanglers


## Methods for Addressing Contamination

- Consistent Communication
- Focus on key contaminants
- (not the laundry list of everything bad)
- Empower the drivers
- Coordinated use of outreach tools
- Cart tagging



## Cart-Tagging

- Targeted, Direct, Proven, Effective


CORRECT THIS AND WE WILL COLLECT NEXT TIME.

## Cart-Tagging Results

Route Results in Atlanta


CONTAMINATION TREND


LOWELL and W. SPRINGFIELD, MA


## How Long Do Campaign Effects Last?



## How Do I Maximize Durability of Message?



## Training Videos

Train them well. Set a standard.


## Track Results

Technical tools and resources.
MRF MATERIAL TRACKING FORM
Date: $\qquad$
City: $\qquad$ Hauler: $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Container Number (if drop-off): $\qquad$
Container Material (if drop-off): $\qquad$
(e.g. bottles/cans, cardboard, paper)


## Access Our Tools



ALWAYS PAIR SOUND OPERATIONS WITH THOUGHTFUL OUTREACH. PROCEED WITH INFORMED DECISION MAKING.

## PLAN-ACT-MEASURE

SO RECYCLER, WHAT DO YOU WANT TO DO FIRST?
Delivering robust recycling service means valuable materials are diverted from landfills back into manufacturing, and residents confidently recycle.


## Effective Outreach - Appeal to the Emotive Instinct



## Effective Outreach Elements



POSTCARD/MAGNET

PERSONALIZED FEEDBACK


CART TAGS

STANDING RESOURCE

THE RECYCLING PARTNERSHIP

ISSUE SPECIFIC COMMUNICATIONS


MAILERS + MEDIA



## Social Media

HOME ABOUT ~ PARTNERSHIP ~ NEWS TOOLS SITE


Social media is the most efficient way to interact with your residents.

## Social Media

The complete set includes: 52 images covering 6 topics

- General
- Holidays
- Material Specific
- Recycling Factoids
- Why Recycle

Pre-written post text for each image.
All posts designed for use with Facebook and Twitter.

BONUS - Create your own.



Make your momma proud: recycle


THE RECYCLING PARTNERSHIP


# ROLLING CART GRANTS 

- Up to $\$ 500 \mathrm{~K}$ for carts
- Up to $\$ 50 \mathrm{~K}$ for educational needs associated with cart campaign.
- Questions? Contact jgast@recyclingpartnership.org


## JOIN OUR NETWORK,

 and let's make recycling more \& better!
## © <br>  <br> 랑

TOOLS
Online
Library
Starters
BMPs

IDEAS
Webinars
Newsletters
E-Books
Forums

RESOURCES
Grants
Campaigns
Tech
Assistance
www.recyclingpartnership.org

## Thank You!

Scott Mouw, Senior Director of Technical Assistance smouw@recyclingpartnership.org 919-633-0738

Justin Gast, Technical Assistance jgast@recyclingpartnership.org541-285-6335

