REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2015, 5:00 PM - 7:30 PM RDN Board Chambers

AGENDA

PAGES

CALL TO ORDER

DELEGATIONS

Russ Black, Next Use. Re. Overview of Mixed Waste Recycling Facilities.

MINUTES

3-4 Minutes of the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee meeting held May 14, 2015.

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORTS

5-13 An Overview of Multi-Material Recycling Facilities. (S. Horsburgh – to be circulated)

Presentation – Brief overview of current MRF technology and ownership in the RDN. (S. Horsburgh)

Table Top Group Exercise. What is the future of MRF technology in the RDN context?

ADDENDUM

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

BUSINESS ARISING FROM DELEGATIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Distribution:

Alec McPherson	Chair, RDN Director
Jim Kipp	Deputy Chair
Frank Van Eynde	Member at Large
Jeremy Jones	Business Representative
Ed Walsh	Waste Management Industry
Wally Wells	Business Representative
Jan Hastings	Non Profit Representative
Jim McTaggart-Cowan	Member at Large
John Finnie	Member at Large
Craig Evans	Member at Large
Ellen Ross	Member at Large
Gerald Johnson	Member at Large
Michele Green	Member at Large
Amanda Ticknor	Member at Large
Rod Mayo	Institutional Waste Generator

Michael Recalma Chief & Council Chief & Council Al Metcalf Al Cameron Fred Spears Charlotte Davis Al Leuschen Karen Muttersbach Glenn Gibson Qualicum First Nation Nanoose First Nation Snuneymuxw First Nation City of Parksville Town of Qualicum Beach District of Lantzville City of Nanaimo Ministry of Environment Environment Canada Island Health

Solid Waste Select Management Committee Members:

Joe Stanhope	Jim Kipp	Bill McKay	Bill Yoachim
Howard Houle	Marc Lefebvre	Teunis Westbroek	Maureen Young

RDN Staff:

Larry Gardner	Manager, Solid Waste Services, RDN
Sharon Horsburgh	Senior Solid Waste Planner, RDN
Daniel Pearce	A/GM Transportation & Solid Waste Services, RDN
Rebecca Graves	Recording Secretary, RDN

For information only:

Regional Board Members: CAO's: Paul Thorkelsson (RDN), Twyla Graff (District of Lantzville), Fred Manson (City of Parksville), Daniel Sailland (Town of Qualicum Beach), Ted Swabey (City of Nanaimo)

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015 BOARD CHAMBERS

Present:

Alec McPherson	Chair, RDN Director
Fred Spears	District of Lantzville
Jan Hastings	Non Profit Representative
Charlotte Davis	City of Nanaimo
Gerald Johnson	Member at Large
John Finnie	Member at Large
Craig Evans	Member at Large
Jim McTaggart-Cowan	Member at Large
Wally Wells	Business Representative
Michele Green	Member at Large
Ellen Ross	Member at Large
Al Cameron	Town of Qualicum Beach

Also in Attendance:

Larry Gardner	Manager of Solid Waste, RDN
Sharon Horsburgh	Senior Solid Waste Planner, RDN
Rebecca Graves	Recording Secretary, RDN
Daniel Pearce	A/GM, Transportation & Solid Waste Services
Ben Geselbracht	Zero Waste Nanaimo
Bill McKay	City of Nanaimo
Ron Bolin	Public Attendee

Regrets:

Chief & Council	Nanoose First Nation
Chief & Council	Snuneymuxw First Nation
Jeremy Jones	Business Representative
Rod Mayo	Institutional Waste Generator
Ed Walsh	Waste Management Industry
Al Leuschen	Ministry of Environment
Karen Muttersbach	Environment Canada
Al Metcalf	City of Parksville
Frank Van Eynde	Member at Large
Michael Recalma	Qualicum First Nation
Glenn Gibson	Island Heath
Amanda Ticknor	Member at Large

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 5:08 pm.

DELEGATES

Jan Hastings, Nanaimo Recycling Exchange re. 4 R's of Recycling Presentation.

Jan Hastings provided a presentation on the 4 R's of Recycling which outlined the history of recycling in Nanaimo, various recycling depots, the business of recycling and the future resource recycling.

MINUTES

MOVED W. Wells, SECONDED C. Evans, that the minutes from the meeting of the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee regular meeting held February 19, 2015, be adopted.

CARRIED

MOVED J. McTaggart, SECONDED G. Johnson, that the minutes from the meeting of the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee regular meeting held April 16, 2015, be adopted.

CARRIED

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The Option Identification Exercise Table from April 16, 2015 was circulated.

REPORTS

Local Governments Authority

L. Gardner introduced the Regional District Bylaw Authority to Manage Consumer Products staff report which gave an overview of the Regional District's ability to regulate consumer products.

[6:55pm Director McPherson left the meeting.]

Table Top Exercise on Future Options

The Committee broke off into groups to continue discussing future options regarding:

- The 2 R's Reduce & Reuse
- The 3rd R Recycling & End Uses
- Curbside Recycling

ADDENDUM

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

NEW BUSINESS

C. Evans announced that Zero Waste Nanaimo has formed and now have regular meetings and invited members of the committee to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:30pm



то:	Daniel Pearce A/General Manager, Transportation &	DATE:	May 21, 2015
	Solid Waste Services	MEETING:	RSWAC, May 28, 2015
FROM:	Sharon Horsburgh Senior Solid Waste Planner	FILE:	5365-00

SUBJECT: An Overview of Multi Material Recycling Facility Technologies

RECOMMENDATION

That the Regional Solid Waste Advisory Committee (RSWAC) receive this report for information as part of the 2015 Solid Waste Management Plan Review Process.

PURPOSE

To provide background information on Multi-Material Recycling facilities that is intended to stimulate discussion on future options for consideration during the Solid Waste Management Plan Review Process.

BACKGROUND

Materials Recovery Facility Processes

Materials Recovery Facilities (MRFs) provide an intermediary or pretreatment approach involving the manual and mechanical separation of a Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) feedstock into recyclable and non-recyclable materials streams. There are two distinct types of MRF's which are typically referred to as "clean" or "dirty" MRF processes.

"Clean" MRFs

The most common type of MRF are "clean MFRs" that provide sorting and processing function for clean, dry, commingled recyclable materials (excluding putrescible and green wastes) derived from source separated collection programs.

"Dirty" MRF's

Dirty MRF's tend to handle single stream materials that require processes to provide a sorting function for mixed MSW feedstocks (including putrescible and organic wastes). Some dirty MRF's process residual waste exclusively to provide energy and fuel sources for other waste disposal treatments. Generally, dirty MRFs are tooled to exclusively recover dry recyclables, with the wet residue and non-recyclables destined for landfill or as feedstock for incinerators/advanced thermal treatment processes. According to research this type of system achieves at best 50 per cent recovery of material for recycling and the residual is either landfilled or used as fuel waste to energy facilities.

MRF processes involve a number of stages, including removal and processing of large bulky items, manual and automated sorting of recyclables, and organics screening. Bagged waste may be opened manually or mechanically using trommel screens with knives. Typical MRF equipment used to recover recyclables includes conveyors, screens, magnets and eddy current separators, shredders, crushers and bailers.

Collection Methods

Over the last 20 to 30 years the basic MRF, along with collection systems, has been rapidly changing. Collection systems have evolved from the multi-bin/truck-side sort method to dual-stream (termed commingled), to wet/dry collection systems where the wet fraction is organic waste such as food waste and yard waste; soiled paper, foil, plastic, and other materials; diapers and the dry fraction consisting of recyclables and non-recyclables.

Curbside collection options include: single stream collection (fully commingled); two stream collection (partially commingled); multi-stream collection (segregated); and Co-collection. This approach is essentially the simultaneous collection of two or more material streams (e.g., recyclables and garbage, or recyclables and organics) with one vehicle. Co-collection may provide improved efficiency over operating two (or more) collection vehicles on the same route. Single stream recycling is where all recyclable materials are collected co-mingled in a single container.

More recently, there has been a shift by some communities to move to automated collection which has led to single-stream processing. One disadvantage is that the high equipment costs of MRF's for the paper/container auto-sort machines, contaminated materials, and the reluctance by industry to change collection methods. In the Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) we have a five year contract with Progressive Waste Solutions who purchased new split packer collection trucks at the beginning of the curbside collection contract. Examples of collection trucks are included in Appendix 1.

For curbside collection the level of commingling at the curb influences the types of material collected, types of trucks used, and the design of the processing facility. Decision makers must decide whether to invest more effort in the collection system (maximum source segregation/minimal sorting) or in processing (commingled collection/maximum processing). Collection costs are typically higher with more detailed material separation curbside, but processing costs can be lower. When material is commingled curbside, collection costs are lower, but processing costs can be higher. Collection and processing costs need to be combined to assess the most cost-effective system.

On Vancouver Island, single family recycling programs tend to offer curbside collection programs that source separate recyclables, garbage and increasingly food waste. Recyclable materials from these programs are shipped to clean MRFs, organics are sent to composting facilities, and residual in the form of garbage is landfilled.

Types of Material Recovery Facilities

There have been MRF's operating at a commercial scale in North America for a number of years. There are numerous clean MRFs located in the Lower Mainland. Green by Nature recently opened a state-of-the-art MRF facility to handle containers collected through Multi-Material BC (MMBC). In Nanaimo, there are three clean MRFs that process primarily source separated recyclables from the residential sector, multi-family and the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector.

Many of the dirty MRF facilities are being modernized to handle "mixed waste". Advanced technology is employed to "break open the bag" and extract recyclables and this requires less manual labour. Newer modern facilities are safer and offer more efficient processes to recover material from the waste stream compared to their low-tech predecessors. Many of the innovations and improvements have evolved from the processing of source separated recyclables. These modern facilities are employed in a growing number of cities across the United States to extract recyclables left in the waste stream. Advanced technology designed to maximize recovery includes screening equipment, air separators, optical technology, magnets, eddy current separators and manual quality controls.

NextUse, owned by Belkorp Environmental Services Ltd., proposes to build a mixed waste processing facility in Coquitlam that would have the technological ability to employ the "break the bag" technique. This facility is awaiting licensing approval from Metro Vancouver under Bylaw 181. This would be the first MRF of its kind in British Columbia.

Single-stream MRFs for recycling have evolved and are the most common technology in North America. This MRF system is very convenient as it can handle a variety of collection methods. MRF's can range from low technology with mostly manual sorts to highly technological sort lines with almost no human hands touching the material. Advances in MRF technologies include; paper screening from containers, acceptance of eddy current magnets, and optical and near-infrared sorting units. Modern single-stream MRFs automatically sort by paper grade or container type/color/resin, with quality and speeds far greater than human sorters can achieve. Although these advanced sort units can be expensive, especially if used in tandem for multiple sorts, they are still less expensive per unit than the initial equipment used 20 years ago.

MRFs sorting through pure MSW are still utilized in several places. In this process, no MSW collection changes need to be made, but, on the processing side, dirty MRFs require lots of equipment and sorters to handle volume to reduce contamination. The dirty MRF requires good equipment, skilled operators, and extensive maintenance programs, plus an understanding of the end markets for the lower-quality sorted materials. One benefit of the dirty MRF is that the technology will most likely serve well in prepping material for waste to energy facilities.

Current Flow of Recyclables in the RDN

Annually the RDN receives approximately 50,000 metric tonnes of MSW. The RDN's 2012 Waste Composition Study indicated the types of materials being landfilled. To illustrate the volume of waste by category, please see Appendix 2. This will highlight the volume of materials that could potentially be recovered.

The RSWAC has identified a MRF as a potential option to manage the RDN's waste stream. The following points should be given consideration as part of any future research:

- 1. Currently, the RDN and the City of Nanaimo does not control ownership of curbside recyclable materials. This transfer of ownership is a result of the Provincial recycling regulation that requires printed paper and packaging to be managed by MMBC that is an industry stewardship program. Curbside collectors such as the City of Nanaimo and the Regional District, servicing single family housing have contracted with MMBC who pay the collector to collect on their behalf.
- 2. Six drop-off depots operating in the region are also contracted to MMBC to accept recyclables generated by the residential sector.
- 3. There is a strong vibrant private recycling industry that has evolved from a culture of source separation and a regulatory framework that has contributed to the Region's impressive high diversion rate.
- 4. The ICI waste stream is managed exclusively by the private sector hauling community and processing of recyclables is conducted by well-established clean MRFs that have emerged to handle source separated recyclables region wide.
- 5. To establish a MRF significant capital investment is required. In addition, it is necessary to have sufficient feedstock to support a facility.

General System Performance

The RDN's 2012 Waste Composition study information shows that approximately 30-35 per cent of the waste stream is potentially recyclable at MRFs (this excludes compostable material). The actual amount depends on whether there is a deposit-return system on various containers, which affects the amount of plastic and metal packaging available for recycling. The top recyclables categories in municipal waste streams in Canada (percentage of residential waste composition):

Recyclables % Paper 7 Plastics 14 Glass 3 Metal 3 Beverage containers 1 Electronics 2 Household Hazardous Materials 2

The actual amount recycled, and therefore the amount of diversion depends on the type of collection system (curbside or depot), and materials collected. According to research, good curbside recycling programs should achieve 90 per cent participation or higher. Even when households participate they do not always recycle all material collected by the program, therefore participation must be multiplied by capture to estimate the proportion of the waste stream that will be recovered in a program. Experience has shown that capture varies by material, generally related to how complicated the recycling message is. In mature curbside programs, people understand that cans, bottles, and newspapers are recyclable; therefore capture of these can be as high as 80 or 90 per cent where good promotion and education programs exist and in communities with user pay systems, which encourage participation. Once new materials are added in an expanded collection program, people are often confused (e.g., different kinds of plastics and mixed paper).

The RDN's curbside recycling program is mature and sophisticated, achieving diversion rates of 25-30 per cent of the residential waste stream. Depot programs generally divert seven to 12 per cent. Deposit or return-to-retail systems typically recover more than 80 per cent of targeted beverage containers. Residual rates also vary depending on how materials are collected. "Typical" residual rates are five to seven per cent or less for curbside sorted materials, and 20 per cent for bag or cart collection systems, or where no curbside sort takes place. Wet/dry programs, where waste is collected in two streams, experience a combined 30 per cent residue rate in their wet and dry streams (because wet/dry programs usually direct non divertible materials into one stream or the other).

The recycling industry is vulnerable to global market conditions. When markets fail, recycling is an expensive way to process waste. Solutions to market vulnerability include structuring contracts to share market risk with either a recycling contractor, or directly with the market itself. It is preferable to guarantee rates to sign a long term contract, usually for five years. In such an arrangement, the early years will focus on establishing efficient collection and processing. Collection is the most expensive part, therefore attention would be on reducing collection costs. Current trends would indicate moves towards faster single stream collection with more expensive MRF's are more cost effective overall.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no alternatives for this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This report is presented for information only therefore has no financial implications.

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS

This report was prepared to provide information to RSWC as part of the Regional District's Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) review process.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS

This memorandum is intended to stimulate discussion by the RSWAC for the purposes of the RDN SWMP review and provides an overview of MRF technologies for future consideration.

A MRF is a mechanized sorting facility, which separates recyclables and organics from waste that would otherwise be landfilled. There are numerous MRFs in operation in the US and in Europe. Similar MRFs have been proposed in Metro Vancouver and one in Fraser Valley Regional District. However, it was recently announced that the latter has been discontinued due to public opposition. Currently there are three MRFs in Nanaimo that handle source separated recyclable materials. New programs will depend on future trends and global commodity markets.

than Hargery

Report Writer

A/General Manager Concurrence

C.A.O. Concurrence

Collection Systems

Dual Stream Collected In Split Packer System in RDN & RDN Split Packer - Commingled Recyclables



Front End Loaded





Single Stream - Automated CollectionSystem

APPENDIX 2

Detailed Data by Waste Sector

	Residentia	intial	Comm	ertial	Sell.	Sell-Haul	10	Totals
Material Category	Waste	Estimated	Waste	Estimated	Waste	Estimated	Waste	Estimated
	Stream Percentage	Disposed (2012)	Stream Percentage	Disposed (2012)	Stream Percentage	Disposed (2012)	Stream Percentage	Disposed (2012)
Passar of All and a second sec	1.7%	637	9.5%	5,049	1,8%	969	12,5%	6.655
Newsprint	0.1%	76	1.3%	690	0.3%	134	1.7%	006
Cardboard (recyclable)	0.2%	105	2,4%	1,271	0.3%	143	2,8%	1,519
Cardboard (waxed)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Cardboard (non-recyclable)	0.0%	c	0.2%	108	%0.0	0	0.2%	108
Boxboard / Cores	0.4%	191	1.3%	209	0.2%	128	1.9%	1,028
Office Paper	0.4%	198	2.5%	1,324	0.7%	368	3.5%	1.889
Magazines and Catalogues	0.0%	Ħ	0.2%	106	0 1%	59	0.3%	166
Molded Paper Containers	%0.0	20	0.4%	237	%00	25	0.5%	282
Hardcover Books	%0.0	7	0.2%	91	0.2%	87	0.3%	186
Takeout Cups	0.1%	30	0.7%	360	%0.0	£2	0.8%	413
Composite Can	0.0%	60	0.0%	21	0.0%	2	0.1%	31
Other Paper	0.0%	1	0.2%	130	0.0%	0	0.2%	191
Platte Could and a second and a	2.5%	1.313	8.3%	4,421	3,0%	1,599	13.8%	7,333
Bags - Retail (carry-out and grocery)	0.2%	124	0.2%	115	0.1%	44	0.5%	284
Bags - Packaging (film and overwrap)	0.9%	468	2.2%	1,173	0.2%	127	3.3%	1.768
Bags - Non Packaging (e.g. Ziploc bags)	0.2%	113	0.7%	379	0.1%	46	1.0%	538
Other Plastic Film (pallet wrap)	0.1%	27	%6.0	473	0.0%	0	%6.0	500
PETE#1	0.1%	71	0.2%	66	0.1%	33	0.4%	202
HDPE#2	0.1%	65	0.4%	235	0.1%	58	0.7%	357
PVC #3	%0 0	0	0.0%	7	0.0%	1	%0.0	89
10PE #4	%0 0	0	0.0%	9	0.0%	0	%0.0	9
PP #5	0.1%	37	0.2%	131	0.1%	29	0.4%	198
P3 #54	0 2%	98	0.8%	450	0 1%	45	1.1%	593
Mixed Resin #7	0.0%	25	0.4%	210	0.0%	25	0.5%	260
	0.2%	104	0.7%	391	0.5%	291	1.5%	786
Durable plastic (non-packaging)	0.3%	180	1.4%	753	1.7%	901	3.4%	1,833
compositable Organics	6.2%	3,301	26.0%	13,879	2.7%	1,453	34.9%	18,632
Food Waste	4.5%	2,381	17.6%	9,386	2.4%	1,297	24.5%	13,065
rard and Garden	0.4%	223	4.7%	2,490	0.0%	12	5.1%	2,725
	1.3%	969	3,7%	1,987	0.3%	141	5.3%	2,824
DODAA Dasba abus	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	%0.0	3	0.0%	19

Waste Composition Study (2012) - Einal - 29 Jan 13

ō
÷
0
9
0
¢
÷
2
-
5
>
ō
-
ata
CD
-
2
<u> </u>
-
ő
1

Signated Waste Signosed Stream (2012) Percentage 1 1.1% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 1 0.0% 2 0.0% 2 0.2% 0 0.0% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.2% 167 0.3% 313 0.3.4% 313 0.9% 313 0.9% 313 0.9% 313 0.1% 313 0.9% 313 0.9% 313 0.9% 313 0.9% <th></th> <th>Residential</th> <th>ential</th> <th>Commercial</th> <th>tercial</th> <th>Self</th> <th>Self-Haul</th> <th>To</th> <th>Totals</th>		Residential	ential	Commercial	tercial	Self	Self-Haul	To	Totals
Stream Disposed Disposed <thdisposed< th=""> <thdisposed< th=""> <thdispos< th=""><th>Mathematical Concernent</th><th>Waste</th><th>Fetimated</th><th>Macto</th><th>Ectimated</th><th>Marks</th><th>Participant -</th><th>11</th><th></th></thdispos<></thdisposed<></thdisposed<>	Mathematical Concernent	Waste	Fetimated	Macto	Ectimated	Marks	Participant -	11	
Percentage 7013 Ferentage 7013 Percentage 7013 Percentage 7013 Percentage 7013 0.00% 8 0.00% 1 0.00% 1 0.00% 1 0.00% 6 0.00% 110 0.00% 1 0.00% 1 0.00% 22 0.01% 55 0.00% 11 0.00% 1 0.00% 16 0.03% 110 0.00% 1 0.00% 1 0.00% 16 0.03% 110 0.00% 1 0.00% 1 0.00% 16 0.03% 303 0.01% 2 0.00% 1 0.00% 16 0.03% 16 0.03% 16 0.03% 16 0.00% 16 0.03% 16 0.03% 16 16 16 0.00% 16 0.03% 16 0.03% 16 16 16 0.00% 16 0.03% <th>Anaterial category</th> <th>Stream</th> <th>Disnosed</th> <th>Stream</th> <th>Disposed</th> <th>alcova 2</th> <th>Estimated</th> <th>Waste</th> <th>Estimated</th>	Anaterial category	Stream	Disnosed	Stream	Disposed	alcova 2	Estimated	Waste	Estimated
0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 1 0.005 0.015 0.015 0.005 0.005 1 0.005 0.005 0.005 111 0.005 115 0.005 0.005 111 0.005 111 0.005 117 0.005 0.005 115 0.005 111 0.005 117 0.005 0.015 0.015 0.055 0.005 117 0.055 </th <th></th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>(2012)</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>(2012)</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>(2012)</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Disposed (2012)</th>		Percentage	(2012)	Percentage	(2012)	Percentage	(2012)	Percentage	Disposed (2012)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Beverage Containers	0.2%	86	1.3%	681	0.2%	Contraction and Contraction	709 .	200
0.0% 4 0.0% 5 0.0% 1 0.0% 2 0.0% 11 0.0% 15 0.0% 2 0.0% 11 0.0% 15 0.0% 2 0.0% 11 0.0% 15 0.0% 2 0.0% 10 0.0% 17 0.0% 5 0.0% 25 0.0% 17 0.0% 0 0.0% 10 0.0% 17 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0 0 0.1% 72	Aseptic Containers (deposit)	0.0%	8	0.0%	19	0.0%	+	0 te/	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Aseptic Containers (non-deposit)	0.0%	4	%0.0	ο Ο	0.0%	- C	20 U U	67 11
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gable Top Containers (deposit)	0.0%	0	%0.0	03	%0.0		0.0%	I o
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gable Top Containers (non-deposit)	0.0%	22	01%	59	0.0%	, r	2000	r y
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Beverage Pouches (deposit)	0.0%	0	%0.0	5 ==	0.0.0	с С	0.2%	95
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Plastic Reverage Containers (demosit)	760 0	u u	2000		0.00	> ;	0.076	П
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	District Designed Contribution (Letterior)	8.0%	0	0.7%	011	0.0%	18	0.3%	133
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Plastic beverage containers (non-deposit)	0.0%	25	%0.0	25	%0.0	17	0.1%	67
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Plastic Beverage (takeout cups)	0.0%	00	0.1%	72	0.0%	2	0.2%	82
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Metal Beverage (deposit)	%0.0	თ	0.1%	65	0.0%	4	0.1%	78
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Metal Beverage (non-deposit)	%0.0	0	0.0%	0	%0'0	0	0.0%	! c
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Glass Beverage Containers (deposit)	0.0%	16	0.6%	303	0.1%	31	0 795	EVC
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Glass Beverage Containers (non-deposit)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0,0%	20	0.0%) tr
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Textiles	1.1%	576	2.0%	1,080	2.6%	1.380	5.7%	1 037
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Clothing	0.1%	45	0.0%	16	01%	EA	201	136
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Composite Textiles	0.1%	74	01%	37	792.0	5 5	0.7.0 Mar	071
0.07% 380 1.4% 727 0.13% 690 0.1% 72 0.5% 288 0.8% 410 0.2% 120 0.4% 213 0.0% 25 0.03% 120 0.4% 213 0.0% 25 0.03% 120 0.4% 213 0.0% 25 0.1% 79 0.2% 39 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 169 0.0% 25 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.0% 25 0.0% 181 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.2% 188 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 0.2% 145 1.0% 259 0.0% 652 1 0.3% 1.46 759 0.0% 26% 2403 2 0.3% 0.6% 313 0.6% 2403 2 2 0.3% 0.0% 0 <td>a stheet</td> <td>/00 0</td> <td>[.</td> <td>1000</td> <td>5 ;</td> <td>% C D</td> <td>101</td> <td>%C.U</td> <td>2/8</td>	a stheet	/00 0	[.	1000	5 ;	% C D	101	%C.U	2/8
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0.0%	v	%0°0	12	0.1%	49	0.1%	66
0.1% 72 0.5% 288 0.8% 410 0.2% 120 0.4% 213 0.0% 25 0.0% 10 0.0% 23 0.0% 25 0.0% 10 0.0% 4 0.0% 25 0.1% 79 0.0% 4 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.0% 0 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.0% 183 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.2% 145 1.0% 259 0.3% 403 25 0.3% 146 1.4% 759 0.6% 318 0.6% 403 26 0.3% 146 1.2% 259 0.0% 26 1 26 1 26 1 26 1 26 1 26 1	Natural Fibre Textiles	0.7%	380	1.4%	727	1.3%	690	3.4%	1,798
0.2% 120 0.4% 213 0.0% 25 0.0% 10 0.0% 2 0.0% 25 0.1% 79 0.0% 89 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 169 0.0% 25 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.0% 0 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.0% 181 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.1% 183 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.2% 145 1.0% 259 0.3% 182 403 0.3% 1.4% 759 0.6% 318 403 26 0.3% 1.4% 759 0.0% 65 1 0 2 0.0% 0 0.3% 1.4% 759 0.0% 2 0	Synthetic Textiles	0.1%	72	0.5%	288	0.8%	410	1.4%	770
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Metals	0.5%	260	3.2%	\$56	0.7%	375	2.4%	1.291
0.0% 10 0.0% 4 0.0% 0 0.1% 79 0.2% 89 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 169 0.0% 12 0.1% 51 0.3% 181 0.6% 23 0.0% 0 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.4% 188 0.6% 239 0.3% 182 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.2% 145 1.0% 759 0.3% 403 0.3% 145 1.0% 759 0.0% 652 0.3% 146 1.4% 759 0.0% 652 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.0% 0 0.3% 269 0.0 652 0 0.0% 0 0.3% 1.9% 1.9% 1.00M 2 0.0% 0 0.3% 0.0%	Metal Packaging (food)	0.2%	120	0,4%	213	%0'D	75	7%Z	35.0
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Aluminum Foil and Travs (packaging)	0.0%	10	700		200) (000
0.1% 7.9 $0.2%$ 89 $0.0%$ 12 $0.1%$ 51 $0.3%$ 169 $0.0%$ 25 $0.0%$ 181 $0.3%$ 181 $0.6%$ 313 $0.0%$ 18 $0.3%$ 181 $0.6%$ 25 $0.0%$ 188 $0.6%$ 299 $0.6%$ 313 $0.2%$ 86 $0.6%$ 299 $0.3%$ 182 $0.3%$ 145 $1.0%$ 233 $0.6%$ 318 313 $0.3%$ 145 $1.0%$ 509 $0.6%$ 403 65 $0.3%$ $1.4%$ 759 $0.6%$ 213 $0.6%$ 403 $0.0%$ $0.5%$ $0.6%$ 313 $0.6%$ 403 65 $0.0%$ $0.5%$ $1.4%$ 759 $0.0%$ 652 241 $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ $0.0%$ 0.0	Alimination and turn har load munitive	20.00	2 8	%0,0	ə	0.U%	0	%0.0	14
0.1% 51 0.3% 169 0.0% 25 0.0% 0 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.0% 18 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.1% 183 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.1% 188 0.6% 313 0.6% 313 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.3% 403 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 0.2% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.0% 0 0.3% 191 0.5% 241 0.0% 0 0.3% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.0% 0 0.1% 0.1 0.1% 54 0.1 0.0% 0 0.1% 0.1 0.1% <td></td> <td>%1.0</td> <td>5/</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>68</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.3%</td> <td>180</td>		%1.0	5/	0.2%	68	0.0%	12	0.3%	180
0.0% 0 0.3% 181 0.6% 313 0.4% 188 0.6% 299 0.3% 182 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 0.2% 145 1.0% 599 0.3% 182 0.3% 145 1.0% 599 0.3% 403 0.3% 145 1.0% 599 0.3% 403 0.2% 145 1.0% 599 0.0% 65 0.0% 0 0.3% 12% 652 241 0.0% 0 0.3% 12% 52 241 0.0% 0 0.3% 1.9% 1.00% 24 0.0% 0 0.3% 0.1.9% 54 24 0.2% 114 0.3% 0.1.9% 54 24	Non-consumables mixed metals (<0.5kg)	0.1%	S1	0.3%	169	0.0%	25	0.5%	245
0 0.4% 188 0.6% 299 0.3% 182 s 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 1 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 599 0.3% 182 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 65 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.3% 311 0.5% 241 0.00% 0 0.3% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.00% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0.02% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 24	Non-consumables mixed metals (>0.5kg)	0.0%	0	0.3%	181	0.6%	313	%6'0	494
0 0.4% 188 0.6% 299 0.3% 182 5 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 311 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 241 0 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 241 0 0 0.00% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0	Gass the other spectra was a first of the	0.5%	275	361.1	115	366.0	\$00	2.6%	1.386
s 0.2% 86 0.6% 313 0.6% 318 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.3% 31 0.5% 241 0.00% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0 0.00% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0 0 0.00% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 2	Glass Packaging (food)	0.4%	188	0.6%	299	0.3%	182	1.3%	669
1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.8% 403 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0 0.0% 0 0.3% 241 0 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1.004 24 0 0 0.0% 1 0.3% 404 1.1% 604 24 0	Other Glass and Ceramics	0.2%	86	0.6%	313	0.6%	318	1.3%	717
1 0.3% 145 1.0% 509 0.3% 403 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 1 0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0 0.0% 0 0.2% 241 0 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 24 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 24 0	Building Materials	0.7%	347	4.6%	2,438	5.6%	2 963	10.8%	27.00
1 0.2% 88 1.4% 759 0.0% 6 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.00% 0 0.2% 91 0.5% 241 0.00% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0.00% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0.00% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 2.4 0.00% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 2.4	Clean Wood	0.3%	145	1.0%	509	0.8%	403	2.0%	1 057
0.0% 0 0.3% 186 1.2% 652 0.0% 0 0.2% 91 0.5% 652 0.0% 0 0.2% 52 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 24	Treated or Painted Wood	0.2%	88	1.4%	759	0.0%	v	1 6 62	ac 3
0.0% 0 0.2% 91 0.5% 241 0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604	Gypsum/drywall/plaster	0.0%	0	0.3%	186	1 2%	653	1 50/	0.00
0.0% 0 0.1% 52 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 0 0 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0 0 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604 0	Masonry/bricks	0.0%	0	0.2%	16	20	341	20.7	000
0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.0% 0 0.8% 437 1.9% 1.004 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.1% 54 0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604	Asphalt products	0.0%	0	01%	5	2000	7 62	0.0%	332
0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 1.9% 1.004 0.2% 114 0.3% 404 1.1% 604	Carpet & Underlay	0.0%	c	780	20	0.0%	5	0.1%	52
0.2% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 54	Flooring (non-wood)	0.0%) C	20 U	(¹)	% F.T	1,004	2.7%	1,441
0.2.% 114 0.8% 404 1.1% 604	Other (fiberelace insulation)	702 0			2	927-0	44	0.1%	54
	(incoment of the second of the	0/7-0	114	0.8%	404	1.1%	604	2.1%	1,122

Waste Composition Study (2012) - Final - 29 Jan 13

Material Category Waste Percentage Stream Percentage Stream Computers and Peripherals 0.0% Televisions and Audio Visual Equipment 0.1% Telephones and Telecommunications Equipment 0.0% Small Kitchen Appliances and Floor Care 0.1% Small Kitchen Appliances and Floor Care 0.0% Smoke and CO Detectoric 0.0% Other Electronics 0.0% Batteries 0.0% Medical/Biological 0.1%		Estimated Disposed (2012) 144 0 36 3 36 3 3 69 69 135 135 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	Waste Waste Percentage 0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0	Estimated Disposed (2012) 997 2012) 2012) 2012 137 243 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 3	Waste Kaste Stream Percentage 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0	Estimated Disposed (2012) 40 40 9 123 0 0 0 7	Waste Stream Percentage 0.5% 0.5%	Estimated Disposed 1,323
			Stream Percentage 0.5% 0.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.7% 0.7%	Disposed (2012) 997 997 997 997 137 243 33 33 83 1,220 83 1,220 31 33 33	Stream Stream Percentage 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Disposed (2012) 2 40 9 123 123 0 0 7	vraste Stream Percentage 0.5% 0.6%	csumated Disposed (2012) 1,323
			Percentage 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.2% 2.1% 0.1% 0.7%	(2012) 997 274 257 137 243 3 3 3 8 3 1,220 1,220 33 33 33 33	Percentage 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	(2012) 1882 2 40 9 123 123 0 0 7 7	Percentage 0.5% 0.6% 0.3%	(2012)
	****	10 0 0 3 3 5 6 6 9 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.2% 0.2% 0.1% 0.1% 0.7%	997 274 257 137 243 3 3 3 137 1,270 1,270 1,270 33 33 33	0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	123 40 123 0 0 7	2.5% 0.5% 0.6% 0.3%	1,323
	**************************************	36 36 69 13 13 12 12	0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.7%	274 257 137 243 3 3 83 1,270 1,270 1,270 1,270 33 33	0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	2 40 123 0 7	0.5% 0.6% 0.3%	
	8° 26 8° 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26	36 9 13 13 12 12	0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.2% 0.1% 0.1%	257 137 243 3 83 83 31 1,200 1,200	0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	40 9 123 0 7	0.6%	276
	<u>8</u> 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	36 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.3% 0.5% 0.0% 0.2% 0.2% 2.3% 0.1% 0.1%	137 243 3 83 83 31 1,200 1,200	0.0% 0.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	9 123 0 7	0.3%	333
	* * * * * * * * * * *	36 0 69 113 13 13 13 13 13	0.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.2% 0.1% 0.1%	243 3 83 83 31 33 383 383	0.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	123 0 7		146
	* * * * * * * * * *	69 69 13 13 13 13 13	0.0% 0.0% 0.2% 0.1% 0.1% 0.7%	83 11,220 33 38 3 38 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	%0.0 %0.0 %0.0	0 0 1	0.8%	402
	* * * * * * * *	0 69 113 13 42 0 12	0.0% 0.2% 0.1% 0.1% 0.7%	0 83 31 33 33 33 36 3	0.0%	0 ~ 2	0.0%	9
	* * * * * * *	69 13 13 13 12 12	0.2% 7.3 0.1% 0.7% 0.0%	83 11.200 31 383 0 0	0.0%	102	0.0%	0
	* * * * *	13. 13 13 12 12	2. 0.1% 0.7% 0.0%	31 33 383 0	%0'0	162	0.3%	160
	* * * * * *	13 42 12 12	0.1% 0.7% 0.0%	383 0 2	0.0%	Contraction of the second seco	2.8%	1,516
	* * * *	42 0 12	0.7%	383	2. 2010.0	1	0.1%	46
	* * *	0 12	%0.0	0	0.0%	0	0.8%	425
Stains/Preservatives 0.0%	8 8	12		102	0.0%	10	%0.0	10
Latex Paint 0.0%	29		0.3%	TP3	0.2%	103	0,5%	278
Oil Based Paint 0.0%		0	0.1%	31	0.0%	0	0.1%	31
Aerosols 0.0%	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	24	0.1%	35	0.1%	35	0.2%	26
Solvents 0.0%	*	0	9.1%	34	%0.0	0	0.1%	34
Pesticides/Herbicides/Fungicides 0.0%	8	0	0.0%	ń	0.0%	0	0.0%	m
	8	e S	0.0%	17	0.0%	0	0.0%	20
	*	0	0.0%	с	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	1	0.0%	10	0.0%	13	0.0%	23
Other Petroleum Based Products 0.0%	28	0	0.0%	16	0.0%	0	0.0%	16
		0	0.0%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	S
Other HHW 0.1%	_	39	0.9%	488	0.0%	0	1.0%	527
		828	3.1%	1,633	%670	470	7.4%	3.932
		1,394	2.2%	1,187	0.4%	205	5.2%	2,786
Pet Waste 0,8%		435	0.8%	446	0.5%	266	2.1%	1,146
		(69 Street and	1.1%	572	1.6%	839	3.0%	1,599
	-	61	0.1%	75	0.0%	26	0.3%	162
		102	0.5%	261	0.0%	7	0.7%	370
		0	0.4%	196	1.5%	825	1.9%	1.021
		9	0.1%	40	0.0%	0	0.1%	46
White Goods 0.0%		0	0.0%	٥	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Fotals 17%	80%	183	62%	33,239	21%	10.998	100%	53 319

# **Detailed Data by Waste Sector**

Waste Composition Study [2012] - Final - 29 Jan 13