

**Waste Management Forum - Data from the Easels  
October 14, 2015**

**What is working right now?** (number in parenthesis indicates the number of dots)

Table 1:

- Convenient – location of the landfill – routines (haulers and users) (4)
- Going to single stream (4)
- Recycling center in Estes and Loveland (2)
- Positive cultural attitudes (3)
- Household hazardous waste center
- Relationships/partnerships (2)
- Transfer stations
- Educational piece

Table 2:

- Single-family residences participate well in recycling (2)
- Pay as you go system working well for residences but hides costs
- Loveland yard waste diversion is popular and helps reduce difficulty for citizens
- What we do now- pay for recycling whether government or private (1)
- Private haulers and other private entities doing heavy lifting – without them, have a huge problem (4)
- Climate wise and action plan; materials management piece helping move things forward
- Education and outreach – much has been done about recycling (3)
- Processes that county and cities do to include citizens/ businesses in planning (2)

Table 3:

- Fact that there is a public landfill (5)
- Using dumping fees to pay for the programs and hazardous waste, transfer, recycle, etc. (4)
- Invisible and seamless (don't worry about trusts) (1)
- County infrastructure good (digester, compost)
- Curbside collection (1)
- Easy to use and access the landfill
- Riverside recycle center
- Loveland's **crushu** for aggregates
- Priority for community – people are aware (1)
- County's MRF (Materials recycle facility)
- Priority and commitment by leadership to collaborate (2)
- Quality equipment (update) (1)
- Waste collection is efficient (very)
- Choice of haulers (resident and business) by some cities/county

Table 4:

- Single stream as a reduction; single stream diverting material and increase life; a good access to single stream (3)
- Drop off points for access
- Doing more than minimum
- Environmentally sound; we have landfill; affordable stop illegal dumping cheap; collecting methane (5)
- Public outreach and education (2)
- Hazardous waste drop off
- Cooperative municipal/county work (4)

Table 5:

- Ethic of recycling (4)
- A lot of options for solid waste reduction
- There is dialog (Public and Private) (2)
- Single stream recycling
- Good Collaboration (Public and Private) (3)
- Haulers see themselves as active participants (1)
- Recycling facilities well-used (1)
- Landfill functions well (2)
- People want to know how to recycle – education (2)

Table 6:

- Curbside recycling/waste stream diversion for municipal areas
- Ban on cardboard in dumpsters (CSU/Ft Collins ordinance) (2)
- Forecasting/ willingness address issues (4)
- Working well in general
- Fort Collins collects great data from businesses and haulers (2)
- Fort Collins education program
- Low cost to consumer/option for consumer (2)
- “Top shelf” operation at landfill
- One-stop shopping at landfill (hazardous waste, electronics, recycling, garbage) (5)
- Great landfill staff
- Clean city/county

Table 7: (not used)

Table 8:

- Way for citizens to get rid of things/ consumer standpoint (infrastructure 4H) (5)
- Trunks are safe and well schedules (1)
- Appliance retrieval/electronics improving
- Cities are responsive to new ideas (2)
- Sponsoring clean up days in certain places (1)
- School districts are helping
- Private sector interest (5)
- Transcending and repurposing (1)

Table 9:

- Current landfill operation (not sustainable) (3)
- Education (4)
- Recycle opportunities (3)
- Re-use (large volume industry) (1)
- Sympathetic/educated population (1)
- Voluntary programs (1)
- Capturing methane (from landfill)
- Future planning (2)
- Zero waste events (more common)

**Concerns/What is missing?**

Table 1:

- Effective communication we seasonals and visitors (process for visitors to recycle)
- Education of the public (4)
- Need for more comprehensive approach to dealing with yard waste/composting (1)
- Incentives for the consumer and disincentives (5)
- Reduction of consumption that causes waste (5)
- Advertising recycling
- Program to handle glass
- Needs to be more convenient/more drop off areas
- Cut red tape for composting and recycling for facilities

Table 2:

- Local infrastructure to process materials, such as food (Styrofoam, hard to recycle items, mattresses, etc.) (1)
- Landfill tip fees are too low (1)
- Data and tracking of data and collecting correct info that will lead to better decisions (weight audits and composition studies, weights of recycling in all communities not just landfill. Not tracking or collecting the right data) (1)
- Innovation – waste energy ideas, creating different markets (3)
- Limit – city of FC – only certain trash haulers can go to an area and not all can do yard waste recycling. Limiting number of residences who can recycle yard waste
- Engaging commercial sector (including food service industry) in the pay as you throw system. Not included in general fee and don't have space (7)
- Education piece on what and how to commercial and residential
- The consequences of lack of education is the contamination of recyclables and compostables
- Inconsistencies between programs as to what can be recycled, composted, etc. and what can be taken (3)

Table 3:

- Curbside recycling
- Single stream 0 cost of (increase) processing
- Tipping fees too low
- Rubble issues and rates if
- If tipping fees are too high – people use other means

- Oilfield byproducts – rather landfill than recycle – this is where fees should go (1)
- Curbside recycling charge for haulers who pass on to customers
- Who pays tipping fees (fort Collins doesn't some other cities do)
- Tipping fees are lower than the cost to recycle by haulers (5)
- Limitations of current MRF (cap cost single stream processed twice (population)) (3)
- Composting as a focus is missing in county (2)
- Some pilot programs are needed (waste to energy, composting – knowing we have a landfill deadline) and hard to recycle materials (Styrofoam and e-waste) (1)
- Local markets for recyclable and compost
- Some private haulers bring only recycling and take trash (tip fees) elsewhere (3)

Table 4:

- Too far down on pyramid – environment strategies (\*)
- Cheap disposal cost (2)
- Need better technology (\*)
- Transportation cost – MURF and market out of state (2)
- No local food compost facility (2)
- Not capturing methane energy (\*)
- No flow control (1)
- Integration with other agencies
- No hard to recycle place- Styrofoam
- Yard waste not included in bundled waste
- No local markets for recycled end product (1)
- No state legislation to mandate recycling (2)
- Single stream contamination (2)
- No consistency on recycling
- Consistent packaging of using recyclable materials (no Styrofoam)
- Lack of public support for environmental strategies
- Combining the 3 started (3)

Table 5:

- Don't enable the highest and best use for recycled material (single stream) (5)
- Limitations in technology in MRFs and cost benefit analysis
- Too much "recycle" not enough "reduce" emphasis (3)
- We don't throw things away; it all goes somewhere (2)
- More emphasis on "reuse" secondary use/composting
- It's easy to be a "disposable society" because its more convenient/cheaper to landfill
- Deposits on glass bottles
- No regional MRF (not enough volume)
- Education about the correct way to dispose and use of items causes contamination in procession (and sustain it with money) (4)
- Measurement by weight and not by volume (1)
- Strong staff may lead to a less engaged public because they trust it will be done (1)

Table 6:

- Loss of diversion rebate (1)
- Manufacturer responsibility product technology (3)

- Shorten the distance; bet. Purchase and disposal (product and packaging) (1)
- Disconnect bet. Rural and city; lack of options (2)
- Cost doesn't reflect true "cost" disposal
- Multifamily choices limited (2)
- Time to access landfill for haulers and recycling drop off site: size limited. Building not limited (2)
- Go back to dual stream- maximize revenues (3)
- Purchase equipment to handle waste stream (1)
- Waste of resources/energy

Table 7: (not used)

Table 8:

- Carbon footprint for interest less cost analysis (4)
- More repurposing reusing (1)
- Participation in recycling (1)
- More source separation is needed (1)
- Cost structures for everyday people to do individually
- Increase education for communities (5)
- Increase options for outside city limits (2)
- Waste energy (1)

Table 9:

- Food composting (county wide) (3)
- Finances/permits
- Lack of incentives for waste separation (1)
- Lack of penalties/enforcement for not separating waste (1)
- Lack of re-use opportunity (2)
- Container deposit law missing (2)
- Pay as you throw by type – more emphasis at landfill
- Lack of public/private partnerships at landfill (2)
- Equipment (agriculture) disposal/reuse/ transfer
- Hydrocarbons and hazardous waste disposal/reuse/transfer (3)
- Waste to energy (1)
- Stability and transfer costs
- Improvement/sustainability of debris/odor control/lined nuisance/aesthetics

## What is the most important next step?

Table 1:

- Create a shared vision (3)
- Share this morning's presentation with the community to create more public awareness
- Advertise the issue (1)
- Narrow down the scope of the project (1)
- Develop a task force (6)

Table 2:

- Need more meetings like this; need more and better collaboration
- Look at smaller scale demonstration projects with triple helix (3)
- Use the CPD more often
- Maximize social media communication (education, feedback, organization, surveys – anything can accomplish in 3 min or less; gathering contacts) (3)

Table 3:

- More stakeholder meetings/communication (2)
- Look at waste diversion campus model, with MRF, compost and facility, charm, etc. (5)
- Discuss making use of existing landfill when it is closed for some waste purposes; compost recovery (1)
- Study/analysis of options (2)
- Analyze economic model: MRF (2)
- Tactics to divert waste from landfill (1)
  - Group vote on group decision for tools and technologies
- Secondary procession- incentivize for materials as has been done for glass etc. (2)
- Focus on reducing aluminum cans in landfill

Table 4:

- Rally social support- listening sessions (2)
- Continue development of new Larimer County landfill (4)
- Options and Cost of alternatives (3)
- Education on issue (2)
- Develop solid waste and recycling district and/or authority (4)

Table 5:

- Community Recycling Facility (F.C.)
- F.C. Updating community recycling ordinance
- Financing and increased costs associated with new landfill – begin talking (and operations) (2)
- Education – consistent, continual, well-planned regionally created and continually updated; fully funded (5)
- Continuation of this process with this group for some time; keep this group engaged and connected between now and the next meeting (3)
- Define the “region” (1)
- Involve private sector in the planning committee (1)

Table 6:

- Decide- Site landfill or privatize? (4)
- What to do with the current diversion system site? (expand or expend) (1)
- Figuring out GOAL for waste diversion- get everyone on the same page (4)
- Expand into construction diversion at the site
- Timeline/deadlines for decision-making (5)
- Another conference such as this (1)

Table 9:

- Formalized collaboration (e.g. Set schedule and goals) (6)
  - Bring in experts for technology and collaboration
  - Recover Park Planning team (Be Bold- Manhattan Project)
  - Uniform standards
- Education and marketing (one message does not fit all) (3)
- Pursuit of grants and incentive ideas (3)
- Life cycle analysis of resources (2)