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TOPICS COVERED

- Context
  - Traditional & non-traditional barriers
- Barriers
- Key drivers
- Actionable recommendations
WHY CONSIDER ENTRY INTO COMMERCIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT?

- **Why?**
  - 40-60% of stream/Goals
  - Big bang/fewer actors
  - Low cost
  - A few key streams
  - Job creation (10:4:1), GHG
  - Program access, aesthetics...

- **Why not / Barriers?**
TRADITIONAL BARRIERS

Generator Side
- Space / screening
- Optional recycling ➔ Cost / split incentives / volumes
- Management disinterest / non-local
- Hassle
- Training / retraining

BUT...
- Less studied, but IMPORTANT, problems
  - invoices & contract barriers
  - Knowledge gaps & right-size
  - Bidding and joint economies

City Side
- Heterogeneous
- Authority
- Politically tough
- Full plate
- Market “working”

BUT...
- False heterogeneity
- Small / med / lg;
- Several key materials

CAN solve some (space); not others ($?)
# CUSTOMER ISSUES – CONTRACTS & INVOICES

Majority report NO PROBLEMS, but...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No problems</strong></td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed automatic renewal rollover</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't negotiate/ reduce rates</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't bring in provider for recycling/organics</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don't live up to the agreement</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't switch service level</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanted to cancel but couldn't</strong></td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY CAN ENCOURAGE BIDDING – IMPORTANT BECAUSE...

- Right-sizing
- Awareness of options
- Savings
- Options to avoid extra fees & improve conditions / clauses
- Joint services / economies
  - SERA Statistical analysis showed multiple services saw SUBSTANTIAL savings in pick-up/base fees
- Businesses unaware!

City can educate
ECONOMICS AS A DRIVER –

- Hauler fees – affected by tipping fees
- Government levers are limited
- One state has counties that work it TWO ways
  - Surcharges on tipping fees / enviro fees
  - AND exemption of recycling & organics from sales tax
- SERA statistical survey found 3x greater uptake in organics programs in counties with high differentials

- CITY CAN AFFECT
WHAT DRIVES COMMUNITY INTERVENTION?  SURVEY & SERA STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- Goals (local & state & variations)
- Authority (available, currently taken) & regulations
- Hauler situation
- Political support
- Residential progress
- Com’l success (local & regional)
- Cost
- Region
- Tip fees
- Demographics
- Size / urban / rural
- Processing
- Market access
- Activists & models
- Other...

⇒ Analyzed “Drivers” – May not be what you think!
**COMMUNITY DRIVERS?...**

May not be what you think...

3 Key factors:
- Goals / plans
- Activist Staff
- Residential progress

- *Cities can MAKE THIS HAPPEN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals established</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Green” image</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business interest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential progress</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility investment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size / urban / suburban</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal tip fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of the country</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market access</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council / commissioners (electeds)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulers</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local task forces</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State planners</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THANK YOU!!

Questions?
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Thanks for filling out surveys that help support analyses like these!
National: www.garbageandrecyclingsurveys.com