City of Peterborough

IMPLEMENTING MULTI-RESIDENTIAL BEST PRACTICES: PHASE 2

CIF Project Number 565.4

Prepared For:
Continuous Improvement Fund
Continuous Improvement Fund Office
92 Caplan Avenue, Suite 511
Barrie, Ontario L4N 0Z7

Prepared by:
The City of Peterborough
500 George Street North
Peterborough, Ontario K9H 3R9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2009 Peterborough completed a project to implement Best Practices at multi-residential buildings. This included completing site visits, developing new promotion and education materials, and increasing the number of recycling containers at buildings. Peterborough was provided funding and technical support from the Continuous Improvement Fund to complete this project entitled CIF 174: Multi-residential Recycling, Implementing Best Practices. In 2011, Peterborough was approved additional funding for Project 565.4, which was a Phase 2 to Project 174. In Phase 2, buildings that did not implement Best Practices in Phase 1 were targeted and further promotion & education initiatives (workshop, guidebook) were implemented

The following Table is an overview of the Project 565.4 deliverables, proposed and achieved.

Project deliverables:	**Details**
1. Complete site visit at 46 buildings that had not implemented best practices	✓ **completed**
2. Increase cart capacity to 50 litre per unit at these buildings (with distribution of 136 carts)	✓ **completed** ✓ The average litre/unit at the 46 buildings is 43 litres per unit ✓ When the 74 carts that were deemed not necessary (at senior buildings) are excluded, the average litres/unit increases to 62.
3. Design, print and distribute superintendent handbook	✓ **Completed**
4. Develop & Deliver Superintendents Workshop	✓ **Completed**

CURRENT SITUATION

The City of Peterborough provides blue box collection to 33,700 households. Approximately nineteen percent (19%) or 6,400 are multi-residential households that require depot-style recycling systems. The City of Peterborough provides 95 gallon (360 litres) capacity roll-out carts to these buildings. Recycling collection of these carts is weekly and based on a two-stream sort system of containers and paper products / film plastic. Peterborough distributes these carts to the buildings at a cost of $75 each (including tax) and the carts are replaced free of charge if they are damaged or broken. The City of Peterborough has a four-day waste pick-up schedule (Tuesday through Friday) for curb side collection to households and multi-residential buildings. There is no tonnage data specifically for multi-residential units. Smaller buildings may set garbage out to the curb in bags for curb side collection. The buildings are required to comply with the City's 2-bag limit per apartment unit. Peterborough does not provide front-end bulk bin garbage collection to the multi-residential buildings.

In 2009, The City of Peterborough worked with the Continuous Improvement Fund on a project entitled "CIF Project # 174: Multi-Residential Benchmarking, Database Development and Communications". The City of Peterborough visited all multi-residential units with eight (8) or more apartments. During this project, each building was visited three (3) times with the scope of the project including:

Phase 1

- Visual waste audit performed (how full were the carts)
- Data regarding the building, address, superintendent name, number of units, floors, contact information)
- Number of carts per building
- Cleaning and re-labelling of carts if needed

Phase 2

- Purchased recycling bags for each unit (in lieu of blue boxes which single family households receive)
- Produced posters and brochures for each building
- In person distribution of bags, brochures and posters to each building

Phase 3

- Visual waste audit performed again
- Update any data missing
- Cleaning and re-labelling of carts if needed
- Determining if buildings are at best practice level for carts

This was the first time that P&E materials were distributed to multi-residential units and buildings. This project was a huge success. The face-to-face contact with the Property Managers of each building has helped build a working relationship between buildings and City staff. Property Managers now feel comfortable calling the office to get advice or materials. The other invaluable piece was the door-to-door contact with the tenants of the building. In general, most of the residents were thrilled to get the information and especially the recycling bag. The project was deemed a success due to the fact that overall recycling increased in the buildings.

At the end of Project 174, there are 46 buildings that remained under the recommended Best Practice standard. The City of Peterborough Waste Management Division wanted to see those buildings meet the Best Practice standard of compliance and initiated the current CIF Project #565.4.

TABLE 1 - Caddy Counts at Non-Compliant Building Prior to Project 565.4

#	Building Addresses	Pre-Study Caddy Count	Best Practice Level	Caddies Required to Achieve Best Practice
1	49 Argyle Street	3	4	1
2	931 Armour Road	7	9	2
3	303 Aylmer Street North	12	14	2
4	333 Brock Street	12	16	4
5	467 Chamberlain Street	171	4	1
6	205 Charlotte Street	8	14	6
7	245 Charlotte Street	14	17	3
8	1818 Cherryhill Road	4	6	2
9	869 Clonsilla Avenue	8	11	3
10	885 Clonsilla Avenue	4	4	0
11	899 Clonsilla Avenue	12	15	3
12	909 Clonsilla Avenue	10	16	6
13	486 Donegal Street	9	14	5
14	110 Douro Street	3	5	2
15	171 Dublin Street	3	4	1
16	831 Dutton Road	8	9	1
17	470 George Street South	11	15	4
18	333 Hedonics Road	16	19	3

#	Building Addresses	Pre-Study Caddy Count	Best Practice Level	Caddies Required to Achieve Best Practice
19	800 Hilliard Street	3	5	2
20	951 Hilliard Street	4	6	2
21	235 King Street	7	13	6
22	240 King Street	8	12	4
23	169 Lake Street	10	18	8
24	1837 Lansdowne Street	3	6	3
25	181 Marina Blvd.	5	6	1
26	294 McDonnel Street	8	12	4
27	550 McDonnel Street	4	6	2
28	1565 Monaghan Road	6	9	3
29	1601 Monaghan Road	9	11	2
30	417 Montcalm Drive	7	9	2
31	389 Murray Street	4	6	2
32	775 Park Street South	4	7	3
33	701 Parkhill Road West	10	11	1
34	611 Rogers Street	10	13	3
35	421 Sheridan Street	12	15	3
36	200 St. Luke's Avenue	7	9	2
37	225 Stewart Street	3	5	2
38	335 Stewart Street	2	2	0
39	1 & 2 Stornoway Place	13	18	5
40	1189 Talwood Court	12	15	3
41	839 Talwood Court	11	15	4
42	1200 Talwood Drive	11	16	5
43	2199 Walker Avenue	13	17	4
44	440 Water Street	7	15	8
45	1111 Water Street	5	6	1
46	1833 Willowcreek Blvd,	6	8	2
TOTAL		351	487	136

TABLE 2: Current Caddy Counts and Audit Findings at Non-Compliant Buildings

#	Building Addresses	Post-Study Caddy Count	Best Practice Level	Audit Findings
1	49 Argyle Street	3	4	1
2	931 Armour Road	7	9	Best Practice N/A
3	303 Aylmer Street North	18	14	Best Practice Achieved
4	333 Brock Street	12	16	Best Practice N/A
5	467 Chamberlain Street	4	4	Best Practice Achieved
6	205 Charlotte Street	8	14	Best Practice N/A
7	245 Charlotte Street	18	17	Best Practice Achieved
8	1818 Cherryhill Road	4	6	Best Practice N/A
9	869 Clonsilla Avenue	10	11	Best Practice N/A
10	885 Clonsilla Avenue	6	4	Best Practice Achieved
11	899 Clonsilla Avenue	12	15	Best Practice N/A
12	909 Clonsilla Avenue	10	16	Best Practice N/A
13	486 Donegal Street	11	14	Best Practice N/A
14	110 Douro Street	4	5	Best Practice N/A
15	171 Dublin Street	3	4	1
16	831 Dutton Road	8	9	Best Practice N/A
17	470 George Street South	13	15	Best Practice N/A
18	333 Hedonics Road	17	19	2
19	800 Hilliard Street	5	5	Best Practice Achieved
20	951 Hilliard Street	6	6	Best Practice Achieved
21	235 King Street	9	13	Best Practice N/A
22	240 King Street	9	12	3
23	169 Lake Street	11	18	7
24	1837 Lansdowne Street	3	6	Best Practice N/A
25	181 Marina Blvd.	5	6	1
26	294 McDonnel Street	8	12	Best Practice N/A

#	Building Addresses	Post-Study Caddy Count	Best Practice Level	Audit Findings
27	550 McDonnel Street	5	6	1
28	1565 Monaghan Road	7	9	Best Practice N/A
29	1601 Monaghan Road	10	11	Best Practice N/A
30	417 Montcalm Drive	7	9	2
31	389 Murray Street	4	6	2
32	775 Park Street South	4	7	Best Practice N/A
33	701 Parkhill Road West	10	11	Best Practice N/A
34	611 Rogers Street	10	13	Best Practice N/A
35	421 Sheridan Street	13	15	Best Practice N/A
36	200 St. Luke's Avenue	7	9	2
37	225 Stewart Street	3	5	Best Practice N/A
38	335 Stewart Street	3	2	Best Practice Achieved
39	1 & 2 Stornoway Place	18	18	Best Practice Achieved
40	1189 Talwood Court	14	15	Best Practice N/A
41	839 Talwood Court	11	15	Best Practice N/A
42	1200 Talwood Drive	17	16	Best Practice Achieved
43	2199 Walker Avenue	13	17	Best Practice N/A
44	440 Water Street	7	15	Best Practice N/A
45	1111 Water Street	5	6	Best Practice N/A
46	1833 Willowcreek Blvd,	6	8	2
TOTAL		398	487	24

GOALS & OBJECTIVES

BEST PRACTICE
One cart for every 7 units

GOALS FOR BEST PRACTICE LEVEL FOR CARTS

1. At the 46 non-compliant buildings, determine if carts are required and if not required give reasoning as to why they are deemed not applicable.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

1. Have all 46 non-compliant buildings (3,375 units) meet Best Practice levels for cart to unit ratio. Or have an explanation as to why Best Practices are not applicable
2. Increase recycling rates, lower contamination and stream mixing

The City of Peterborough partnered with Trent University on this project. By the end of May 2012, the students had completed a series of tasks. Once the tasks were completed, the students finished a report with proof as to whether a building required more carts or were able to justify why the building would not need to comply with Best Practice levels.

TARGET AUDIENCE

TARGET AUDIENCE

The decision makers of each multi-residential building are the target audience for this project. These individuals are the group that will decide whether or not to purchase the carts to bring them to best practice levels. The City of Peterborough will need to persuade this group of the importance of recycling and encourage them to purchase more carts to bring them to the Best Practice level. The Property Managers and Superintendents are very important in the encouragement of recycling to the tenants – if they strongly believe in recycling – it will show in the building.

The target audience for the Multi-Residential workshop were the Property Managers and Superintendents of the 46 buildings identified in this project. Also, buildings that have been noted for contamination issues and stream mixing were targeted.

SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths

- City staff customer service is strong and has a good reputation
- Past success with the multi-res buildings and rapport (established multi-residential program in 1990)
- New graphic labels for the carts that are more visually appealing and give residents the tools necessary to recycle at a glance.
- New graphic posters with our 2-stream system clearly marked
- New recycling bags with graphics for each tenant
- Funding & technical support from CIF is available

Weaknesses

- Trent students found that they did not have time to perform this project well. The students had no idea that this project would be so labour intensive.
- Time constraints of City staff
- A multi-municipal graphic bag order was placed but the bags were not available to distribute to tenants at the time of this project (this was in our original plan of action)

Opportunities

- Partnership with Trent University and building relationships with students volunteering their time towards environmental course
- Workshop gave Property Managers and Superintendents a better understanding of our program in the City of Peterborough and tools to help increase recycling in their buildings
- Increase relationships at the workshop with the Property Managers and Superintendents
- Surveying of the tenants at each building – gave us some information
- More recycling and less waste to landfill
- Support of Property Managers to promote recycling in their buildings
- Multi-Residential units are a growing part of our community
- If building has private garbage collection, the building may find a decrease in haulage costs due to the increase in recycling

Threats

- Property Managers may see recycling as extra work and not be interested in cooperating.
- Property Managers may not want to work with us and will not attend the workshop
- Owners will not purchase the extra carts necessary to bring their building to Best Practice levels
- Physical space at the building may prohibit the purchasing of the carts
- Tenants at the building may not be supportive of recycling
- Difficult to enforce recyclables ban in multi-res buildings, as private haulers often take their garbage, therefore, hard to persuade them to recycle
- Frustration in making appointments with the Property Managers and getting confirming information
- Building depots may be dark and not easily accessible
- Building depots may be dirty and have loose recycling materials or garbage in the area.

THE PROJECT SCOPE

This project is broken into two (2) sections:

1. Best Practice Level for Carts
2. The Multi-Residential Workshop.

PART 1 --- BEST PRACTICE LEVEL FOR CARTS

The City of Peterborough partnered with Trent University regarding this task. The students were given a series of tasks to be performed by the end of March 2012. The students prepared a report as to why buildings in their project would require more carts or would be able to justify why the building does not need to comply with Best Practice levels. Unfortunately, not all 46 buildings were audited by the Trent students and not all information was captured on the final reports. Therefore, City staff had to visit or revisit almost every building, making some of the work performed by the Trent students unnecessary. This was more time demanding for City staff to perform these tasks.

BUILDING EVALUATIONS

In December 2011, students from the Environmental Studies program at Trent University were asked to pick eight (8) buildings out of the 46 target buildings and perform a series of tasks as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Tasks Performed by Trent students

Task	Details	Timeline
Data Collection	Verify data that was previously research in 2009/2010. An evaluation form was distributed to students to complete. Details such as: contact information, owner and property manager information, building information such as number of units, demographics, collection day, number of carts, indoor or outdoor depot and serial number of carts.	January 2012
Visual Performance Evaluation	A visual audit on the fullness of the carts, contamination, stream mixing, accessibility, overflowing carts and if any loose materials were around the carts was performed. Old cart labels were removed and replaced with new graphic cart labels. New posters were placed around the buildings.	January 2012
Barrier Evaluation	An evaluation was also performed regarding, contamination, stream mixing, and if cardboard was flattened or not	January 2012
Recycling Area Evaluation	An audit regarding the location of the carts (indoor or outdoor), accessibility to tenants, depot area well lit, cleanliness, loose materials around carts, if carts are overflowing and if the carts were labelled (containers or paper products)	January 2012
Survey Tenants	Lobby displays were set-up and tenants were surveyed. Old recycling bags were distributed to those tenants that participated in the survey.	January / February 2012
Visual Performance; Barrier and Recycling Area Evaluations	Above evaluations were performed at the buildings once again to determine if recycling increased after educational efforts were concluded.	March 2012
Final Report	Trent University students were responsible for completing a report at the end of this project. From the above data, the students were to determine if more recycling carts were required at each building or to justify why they felt the building did not require any further carts.	April 2012

Table 4: Tasks Performed by City staff

Task	Details	Timeline
Cart Labels	New graphic cart labels were developed and printed	February 2012
Posters	New Multi-Residential posters were developed and printed	April 2012
Upon receiving copies of the reports from the Trent students, it was found that not all information was captured and final visual waste audits were not performed on many of the buildings. Therefore, City staff visited 29 of the 46 buildings targeted in the project to capture missing information.		
Visual Performance Evaluation	A visual audit on the fullness of the carts, contamination, stream mixing, accessibility, overflowing carts and if any loose materials were around the carts was performed. Old cart labels were removed and replaced with new graphic cart labels. New posters were placed around the buildings.	May / June 2012
Barrier Evaluation	An evaluation was also performed regarding, contamination, stream mixing, and if cardboard was flattened or not	May / June 2012
Recycling Area Evaluation	An audit regarding the location of the carts (indoor or outdoor), accessibility to tenants, depot area well lit, cleanliness, loose materials around carts, if carts are overflowing and if the carts were labelled (containers or paper products)	May / June 2012
Photographs	Photographs of buildings were taken to enter into the Multi-Residential database	May / June 2012
Recycling Bags	New graphic recycling bags (5,000) were developed and received	July 2012
Multi-Res Database	The database was updated to reflect new information	3rd Quarter 2012

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

TABLE 5 lists the buildings that are currently at Best Practice level. There are ninebuildings at this level and therefore, they do NOT require more carts

- Threeof these buildings purchased more carts to bring their building to the best practice level after attending the Multi-Residential Workshop.
- Four of these buildings purchased carts after discussions with City staff about the need of more carts for their buildings
- Two buildings were at Best Practice level already

Name & Street		**Units**	**Building Carts**	**Best Practice Requirement**
1	Aylmer Court – 303 Aylmer Street	96	18	14
2	Chamberlain Place Apartments – 467 Chamberlain Street	30	4	4
3	Charlotte Towers – 245 Charlotte Street	122	18	17
4	Lincoln West Apartments – 885 Clonsilla Avenue	30	6	4
5	Hilliard Park Homes – 800 Hilliard Street	33	5	5
6	Kiwanis Scotts Plains Housing – 951 Hilliard Street	40	6	6
7	333 / 335 Stewart Street	17	3	2
8	Kingswood Court – 1200 Talwood Drive	115	17	16
9	Stornaway Place – 1 Stornoway Place	126	18	18
Total		609	95	86
Average litres per unit			56	50

TABLE 5: Buildings at Best Practice Level

Table 6 lists the buildings that are not at the Best Practice Level, but more carts are deemed not necessary because Best Practices do not apply. There are 26 buildings at this level.

- There are a large number of seniors in Peterborough and 19 of these buildings are senior buildings with usually only one person living in an apartment. Consequently, less recycling is generated than in a typical multi-residential dwelling. For this reason and because audits indicate carts are not over-capacity, it is felt that these buildings do not require more carts.

- The remaining seven (7) buildings have a number of empty carts, so additional carts are not required. City staff will need to determine how to increase recycling in these buildings as these are "family" buildings and should be filling the carts regularly.

Name & Street		Units	Building Carts	Best Practice Requirement
1	*Auburn Retirement Village – 931 Armour Road	60	7	9
2	*Cathedral Court – 333 Brock Street	110	12	16
3	*Rivulet Courtyard – 205 Charlotte Street	98	8	14
4	*Summit Place - 1818 Cherryhill Road	39	4	6
5	*Kawartha Glen Condo's – 869 Clonsilla Avenue	75	10	11
6	Kawartha Place – 899 Clonsilla Avenue	103	12	15
7	Pathway Apartments – 909 Clonsilla Avenue	110	10	16
8	*Brooklawn (Ptbo Housing) – 486 Donegal Street	100	11	14
9	*Riverview Apartments – 110 Douro Street	32	4	5
10	*Kinsmen Garden Court – 831 Dutton Road	66	8	9
11	*Park Place Apartments – 470 George Street South	103	13	15
12	*Kingsford – 235 King Street	92	9	13
13	Peterborough Place West – 1837 Lansdowne Street	40	3	6
14	TVM Manor – 294 McDonnel Street	85	8	12
15	*Marycrest at Inglewood – 1565 Monaghan Road	60	7	9
16	*Park Towers Apartments – 1601 Monaghan Road	78	10	11
17	*St. Giles Senior's Residence – 775 Park Street South	48	4	7
18	Parkhill Apartments – 701 Parkhill Road West	78	10	11
19	*Rogers Court Apartments (Ptbo Housing) – 611 Rogers	90	10	13
20	*Churchill Manor Apartments – 421 Sheridan Street	105	13	15
21	The Old Bakery Factory – 225 Stewart Street	32	3	5
22	*Cambridge Court – 1189 Talwood Court	103	14	15
23	*Goodfellow Towers – 839 Talwood Court	103	11	15
24	Tarawood Place – 2199 Walker Avenue	116	13	17
25	*St. John's Centre – 440 Water Street	106	7	15
26	*The Maples – 1111 Water Street	39	5	6
Total		2,071	226	300
Average litres per unit			39	52

TABLE 6: Extra Carts Deemed Unnecessary *** indicates a "Senior" building**

Table 7 lists the buildings that are not at Best Practice Level and which should purchase more carts to achieve it. There are 11buildings in this category.

- At most of the buildings, the carts were full or almost full.
- Storage is an issue at some buildings; they do not have space for more.
- Castlewood Place was a mess – the bins were completely full and heavily contaminated. BFI picked up the bins and city staff made special arrangements with MRF staff to empty and sort material. We provided educational materials to each tenant in this building (letter, recycling bag, Stream 1 and 2 recycling brochure). Posters were placed inside the building and at the depot as well. Follow-up visits to this site have found that the building is performing at a much better rate.
- A personal telephone call was made to each of the building superintendents below asking them to attend our Multi-Residential Workshop. Almost half of this group registered for the workshop but only a couple attended.

Name & Street		**Units**	**Building Carts**	**Best Practice Requirement**
1	Argyle Street – 49 Argyle Street	27	3	4
2	D.C.M. Apartments – 171 Dublin Street	26	3	4
3	Valley High Apartments – 333 Hedonics Road	131	17	19
4	Otonabee Place Apartments – 240 King Street	86	9	12
5	Westlake Towers (Ptbo housing) 169 Lake Street	125	11	18
6	Hillmar Apartments – 181 Marina Blvd.	43	5	6
7	Bonnerworth Lodge – 550 McDonnel Street	40	5	6
8	The Montcalm Apartments – 417 Montcalm Drive	60	7	9
9	Cavendish Apartments – 389 Murray Street	41	4	6
10	Myrtle Terrace – 200 St. Luke's Avenue	60	7	9
11	Castlewood Place – 1833 Willowcreek Blvd.	56	6	8
Total		695	77	101
Average litres per unit			47	61

TABLE 7: Buildings not at Best Practice Level

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH TOTAL CART CAPACITY

As noted, the best practice recommendation is based on averages and it recognizes that some buildings will require more or less than this to have an optimized recycling program. The total number of carts in Peterborough is 960 to service 6,400 multi-residential units. This provides the Best Practices recommended average of 1 cart for every 7 (or 50 litres per unit).

BENCHMARKING

Before 2009 / 2010 The City of Peterborough had no reliable data on multi-Residential units. Therefore, revisiting these sites in 2012 was helpful in improving the City's Multi-residential database. It was also helpful to re-connect with the property managers and educate them on what the Waste Management department could assist with.

It was noted that there were not any drastic changes in the audit and barrier evaluations in the buildings.

VISUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS, BARRIER EVALUATIONS AND REYCLING AREA EVALUATIONS

These tasks were performed during the winter months, and the carts that were stored outside had a layer of ice on them which made it difficult to perform the visual audits of the carts. This would be a barrier to tenants at these buildings, especially if the tenant was a senior as they may not have the strength to remove the ice.

Some multi-residential buildings suffer from high levels of stream mixing and contamination. This is a common problem with the blue box recycling program and if the blue box is visibly contaminated or the streams are mixed, the material will not be picked up. Items found during the audits are found below.

Common Stream Mixing	Common Contaminants	
• Plastic grocery bags in the containers stream • Gable tops (juice / milk containers) in the paper stream • Styrofoam in paper • Tetra paks	• Potato chip bags • Clothes hangers • Stretch wrap • Paper towels and tissues • Wooden orange crates • Coffee cup lids • Ziploc bags • Styrofoam Packets that soak up blood/juices from meat • Plastic cutlery • Lint / fabric softener sheets • Wooden bowl • Pringle Can	• Cheese wrapper • Straws • Bubble wrap • Records • Waxed cardboard • Foam packaging • Hard plastic packaging • Plastic storage bins • Prescription drug pkg • Coloured tissue paper • DVD package • Broken glass • Fast food drink cups

LOBBY DISPLAYS

The Trent University students performed lobby displays at buildings that would allow them to do so. The Trent students were hoping to educate residents about 2 streams and to gather general information through surveys that they developed.

The students found that there is frustration from tenants who don't take the time to sort their recycling properly. It appears that non-recyclers and poor recyclers are barriers to recycling attitudes and they wanted nothing to do with the survey.

The students felt that for the senior buildings if there was recycling collection on each floor it may increase the recycling and greatly help older people.

It was a challenge or issue to get residents to participate in the outreach activity. But, the biggest challenge was contacting property managers. Some were unreceptive and would not return calls.

DATA MAINTENANCE

In 2010, CIF had arranged for the City of Peterborough to receive the Multi-Residential Database in Access.

After the visits to the 46 non-compliant buildings, this was a perfect time to confirm the information previously captured in the database.

- Number of carts and serial numbers of the carts were confirmed
- Building Owner, Property Manager and Superintendent information was confirmed
- Collection day, demographics of building and number of units were confirmed
- Photographs were taken of each building

NEXT STEPS

In the Spring of 2013, the Waste Management Department has listed as an objective of the department to revisit these 46 multi-residential buildings. It is hoped that with the placement of the new posters and graphic cart labels that the recycling levels at each building would increase. It is also hoped that the stream mixing and contamination levels have decreased.

PART II --- MULTI-RESIDENTIAL WORKSHOP

A Multi-Residential Workshop was held on September 11, 2012 with the objective of having Property Managers and Superintendents attend the workshop. The objectives of the workshop were to teach this group:

- Build a better understanding of why it is so important to recycle more.
- Learn practical ways to increase recycling
- Provide an opportunity for them to share what has worked in their buildings and for them to learn from others
- Be able to estimate how much their building is recycling and set goals and track their progress

GOALS & OBJECTIVES

GOAL OF MULTI-RESIDENTIAL WORKSHOP

1. Provide a recycling training workshop to Property Managers and Superintendents at the non-compliant buildings to build a better understanding of why it is so important to recycle more.
2. A goal of 12 – 14 participants to attend this workshop is our target. .

PROJECT OBJECTIVE

1. Deliver a pilot workshop for multi-residential building property managers and superintendents.
2. Invite some of the larger buildings that have been experiencing problems with contamination and stream mixing in the caddies as reported by BFI, the City's contractor.

TARGET AUDIENCE

TARGET AUDIENCE

Following on the results of Part I of this project, all 46 non-compliant buildings were invited to the workshop. A focus was on the 11 buildings that were felt to require more carts to bring them to Best Practice Level. A personal telephone call was made to each superintendent and owner (if needed) of the 11 buildings to invite them to the workshop. A letter was e-mailed to them upon request.

The Manager of Housing for Peterborough agreed to let Janelle Carey attend a quarterly meeting with all the Social Housing Providers in attendance. During this meeting, the importance of the workshop was discussed and invitations were made. This was a huge opportunity to get our message out early, with the support of the Housing Division in Peterborough. The Housing Department also sent out with the minutes of their meeting, the information regarding the workshop to all the buildings in their portfolio.

Another objective was to contact some of the larger buildings that had been having some issues with BFI, the City's recycling contractor. Superintendents were told about the upcoming free workshop; they seemed quite interested but needed the go-ahead from head office. Therefore, some of the larger Multi-Residential unit owners such, as AON, TVM Properties and Don McPherson were contacted to explain the program and ask that their superintendents be allowed to attend. All of these owners agreed that they would allow their superintendents to attend. A follow-up telephone call to Superintendents, found that in actuality, the owners never passed along the permission for their superintendents to attend this workshop.

Approximately 70 telephone calls were made to various individuals, with follow-up calls and e-mails sent as well.

THE PROJECT SCOPE

CONTENT

CIF held a "Train the Trainers" workshop to teach municipal staff how to run their own multi-residential workshop. Betty Muise was the instructor for this course. The City of London hired Betty Muise to teach the pilot multi-res workshop and had successful results. Therefore, Betty Muise was also contracted to be the instructor for the workshop being held in Peterborough.

The City of Peterborough customized the presentation to fit Peterborough's program and to make a shorter-length workshop.

SUPERINTENDENT HANDBOOKS

In order to deliver the workshop, The City of Peterborough wanted to give each participant a Superintendent Handbook to take with them as a reference tool. CIF had developed a draft handbook to help municipalities as well as keeping consistency between all Ontario municipalities. Therefore, this draft was customized for the City of Peterborough's programs. We worked with a designer that CIF had suggested. This designer had worked on a number of other municipalities handbooks. The printed handbooks were delivered in August, 2012 in time for the workshop in September.

FORMAT

Discussions were held with Anne Boyd regarding what worked well with London's workshop, lessons learned, length, number of attendees and how the workshop was promoted. After these discussions, a format was developed to suit Peterborough.

It was decided to start the day at Peterborough's Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). This way participants could meet at this location, have a tour of the MRF and the Household Hazardous Waste Depot and then proceed to the Library for the training part of the workshop.

The presentation format was as follows:

- Module 1 – General Overview
  - Purpose of workshop, agenda, format, introductions and an activity for all participants

- Module 2 – Why Recycle More
  -Did you know?, Peterborough information, what happens to recyclables, MRF Overview and facts

- Module 3 – What's Possible
  - Recycling makes a difference, legislation, activity, capture rates challenges, successes

- Module 4 – Options for Improvement
  - steps to successful recycling, making it work for you, create a place, supply enough containers, calculate containers, activity, make collection easy, promote recycling and contamination

- Module 5 – My Next Steps
  - Estimating, setting goals and tracking progress and wrap up

At the end of the workshop, promotional tools were set-out for each building, which included:

- new graphic recycling bags for each tenant
- superintendent handbook
- posters for the recycling rooms
- recycling guides for each tenant – these go with the bags
- graphic labels for the carts

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

WORKSHOP DETAILS

The length of the workshop was a half day, beginning with a tour of the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) at 9:00 a.m., and ending with lunch at 1:00 p.m. It was felt that a longer workshop would be a barrier to many superintendents attending.

25 participants enrolled for the workshop. Four people were "no shows" and two individuals called and cancelled due to health reasons. Therefore, 19 individuals were in attendance. Of this number, the following is a break-down:

Position	Number
Superintendents / Property Managers – those that do the recycling in the building	12
Owners or those in Charge – do not do the recycling – have others do it	7

EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP FROM PARTICIPANTS

The overall comments were all outstanding and the workshop was deemed to be very successful. Some comments stated

- Best Workshop ever attended
- very engaging and excellent exchange
- concise and to the point
- Very informative

All those that attended the workshop said that they would recommend the workshop to others. All attendees rated the usefulness of the workshop in the High to Very High category.

WHAT WORKED WELL

- MRF Tour - It was felt that the MRF tour is a very valuable teaching tool – people had no idea about the recycling process and it definitely helped bring everything together, seeing first-hand what happens at the facility. Some stated that they wished this was longer and more detailed.
- Having Betty Muise as the facilitator of this workshop worked extremely well. She is knowledgeable, likeable and a great adult instructor. Betty was key to the success of this event.
- Interaction with Others – another comment that was made numerous times was the sharing of information and finding out that other superintendents were experiencing the same problems as they themselves were – they were not alone.
- Hands-On Activities – the activities that were done as a group were ranked high as well

CHANGES TO THE NEXT WORKSHOP

The first change that would be made would be to let participants know that safety shoes / boots are required for the tour of the MRF. Although the tour went on as planned, this should have been advised to individuals and was overlooked.

One of the hands-on activities was the sorting of recyclables. Our bag had a large number of items that were recyclable materials but only a few that were actually garbage. Next time, more garbage items will be included.

There was no parking at the Peterborough Library and a number of the participants received parking tickets. This was taken care of, but next time arrangements will be made to have the parking looked after, or an alternate facility will be found.

A bus tour of the landfill, taking participants to the "tip" to show them the garbage that is produced on a regular basis would be most helpful and interesting. However, this would increase the time of the workshop and may not be feasible.

GOALS REACHED

The goal of the workshop was to have 12 – 14 participants attend the day of the workshop. Therefore, having 19 participants in attendance exceed our goal.

Following the workshop in September 2012, 13 carts were purchased. With the purchase of these carts, four buildings were brought to the best practice level. These buildings are listed in Part I under Table 5 – Buildings at Best Practice Level and not requiring carts. Without the purchase of these carts, these buildings would have been listed under Table 7 – Buildings not at Best Practice Level and required to purchase section.

- Aylmer Court
- Charlotte Towers
- Hilliard Park
- Stornaway

NEXT STEPS

The City of Peterborough plans to hold at least one (more would be better) workshop in 2013. Spring and Fall Workshops would be ideal. Betty Muise is an excellent facilitator for these workshops and having her do the instruction is key. This is completely dependent upon budgets.

We will also be working on getting the new graphic recycling bags, new graphic cart labels, and posters out to the other buildings that were not part of the workshop.

COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The tools that were used for the workshop in the multi-residential project were as follows:

Recycling Bag

- This bag has recycling information - Stream 1 – Containers on the front of the bag and Stream 2 – Paper Products and Film Plastic on the back of the bag.
- The bag is colourful and easy to read
- The bag is washable, so if something leaks, it can be easily cleaned
- The bag has the City information included on it for easy reference
- The material will hold recyclable materials (laminated, woven polypropylene gloss finish) until ready to deposit into the carts
- The dimensions of the bag are: height – 40 cm, width – 42 cm; depth – 18 cm and will have a 30 litre capacity. The bag is 100% total recycled content.
- These bags were given out at the workshop to participants.

Resident Flyers

- Recycling Moments flyers were handed out by the Trent University students and also at the workshops.
- This flyer lists Stream 1 and Stream 2 materials with images and written verbiage
- This flyer also lists items that are not to be recycled – these items were found in the visual waste audits performed in the baseline data in 2009.
- This flyer also has a spot about Peterborough Recycling and how it is good for the environment.
- The last section of the flyer is devoted to electronic recycling information

Posters

- Recycling Moments Posters were placed around the multi-residential buildings (with the permission of the Property Managers) by the Trent Students.
- Large posters with visual graphics that display Stream 1 – Container Items and Stream 2 – Paper Products and Film Plastic were placed above the carts
- These posters were also distributed to those that attended the workshop.

Cart Labels

- New graphic labels for the carts were purchased and were placed on each cart. These labels have visual graphic images that display The City of Peterborough Stream 1 and Stream 2 materials.
- These new graphic labels were also distributed at the workshop.

Superintendent Booklet

- A booklet was produced and given out to all those in attendance of the Multi-Residential Workshop.
- This booklet will give each Property Manager valuable tools to help with recycling practices in their buildings. .

BUDGET

BUDGET: CIF Project 565.4 (Approved)

Work Description	Unit	Number of Units	Cost per Unit	Funding requested based on 50% of Cost
Site visits, performance evaluation (Cost of $35/building)	Building	45	$70	$1,575
Increase collection capacity to 50 litres per unit = 1 cart/7 units on average • Carts and labels • Funded at 50%	Carts	130	$65	$4,200
Customize & Print Superintendents Handbook	Handbook	1	$3,500	$1,750
Develop Superintendents Workshop			$5,000	$2,500
Total funding (inclusive of taxes)				$10,176

BUDGET (Actual)

ITEM	QUANTITY	COMMENTS	ACTUAL TIMELINE	COST
2-stream Posters	1,000	Printing of Posters	April 2012	$234.76
95 Gallon Carts	136	Purchase carts	February 2012	$6,704.10
Cart Labels	3,000	1,500 of each stream	December 2012	$6,203.70
Superintendent Handbook	n/a	Design handbook	July 2012	$550.00
Superintendent Handbook	500	Print handbook	August 2012	$1,344.70
Workshop Facility	n/a	Peterborough Library	September 2012	$61.02
Workshop Facilitator	n/a	Training of PM's in multi-res buildings	September 2012	$1,953.51
Workshop Food	28		September 2012	$336.32
TOTAL				**$17,388.11**

SCHEDULING

TIMETABLE

TASK	DETAILS	TIMELINE
Trent Student Meetings	Get instructions and building information	December 2011
Data Collection	Confirm Building and Contact Information - given by City	December 2011
Visual Waste Audit	Visual performance evaluation of carts at each building – see form with information Cleaning & labelling of carts Get serial numbers of carts	January 2012
Outreach – Property Manager (PM)	This can be done when collecting data or when visit the building. How does PM feel regarding purchasing more carts?	December or January 2012
Outreach – tenants	Set-up time with PM to either go door-to-door or do lobby display Give out recycling bags & resident flyers Talk to residents about recycling, give out survey Place posters around building	February 2012
Final Visual Audit	Visual performance evaluation done again (same as initial one)	March 2012
Evaluation	Evaluation of building carts Does the building require more? If not, give reasons why no carts are necessary to purchase Final report due to Trent University	March 2012
Training / Workshop	Training of PM's at each building and handing out Superintendent handbooks	September 2012

SCHEDULING

TASK	TOOLS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY	TARGET DATE
95 Gallon Carts	Speedco (Multi-Municipal Tender)	12 weeks	Janelle	February 2012
Superintendent Handbook	The Design Loft	3 months	Janelle	May 2012
Design of Multi-Res Posters and Handbooks	The Design Loft	1 month	Janelle	June 2012
Printing of Superintendent Handbooks	Commercial Press	1 month	Janelle	August 2012
Training / Workshop	Betty Muise – CIF	3 – 6 months	Janelle	September 2012

CIF PROJECT 565.4 CONCLUSIONS

PART I CONCLUSIONS & RESULTS --- BEST PRACTICE LEVEL FOR CARTS

- The City determined 19 of the 46 non-compliant buildings were non-compliant because Best Practices do not apply. Buildings that house seniors, single tenants and/or have unused capacity were identified as not having the standard Best Practices applied.
  - ❖ Peterborough is a unique community and the latest census figures from Statistics Canada show nearly one if five people in Peterborough are aged 65 or older (2011) which is 19.5%. This is the highest ratio in the Country among municipalities.
- 11 of the 46 non-compliant buildings were determined to require additional carts and information to help them achieve this.
- 7 buildings where carts were not used to capacity need additional study to see if tenants are recycling all they can.
- Established a far superior database for our Multi-Residential Program.
- Established a better rapport with many Multi-Residential owners and superintendents.

PART II CONCLUSIONS & RESULTS --- MULTI-RESIDENTIAL WORKSHOP

- Established a format for holding successful networking and educational opportunities which we can build upon.
- Successfully educated participants on the fundamentals of recycling
- Encouraged 4 buildings to purchase additional carts to achieve Best Practice levels.
- Distributed promotional and educational materials to several buildings.
- Learned from participants at the workshop that visual graphic images is more effective than wording