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**PROGRAM EVOLUTION**

- Drop-offs, voluntary added fee recycling, education
- Embedded recycling, MF and commercial ed. / assistance, expanded D/O
- PAYT with embedded rates, yard waste, commercial programs, continued ed.
- Add Food scraps to res., mandates and bans, address MF recycling
- Every-other-week MSW, mandatory commercial and MF, EPR, zero waste

---

**PAYT - EFFECTIVE AND COST-EFFECTIVE**

- Biggest Impact (statistically)
  - 1/3 of the effect costs ZERO (SR)
  - PAYT needs NO SEPARATE FUNDING – paid by users (more equitably)
  - No increase in costs (or workloads) for 2/3 communities (short / long run) (2 state surveys)
  - Cheap for reduction of both GHG and Landfills

---
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EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE PROGRAM OPTIONS / “WINNERS”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Diversion Impact</th>
<th>Strong Cost Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay As You Throw (PAYT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Other Week (EOW)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate week YW</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Stream, fewer streams; containers</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandates and Bans</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other as well: analyzed containers, sign-ups, charge structures, same day. Curbside, landfill costs, etc.


PAYT ACCEPTANCE

- Preferred by households as More Fair
  - Surveys in multiple communities – after PAYT: 89%-95%
  - PARADE™: 2/3 in favor

- Strengths / weaknesses
  - Key Advantages: Rewards all diversion activities
  - Disadvantages: Concerns about illegal dumping, equity (low income, large families), MF (see FAQs)

- Key Advantages: Behavior / reminder, choice, Utility, equity
- Disadvantages: Change...
- Key Advantages: Costs & savings - “Net” depends on local conditions
- Disadvantages: More complex rate study, outreach

- Key Advantages: Works in variety of systems, tailor
- Disadvantages: NEEDS NO SEPARATE FUNDING!

PAYT– HOW THE BASIC SYSTEM TYPES WORK

- Variable cans/subscription
- Bags, tags, stickers
- Hybrid
- Weight based
- Drop-off
- Recycling rebates

Drivers

- Citizen demand / Politics
- Diversion (tons)
- Total Cost and Cost efficiency
- Other environmental impacts (GHG, toxicity, resources)
- Many others...

Scores of potential choices

HOW TO GET PAYT IN PLACE

- Municipalization
  - Do it yourself, local decision-making, local action

- Ordinance
  - If multiple haulers servicing area and want minimal disruption in service providers

- Contracting / districting / franchising
  - If multiple haulers servicing area and want economies of scale, single provider

PAYT: SOME STATE EXAMPLES

... BUT PAYT not all created equal
Differentials, services embedded...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>Res and Com'l PAYT; by ordinance 100% diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder (2000)</td>
<td>53% (32% R) $23/36/48, optional bags / EOW trash; YW + FW, EOW SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>26% (8% incr w/PAYT) $22/34/46, optional trash bags; YW in designated areas by ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango (2010)*</td>
<td>55% (35% R) $26/49/58, weekly SS Rcy weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden (2010)</td>
<td>Goal 25% Contracts / RFPs; $7/11/17; also super-saver EOW $5.42 or $2.65 bag; SS wkly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>60% (37% R) $10/15 for 64s; 95's are $13/21/33/51; SS EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette (2007)*</td>
<td>~26% R $8.15/22; SS EOW, contracts and tracking; considering adding YW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville (2009)</td>
<td>60% (37% R) $12/19/26 but many options (extra for more YW); SS EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton**</td>
<td>14% C/S $13.50/16/25/34; 2x/mo recycling;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See more case studies in previous webinar slides, or on the website case studies, or in PAYT manuals / documents we've prepared for the EPA, or States of Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, California, Wyoming, SSEB, CONEG, or others... Or request a peer-match on www.paytnow.org.

CASE STUDY: FORT COLLINS – “ORDINANCE”

- 140K residents, NW of Denver
- Trash Collection in Fort Collins
  - Privatized (i.e., “open subscription”); 3 companies
- Ordinances 1992, 1995; sets PAYT

FLEXIBILITY IN IMPLEMENTATION

- Four varied examples
- We’ve assembled MANY other case studies and projects in most of the 47+ states and provinces with PAYT. See website, and manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>Ordinance Mid-sized city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater, CO</td>
<td>Contract Small, urban area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Lake</td>
<td>Drop-off Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>Added points system Mid-sized city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See more case studies in previous webinar slides, or on the website case studies, or in PAYT manuals / documents we've prepared for the EPA, or States of Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, California, Wyoming, SSEB, CONEG, or others... Or request a peer-match on www.paytnow.org.
THE ORDINANCE

- Haulers must:
  - Minimum 33-gallon unit, embed recycling
  - Sets price ratios (100% base unit)
  - Yearly education; annual Recy Plan listing rates, records available for inspection & to verify PAYT implemented
  - Report volumes collected bi-annually
  - Violations = fines plus risk of losing license
  - Includes HOAs
- 85-95% participation, 33% diversion (19% recy, EOW Recy)
- Note – sustainability goals - recycling / PAYT / solid waste strategies responsible for largest share of 5 year progress

EDGEWATER, CO

- Small urban community (2,000 HH)
- Municipal collection, no curbside recycling, unlimited trash
- Diversion rate around 6-7%
- Trash rates at $12.50/hh/month

EDGEWATER TODAY

- Took two years but the city decided to switch to a single contract with PAYT
- No loss of jobs for City staff
- EOW Super Saver - $8, 32-gallon $10, 64-gallon $15, 95-gallon $20
- All prices include embedded recycling
- Recycling rates are in the range of 17-18% in the first three months! (Tripled recycling)

GRAND LAKE, CO

- Small rural town (population <1,000)
- Large tourist population, second home owners
- Issues:
  - illegal dumping,
  - Human wildlife interaction
  - funding recycling,
  - appearance of town
WHAT HAPPENED?

- Ad-hoc committee to study the issue
- First try – mand. service
- Settled on PAYT – illegal dumping reduction
- Went out to bid with three options
  - Build their own facility (drop-off)
  - Lease a facility and town runs program
  - Contract with a hauler
- Chose to build, run their own facility

WHAT HAPPENED?

- Charge $4.00 per bag ($.50 to vendor, rest to town)
- Implementation was easy- some illegal dumping at the start
- Already getting cash flow for the program
- Very popular, very positive feedback (citizens and vendors)
- Planning on using revenues to set up recycling program

LOVELAND – BEYOND PAYT

- Very mature PAYT – 1st in State
  - $5.50/$11/$16.50; 17 gal $2.75, SS EOW
- Municipal service (95+%)  
- Diversion:
  - 61% overall, but 26% recycling – want to do more to get more materials out of disposal
- Single stream doing well –

LOVELAND – BEYOND PAYT

- Single stream (EOW) doing well... Want more
  - RecycleBank™ – low cost to City; community-wide type: background on RecycleBank™
  - Good price, RB added many LOCAL partners
  - Implemented in July; Too early for results

For more info:
See 2-part article in Feb/Mar 2011 Resource Recycling Addressing PAYT, RB And Recy Credits...
IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS

- Service delivery
  - Muni, contract (bid or RFP), franchise, district, ordinance
  - Also drop-off options
- PAYT system type
  - Can, bag, tag, hybrid, etc.
  - Existing... future plan
  - Capabilities & resources (billing, containers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Pros</th>
<th>Contract Pros (similar for munic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Hauler (“Taking”) &amp; Lower Cost / bills</td>
<td>Fewer Hauler (“Taking”) &amp; Lower Cost / bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can specify rate structure, implement the program and provides services, including options for rates – each implement the program and provides services, including options for rates – each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (contract) can implement the program and provides services, including options for rates – each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can designate facility destination for materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizen Complaints (“Choice”)
- Maintains competition
- No need for “notice”
- Quick
- Can specify rate “structure”
- Can designate facility destination for materials
- Can “designate” facility destinations for materials
- Fewer trucks, “cleaner” set outs, reduced wear/tear on streets
- One hauler to contact if problems arise.
- City control including rates/setting; revenues
- Can “designate” facility destinations for materials

IMPLEMENTATION – THE BARRIER

- Makes sense… why not in place more?
- Technical issues rarely the problem
- Public process, public education crucial.
- Politics, political will is THE key stumbling block
  - Suggestions from communities, & champion
  - Negatives manageable if political will

Recently finished working with small CO community on new service provision arrangement and PAYT – took ~6 months, (others, years)... political will!!

Maybe also consider renaming!!

THANK YOU!!
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