

**CROW WING COUNTY  
LAND SERVICES  
2012 RECYCLING REPORT**

April 10, 2013  
Douglas R. Morris  
Crow Wing County Solid Waste Coordinator



**Land Services Department**

Mark B. Liedl.....Land Services Director

**Environmental Services**

Christopher Pence.....Land Services Supervisor

Douglas R. Morris.....Solid Waste Coordinator

Paul Herkenhoff, PLS.....Survey Coordinator

**Property Valuation and Classification**

Gary Griffin.....Land Services Supervisor

**Public Land Management**

Kirk Titus.....Land Services Supervisor

Office of Environmental Services  
15728 State Highway 210  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Telephone (218) 824-1290

FAX (218) 824-1291

Doug.Morris@crowwing.us

**CROW WING COUNTY**

April 12, 2013

RE: Crow Wing County 2012 Recycling Report

For your information the, 2012 Recycling Report has been incorporated onto the County web site. To find it, please go to the Crow Wing County Web site [www.co.crow-wing.mn.us](http://www.co.crow-wing.mn.us) and type in "recycling report." It should bring you right to it. The Report presents the 2012 data on recycling within the County, discussions on the other SCORE programs, and presents a number of conclusions and recommendations. If you require a hard copy please contact our office.

Overall, we are over the state recycling goal of 35% - projected to be 46%. We did see an increase in the overall recycling by 2,896 tons or 9.9% from 2011. The commercial area increased from 22,720 tons in 2011 to 25,552 tons in 2012 – an increase of 2,832 tons or a 12.5% increase. The residential area dropped from 5,150 tons in 2011 to 4,962 tons in 2012 – a reduction of 180 tons or a 3.7% reduction. Overall, the commercial sector (including both the self-marketing and local haulers) accounted for 80% of our total recycling tonnage in 2012.

As the Report indicates, we continue to make excellent progress relating to residential recycling. If you see any errors, areas not covered, and/or comments on improving this Report, please contact me. We are always looking for ideas to improve this Report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Douglas R. Morris'. The signature is stylized with a large 'D' and a long horizontal stroke.

Douglas R. Morris

Crow Wing County Solid Waste Coordinator

Enclosures: Notification List

**OUR MISSION:**

To provide high quality, cost-effective public services in a friendly and respectful manner.



**2012 RECYCLING REPORT  
CROW WING COUNTY**

**Notification List**

**Landfill Operator**

Marvin Stroschein  
Crow Wing County MMSW Landfill  
15732 Hwy. 210  
Brainerd, Minnesota 56401

**SCORE Fund Recipients**

**Curbside Collection Programs**

Jeremy Vacinek, Finance Director  
City of Baxter  
P.O. Box 2626  
Baxter, MN 56425

Theresa Goble, Administrator  
City of Brainerd  
501 Laurel Street  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Joe Rudberg, Administrator  
City of Breezy Point  
8319 County Rd. 11  
Breezy Point, MN 56472

**Drop Off Programs**

Carol Pundt, Clerk  
Bay Lake Township  
13861 County Rd 10  
Deerwood, MN 56444

Amy Baratto, Clerk  
CID Recycling Committee  
P.O. Box 97  
Ironton, MN 56455



(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Jennifer Max, Clerk/Treasurer  
Crosslake Recycling  
37028 County Rd. 66  
Crosslake, MN 56442

Patricia Kestner, Clerk/Treasurer  
City of Emily Recycling  
P.O. Box 68  
Emily, MN 56447

Sandy Post, Clerk/Treasurer  
City of Garrison Recycling  
P.O. Box 239  
Garrison, MN 56450

Jon Plein, Clerk/Treasurer  
Ideal Township  
35458 Butternut Point Road  
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

Norene Warta, Clerk  
Maple Grove Township  
18451 County Rd 24  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Dewayne Collins  
Merrifield Lions  
16927 N Riverside Dr.  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Anna Anderson, Clerk  
Mission Township  
PO Box 126  
Merrifield, MN 56465

Laurie Hemish, Clerk/Treasurer  
City of Nisswa  
P.O. Box 410  
Nisswa, MN 56468

(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Sandra Peine, Clerk/Treasurer  
City of Pequot Lakes  
4638 County Rd 11  
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

Virginia Hill, Clerk  
Roosevelt Township  
23351 N. Platte Lake Road  
Hillman, MN 56338

Virginia Rogers, Clerk  
South West Townships  
7713 Wetherbee Rd.  
Brainerd, MN 56401

**Area Solid Waste Haulers**

Gabriel Aldridge  
AAA Disposal  
PO Box 25  
Ironton, MN 56455

Dewayne Collins  
Blue Lakes Disposal  
16927 N Riverside Dr.  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Bob Lemieur  
Bob Lemieur Roll-off, Refuse & Recycling  
14827 Pine Av  
Little Falls, MN 56345

Leigh Reiner  
Crosslake Rolloff & Recycling  
P.O. Box 695  
Crosslake, MN 56442

Chad Genz  
Emily Rolloff & Recycling  
P.O. Box 367  
Emily, MN 56447



(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Jane Edmundson  
Garrison Disposal/Nisswa Sanitation  
P.O. Box 308  
Aitkin, MN 56431

James Adrian  
Grinning Bear Rubbish Removal  
Box 86  
Pine River, MN 56474

Heather Schmit  
Hengel Ready Mix & Const, Inc.  
12883 Upper Sylvan Road SW  
Pilliger, MN 56473

James Gerads  
Jim's Mille Lacs Disposal, Inc.  
P.O. Box 367  
Emily, MN 56447

Byron Shepard  
Nisswa Rolloff  
Box 843  
Nisswa, MN 56468

Tina Chisholm  
North Country Sanitation & Rolloff  
P.O. Box 470  
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

Robert Saccoman  
Pequot Lakes Sanitation  
P.O. Box 639  
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

Shellie Wynn  
Range Disposal  
P.O. Box 535  
Deerwood, MN 56444

(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Red Rock Rolloff  
P.O. Box 1800  
Walker, MN 56484

Waste Management  
7968 Industrial Park Road S.  
Baxter, MN 56425

Eric Loge  
Waste Partners Environmental Services  
P.O. Box 677  
Pine River, MN 56474

**Area Recycling Centers**

Grant Vanwyngaeren  
Crow Wing Recycling  
714 Industrial Park Rd. SW  
Brainerd, MN 56401

**OTHERS**

Arlene Vee (SCORE)  
Policy, Local Government Assistance and  
Solid Waste Section  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
504 Fairground Rd, Suite 200  
Marshall, MN 56258

Dan Vleck (Site Engineer)  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
7678 College Road South, Suite 105  
Baxter, Minnesota 56425

Kit Grayson (Site Compliance Inspector)  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
525 Lake Ave South, Suite 400  
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Solid Waste Coordinator  
15728 State Highway 210  
Brainerd, MN 56401-5724

Mark Liedl  
Crow Wing County Land Services Director

Chris Pence  
Crow Wing County Land Services Supervisor

Terry Neff  
Aitkin County Environmental Services  
209 2nd St. NW  
Aitkin, MN 56431

Paul Fairbanks  
Cass County Environmental Services  
PO Box 3000  
Walker, MN 56484

Steve Backowski  
Morrison County Solid Waste Office  
213 SE 1st Av.  
Little Falls, MN 56345

Brian Scheinost  
Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe  
43408 Oodena Drive  
Onamia, MN 56359

Michele McPherson  
Mille Lacs County Solid Waste Office  
635 2nd Street SE  
Milaca, MN 56353

Brainerd Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce  
Attn.: Lisa Paxton  
124 North 6th Street  
Brainerd, MN 56401

(CON'D)

**Notification List**

Jennifer Stockinger  
Staff Writer  
Brainerd Dispatch  
P.O. Box 974  
Brainerd, MN 56401

C-I Courier  
P.O. Box 76  
Crosby, MN 56441

Echo  
P.O. Box 240  
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472

County Commissioners &  
County Administrator

Fred Doran, P.E.  
Burns & McDonnell  
8201 Norman Center Drive, Suite 300  
Bloomington, MN 55437

# 2012 RECYCLING REPORT CROW WING COUNTY

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL  
NOTIFICATION LIST

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY-----	1
TABLE       Recycling Program Overview	
SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION-----	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope-----	4
1.2 Program Background -----	5
1.3 Recycling Program Overview-----	7
1.4 Summation-----	10
TABLE 1.1     Residential Recycling Program Overview	
TABLE 1.2     MMSW Landfill Waste Receipts	
SECTION 2.0 SCORE/COUNTY FUNDED RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING PROGRAM	12
2.1 Background-----	12
2.2 Curbside Recycling Program-----	14
2.2.1 Baxter Program-----	14
2.2.2 Brainerd Program-----	15
2.2.3 Crosby-Ironton-Deerwood Program-----	15
2.2.4 Breezy Point Program-----	16
2.3 Drop-off Program-----	16
2.3.1 Bay Lake Township Program-----	17
2.3.2 Crosslake Program-----	17
2.3.3 Deerwood Program-----	18
2.3.4 Emily Program-----	18
2.3.5 Fifty Lakes Program-----	18
2.3.6 Garrison Program-----	19
2.3.7 Ideal Township Program-----	19
2.3.8 Maple Grove Township Program-----	19
2.3.9 Merrifield Program-----	20
2.3.10 Mission Township Program-----	20
2.3.11 Nisswa Program-----	20
2.3.12 Pequot Lakes Program-----	20
2.3.13 Roosevelt Township Program-----	21
2.3.14 South Long Lake Program-----	21
2.3.15 County Solid Waste Disposal Site-----	22
2.3.16 South West Townships Program-----	22
2.3.17 Drop-off Program Summation-----	22

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.4 Overall Residential Recycling Program Summary-----	23
TABLE 2.1 SCORE Funded Recycling Program Summary	
APPENDIX 2-A 2012 SCORE REPORT	
APPENDIX 2-B 2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (RESIDENTIAL)	
SECTION 3.0 COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL (CII) RECYCLING-----	25
3.1 Introduction-----	25
3.2 Survey for CII Recycling Effort-----	26
3.3 Large CII Recycling Efforts-----	26
3.4 Event Recycling-----	26
3.5 Overview of Entire CII Program-----	26
3.6 Summation-----	27
APPENDIX 3-A 2012 SURVEY FORM	
APPENDIX 3-B 2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (CII)	
SECTION 4.0 OTHER SOLID WASTE/NON-LANDFILL PROGRAMS-----	28
4.1 Introduction -----	28
4.2 Yard Waste-----	29
4.2.1 Christmas Tree Recycling Program-----	32
4.2.2 Brush-----	33
4.3 Hazardous Waste -----	34
4.3.1 HHW Program-----	34
4.3.2 Waste Pesticides-----	37
4.3.3 VSQG-----	39
4.3.4 Mercury Waste-----	40
4.3.5 Pharmaceutical Waste-----	41
4.3.6 Summation-----	41
4.4 Problem Materials-----	42
4.4.1 Waste Tires-----	42
4.4.2 White Goods (Household Appliances) -----	45
4.4.3 Used Oil & Used Oil Filters-----	47
4.4.4 Vehicle Batteries-----	50
4.4.4.1 Rechargeable Batteries-----	51
4.4.5 Fluorescent & HID Lamps-----	52
4.4.6 Electronic (Browngoods/e-waste) -----	53
4.5 Source Reduction-----	55
4.5.1 Lakeland Mold Sand Core Disposal-----	57
4.5.2 Bike Program-----	57
4.5.3 Materials Exchange Program-----	57
4.6 Mattress Recycling-----	58
4.7 Education -----	59
4.7.1 Coupon-----	62
4.8 Litter/Illegal Dumping-----	63

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(CONT'D)**

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
4.9	Demolition -----	67
4.9.1	Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA) Treated Wood-----	68
TABLE 4.1	CWC Hazardous Waste Program	
TABLE 4.2	Used Oil Program	
TABLE 4.3	Coupon Receipts	
TABLE 4.4	Demolition Generation Table	
	APPENDIX 4-A 2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT	
SECTION 5.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	69





## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

This Report is intended to provide an updated overview of the solid waste/non-landfill related activities as outlined in the County Solid Waste Management Plan (Update - September 2003). In addition, this Report presents data concerning the overall waste generation, recycling activities within the County, and data on the other solid waste/non-landfill related programs.

There are two significant benefits for a County to accomplish a County Solid Waste Management Plan, and have it approved by the State. First, it allows a county to receive SCORE grant funds which support the recycling efforts of our local residents. Second, and most important for the County Landfill, it determines a county's Certificate of Need (CON). In Minnesota, municipal solid waste (MSW) cannot be placed into a landfill until CON is obtained, which is written into the 10-year permit. A county CON is based upon the Goal Volume Table that is part of this Plan. This Table assumes at least a 35 percent recycling rate. If a county recycling rate is less than this, it runs the risk of running out of landfill space before their next 10-year permit. As a result, it could be forced to ship their waste out-of-county.

## **MWS/DEMOLITION GENERATION**

The County did experience a third year of a waste generation increase versus the previous four years (2006 - 2009) that showed an overall decrease of 24%. The tonnage in 2012 was 40,757, or an increase of 1.0 percent over last year. Sanitary waste tonnage peaked in 2005 at 51,855 tons. Overall, the County is at the same level of tonnage received in 2001/2002 (38,930/42,863 tons). When the industrial waste streams are removed, the County experienced an overall increase of 1.8 percent in the residential waste generated within the County for 2012.

The County also experienced an overall county wide demolition waste generation increase. Demolition waste peaked in 2005 at 134,454 cubic yards; for 2012 the total volume was 96,640 cubic yards (an overall 39.6 percent increase in volume from 2011). In 2012, the County Landfill cubic yardage was 32,769 or an increase of 136.1 percent over last year - majority of this is due to one project; demolition of the State Hospital. Other area demolition landfills in the lake area also saw a strong growth in volume.

## **RECYCLING**

The County has a well-developed residential recycling program. In addition, some local haulers have a well-developed recycling program to offer both their residential and commercial customers. Many of the larger businesses also have a well-developed recycling/waste reduction program in place. The Table on the following page shows a summation of the recycling programs within the County. The amount of recovered materials met the overall State recycling goal of 35 percent.

## **SCORE/COUNTY FUNDED – Residential Recycling**

The SCORE /County funded recycling programs showed a second year of decrease, this year it was a 3.5% in tonnage.

As outlined below, starting in 2008 the residential recycling program is becoming more important for the County to meet the State recycling goal of 35 percent.

### COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL (CII) RECYCLING

Commercial and industrial activities have always represented the largest portion of the ongoing recycling efforts within the County. In 2012, commercial/industrial documented recycling was 25,687 tons. Of that total, 14,863 tons were recycled using out-of-county recycling infrastructure. Commercial and industrial recycling accounts for 80 percent of all materials collected this year in the County. This is near the statewide average of 75 percent for CII recycling.

In 2008, two area businesses that historically accounted for 50 percent of recycling efforts closed. Prior to this, CII recycling accounted for 90 percent of the total recycling effort within the County – with the majority of this being self marketed by the individual business.

**PROBLEM MATERIALS** (Yard Waste, Waste Tires, White Goods - household appliances, Vehicle Batteries, Used Oil & Used Oil Filters, Used Electronics, and Fluorescent & HID Lamps)

The County's integrated solid waste management program addresses problem materials, and prohibition of these materials into the County Landfills. The problem material challenge consists of two main components: items that reach the end of their useful life and need to be disposed of, and those items that are in stockpiles and/or storage. In many cases, the County's problem material program compliment existing retailer programs to ensure in-depth coverage. The goal is maximum recovery, and to encourage residential participation; convenient times, location, and ease of disposal are key features of the County's program. It is felt that these programs are and will continue to be successful.

### **HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW) and other hazardous waste programs**

Programs that deal with hazardous waste provide a direct benefit to the County by offering proper disposal actions for these items to the residents/businesses of the County. Since 1990, over 684.7 tons of hazardous waste/materials were brought in through these County/State programs that would not have been otherwise. This action has greatly reduced the risk of illegal dumping, or disposal into the County Landfill. If placed in the Landfill, this quantity of chemicals would have had a profound effect on the leachate quality. If disposed of inappropriately elsewhere, these chemicals could have contaminated land, ground water or surface water, and air quality. Removal of this material from the general MSW waste stream has also minimized the health risk to waste haulers and Landfill operators. It is felt that these programs are and will continue to be successful. 2013 saw the initiation of a residential pharmaceutical program by the County.

RECYCLING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Year	Total MSW Tons Generated	Total MSW Tons into Landfill	Tons Collected for Recycling	Residential Tons Recycled SCORE Funded	Overall Cost Residential	County** Cost per Ton Residential	% of Recycling Effort	Residential Tons Recycled No SCORE Funding	% of Recycling Effort	C/I/I Tons Recycled In County Assets*	% of Recycling Effort	C/I/I Tons Recycled Self Marketed	% of Recycling Effort	C/I/I % Total	Problem/Ban Materials Tons	% of Recycling Effort	Recycling Rate	State Goal	Source Reduction Credit	Yard Waste Credit	Recycling Rate with Credits
1991	39,666	29,756	4,464	255	\$99,021	\$388.21	5.7%	0	0.0%	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	11.0%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
1992	40,706	29,886	7,230	535	\$123,250	\$230.51	7.4%	0	0.0%	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	18.0%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%
1993	44,873	30,849	10,965	777	\$148,971	\$191.81	7.1%	0	0.0%	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	24.0%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.0%
1994	47,713	34,647	14,314	1,021	\$165,460	\$162.11	7.1%	0	0.0%	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	Unk	30.0%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%
1995	50,471	34,800	12,572	1,306	\$156,149	\$119.54	10.4%	0	0.0%	10,536	83.8%	Unk	Unk	83.8%	730	5.8%	25.0%	35.0%	0.0%	5.0%	30.0%
1996	51,470	32,537	17,148	1,044	\$170,715	\$163.46	6.1%	0	0.0%	4,785	27.9%	10,446	60.9%	88.8%	873	5.1%	33.0%	35.0%	3.0%	5.0%	41.0%
1997	55,850	33,794	20,569	1,173	\$160,855	\$137.11	5.7%	0	0.0%	3,448	16.8%	14,441	70.2%	87.0%	1,507	7.3%	36.8%	35.0%	5.7%	5.0%	47.5%
1998	68,767	34,610	32,478	1,302	\$167,705	\$128.78	4.0%	6	0.0%	4,328	13.3%	25,324	78.0%	91.3%	1,518	4.7%	47.2%	35.0%	6.0%	3.0%	56.2%
1999	70,822	34,434	34,769	1,560	\$167,905	\$107.62	4.5%	26	0.1%	3,921	11.3%	28,036	80.6%	91.9%	1,226	3.5%	49.1%	35.0%	6.5%	5.0%	60.6%
2000	73,185	36,345	35,118	1,798	\$171,005	\$95.09	5.1%	25	0.1%	3,798	10.8%	28,487	81.1%	91.9%	1,009	2.9%	48.0%	35.0%	8.0%	5.0%	61.0%
2001	75,581	41,236	32,689	1,914	\$178,605	\$93.30	5.9%	56	0.2%	5,257	16.1%	24,154	73.9%	90.0%	1,308	4.0%	43.3%	35.0%	9.0%	5.0%	57.3%
2002	76,803	41,917	33,187	2,005	\$188,772	\$94.15	6.0%	72	0.2%	4,411	13.3%	25,467	76.7%	90.0%	1,232	3.7%	43.2%	35.0%	6.7%	5.0%	54.9%
2003	77,802	42,241	33,973	2,164	\$199,760	\$92.33	6.4%	180	0.5%	3,818	11.2%	26,186	77.1%	88.3%	1,625	4.8%	43.7%	35.0%	6.0%	5.0%	54.7%
2004	84,234	41,981	40,599	2,721	\$205,043	\$75.35	6.7%	163	0.4%	4,661	11.5%	31,429	77.4%	88.9%	1,625	4.0%	48.2%	35.0%	6.0%	5.0%	59.2%
2005	90,894	43,128	46,022	2,934	\$222,474	\$75.84	6.4%	197	0.4%	5,093	11.1%	36,635	79.6%	90.7%	1,164	2.5%	50.6%	35.0%	6.5%	5.0%	62.1%
2006	90,190	40,478	48,058	3,142	\$234,424	\$74.61	6.5%	224	0.5%	6,261	13.0%	36,943	76.9%	89.9%	1,488	3.1%	53.3%	35.0%	6.9%	5.0%	65.2%
2007	89,993	39,625	48,747	3,650	\$242,056	\$66.31	7.5%	265	0.5%	11,220	23.0%	32,253	66.2%	89.2%	1,359	2.8%	54.6%	35.0%	7.0%	5.0%	66.6%
2008	78,119	37,025	39,519	4,066	\$261,204	\$64.24	10.3%	362	0.9%	17,335	43.9%	16,232	41.1%	84.9%	1,524	3.9%	50.6%	35.0%	7.9%	5.0%	63.5%
2009	64,903	35,545	27,767	4,696	\$312,027	\$66.44	16.9%	431	1.6%	9,247	33.3%	11,963	43.1%	76.4%	1,430	5.1%	42.8%	35.0%	8.0%	5.0%	55.8%
2010	65,544	35,558	28,349	4,781	\$333,850	\$69.83	16.9%	444	1.6%	10,274	36.2%	11,153	39.3%	75.6%	1,697	6.0%	43.3%	35.0%	8.0%	5.0%	56.3%
2011	66,934	35,933	29,367	4,679	\$334,758	\$71.54	15.9%	471	1.6%	10,879	37.0%	11,841	40.3%	77.4%	1,497	5.1%	43.9%	35.0%	8.0%	5.0%	56.9%
2012	69,088	36,563	32,272	4,517	\$351,801	\$77.88	14.0%	445	1.4%	10,823	33.5%	14,729	45.6%	79.2%	1,623	5.0%	46.7%	35.0%	N/A***	N/A***	N/A***

\* Used data obtained from local haulers/scrap yards

\*\* This is only the cost to the County, and does not include any additional funding by the individual programs or the haulers

\*\*\* The 2012 Legislative Session Omnibus Environmental Bill eliminated these two credits

## **SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Minnesota's statewide recycling efforts began in earnest in 1989, when the Legislature adopted comprehensive legislation based on the recommendation of the Governor's Select Committee on Recycling and the Environmental (SCORE). This set of laws, commonly referred to as SCORE, initiated a "stable" source of State funding for programs for recycling, as well as waste reduction and the improved management of household hazardous wastes and problem materials. SCORE related programs are a key element of the integrated solid waste management program initiated and managed by Crow Wing County (the County) through its Solid Waste Office within Land Services.

The County's efforts on developing a solid waste system goes back over 38 years to the permitting of the County's old unlined Landfill (SW-111) that started operations in 1974. Prior to this, many of the communities within the County had their own local dump. The development of the County's integrated municipal solid waste management system goes back over 21 years to 1991 when many of the areas recycling programs were initiated and a new lined Landfill (SW-376) was constructed.

Many elements of the integrated solid waste system are located at the County's 564-acre Solid Waste Disposal Site (Site) complex located six (6) miles east of Brainerd on State Highway 210 in Oak Lawn Township. Service provided at the Site complex includes the following:

- lined Mixed Municipal Solid Waste (MMSW) Landfill (SW-376);
- Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Landfill (SW-440);
- used oil/filter and antifreeze collection facility (one of 11 located throughout the County);
- lead-acid battery collection container;
- recycling drop-off center (one of 16 located throughout the County);
- used electronics collection area;
- mattress collection area;
- household appliance and scrap metal collection area;
- used tire collection area;
- yard waste composting operation;
- brush disposal area; and a
- Household Hazardous Waste facility with product exchange.

## **1.1 Purpose and Scope**

This Report is intended to provide an updated overview of the solid waste/non-landfill related activities as outlined in the County Solid Waste Management Plan (Update - September 2003). In addition, this Report presents data concerning the overall waste generation, recycling activities within the County, and data on the other solid waste/non-landfill related programs:

- Recycling (residential and commercial);
- Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other hazardous waste programs;
- Problem Materials (Yard Waste, Waste Tires, White Goods - household appliances, Vehicle Batteries, Used Oil & Used Oil Filters, Used Electronics, and Fluorescent & HID Lamps);
- Reduce/Reuse Activities;
- Education; and
- Littering/Illegal Dumping.

The County has met the States mandated goals since 1996, and will again exceed the recycling goal of 35 percent established by the State for the non-metro areas (Greater Minnesota). This goal was to be met by December 31, 1996. The goal was reached by using documented residential recycling, commercial recycling, appliance recycling, used oil filters, used tires, documented reduce/reuse activities, and State provided estimates for used oil and vehicle batteries. The most significant factor in meeting the established goal is the accurate documentation of the commercial, industrial and institutional (CII) recycling efforts within the County.

This Report is presented in five sections:

- **Section 1.0** - The Introduction; provides a historical review of previous years and summary of the Report.
- **Section 2.0** – SCORE/County Funded Residential Recycling Programs; describe the County's requirements under the statute, and provides a brief evaluation of each of the SCORE/County funded recycling programs.
- **Section 3.0** - Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Recycling section; provides a review and discussion.
- **Section 4.0** - Other Solid Waste/Non-Landfill related programs; provides comprehensive information.
- **Section 5.0** - Provides conclusions and recommendations.

## 1.2 Program Background

Municipal solid waste (MSW), also known as garbage, trash, refuse and rubbish, is simply what is left of products that have been used and is no longer needed. MSW does not include construction and demolition debris, hazardous, medical, and radioactive wastes, or other non-household and non-business refuse. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) regulates the land disposal of MSW through the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act's (RCRA) Subtitle D regulations. RCRA was originally passed in 1976, and reauthorized in the mid-80's. USEPA released RCRA Subtitle D landfill standards in 1991. At that time, RCRA's purpose was to develop regulations for landfills: they had to be lined, have leachate collection systems, ground water monitoring, etc. Congress delegated the administration of Subtitle D to the states. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) further regulates the disposal of MSW through the Minnesota Waste Management Act (WMA). The WMA was originally passed in 1980, with a major revision in 1989. The WMA laid the groundwork for developing integrated programs to reduce the volume and toxicity of waste, fund waste management facilities, increase the separation and recovery of materials, energy from waste, and coordinate the statewide management of waste.

As required by State Legislation, the County is using mandated State goals. To meet these goals, the County is using funding from:

- SCORE funds\* dispensed by the State (funding provided through the Solid Waste Management Tax),
- County funds (provided through the \$15 Solid Waste Assessment\*\*); and
- starting in 2002 funds raised by the Greater Minnesota Landfill Cleanup Fee (GMLCF) through the tipping fee at the County MMSW Landfill\*\*\*.

\* SCORE legislation created a separate revenue mechanism for recycling programs (a statewide tax on the collection and disposal of solid waste). The SCORE tax was modified in 1996 to become the Solid Waste Management Tax (SWMT). The tax rate for municipal solid waste collection is 9.75 percent for residential customers and 17 percent for commercial customers.

Initially, half of the proceeds or \$22 million, whichever was greater, went into the Solid Waste Fund, used for MPCA landfill assessment and closure cost and appropriations for solid waste programs. The remainder went into the General Revenue Fund, but then a portion went to fund MPCA and SCORE grants to counties. Starting in 2006, this was changed to the Environmental Fund. Under this concept, 70 percent of the SWMT went into the Environmental Fund, which MPCA receives funds for SCORE, HHW, competitive grants, loans for waste abatement, and MPCA's operating budget. The remaining 30 percent remained in the General Fund, and is being spent on programs not related to solid waste or the environment.

SCORE authorized grants of \$55,000 or more to counties if they meet certain requirements, including providing matching funds and having an approved solid waste management plan. The 2002 Legislature reduced the baseline from \$55,000 to \$49,500, and reduced the overall SCORE funding by \$1,401,000 or 10% for FY 2003, 2004 and 2005 in the Omnibus Budget Reduction Bill to \$12.6 million. This action was prompted by the announcement of the \$2 billion state budget shortfall for 2002-2003 biennium. The 2003 Legislature reduced the SCORE funds slightly to \$12.5 million. The projected shortfall for the 2004-2005 biennium was \$4.6 billion. For the 2008-2009 biennium the SCORE grant was increased back to the 2001 level of \$14 million and reestablished the baseline back to \$55,000. The Solid Waste Management Tax generated \$63.7 million in FY2010. Even with the projected shortfall for the 2010-2011 biennium of \$4.8 billion, the Legislature increased the SCORE funding by \$250,000. These manipulations have challenged the concept for this being a "stable" source of State funding.

In addition, the MPCA also utilizes SCORE funds to help support the HHW program with an annual HHW stipend. This is usually set at \$600,000 annually that is then distributed to the participating counties.

- \*\* The solid waste service charge (§400.08 subd. 3) was established by County Board resolution in October 1991. This fee was initially set at \$20. In 1993, it was lowered to \$15 where it has remained. All properties (seasonally used as well as year round use) with a building value greater than \$1,000 are assessed the base amount. Maximum charge per parcel is \$45.
- \*\*\* Part of the Landfill \$45 per ton tipping fee, is the \$6.67 for GMLCF. By statute (§115A.919), this cannot be spent on Landfill operations. The funds being raised by this fee will paid in full the post closure care and financial assurance requirement of the County landfills. Each financial assurance fund is generating interest. The interest generated is being replaced by funds raised by GMLCF. The interest generated is becoming an important funding source for the County's waste abatement programs. With the flat/fluctuating State SCORE/HHW funding, funding through this interest is filling in the State funding shortfalls to maintain and even expand the County's waste abatement programs.

Special revenue governmental fund accounts are used when proceeds of a special revenue source are restricted to expenditures for specific purposes. The County tracks solid waste/non-landfill revenues and expenditures as a Special Revenue Fund (Fund 18 – Solid Waste/Non-Landfill) to accurately track the overall SCORE and solid waste program revenues/expenditures as required by State Statute (§115A.929).

The County maintains one Proprietary Fund. This fund is used to present business-type of activities – Landfill operations. The County tracks Landfill revenues and expenditures as an Enterprise Fund (Fund 50 - Landfills).

Under the current County funding structure, the Landfill tipping fee accurately reflects the actual cost of the Landfill operations versus the total integrated solid waste system cost. This has two advantageous. First, with keeping the tipping fee low at the County Landfill it can compete with

alternative disposal options that are also priced to reflect the cost of disposal only. Also, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 297H, requires a political subdivision that subsidizes solid waste services below the cost of their market price to pay the Solid Waste Management Tax (SWMT) on the difference between the subsidized price and the market price. As defined by Minnesota Statute, 297H.01, Subd. 4, "*Market price*" means the lowest price available in the area, assuming transactions between separate parties that are willing buyers and willing sellers in a market. The intent of the statute is to provide equity in payment of the SWMT where a public subsidy for service is provided from local revenue sources. Second, dependency on Landfill tipping fee revenues to support the other solid waste/non-landfill programs puts these programs in direct competition with their source of funding. When all aspects of an integrated solid waste program are incorporated into a single tip fee, it allows little flexibility for change.

The County Solid Waste Assessment covers the majority of the cost of the solid waste/non-landfill services such as recycling, yard waste, household hazardous waste, problem material management, education, and illegal disposal. This funding mechanism provides for curbside collection of residential recyclable materials in three cities, sixteen recyclable materials' drop-off sites, eleven used oil/filter and antifreeze collection facilities, and grants to upgrade the area's recycling drop-off sites. Cities, townships, and volunteer committees operate the recycling programs. The County will maintain the Solid Waste Assessment, and use these funds as the designated revenue source for the solid waste/non-landfill related activities as outline in the Solid Waste Management Plan.

The GMLCF has and will continue to cover the entire cost to establish and maintain the financial assurance trust funds for the old Landfill (SW-111), new Landfill (SW-376), and the C & D Landfill (SW-440). It is also covering the ongoing operational/maintenance cost associated with post closure care for the old Landfill, the closed Phase I aspect of the C & D Landfill, and the County's share of the costs for the removal of the old Brainerd Dump from the State's Permanent List of Priorities (PLP).

Overall, the County source of funding for the integrated solid waste program has been stable and sustainable as highlighted by the fact the tipping fee nor the solid waste assessment has not changed since 1992. While on the other hand, State funding has fluctuated during fiscal crisis.

### **1.3 Recycling Program Overview**

Table 1.1 shows by year the recycling effort within the County. Below gives additional information for each year concerning the recycling program.

**1991** - SCORE funded recycling programs were in their initial stages of operation during 1991, and most operated part of the year.

**1992** - In 1992, the residential recycling strategy selected by the Board was essentially in place. To complete the initial strategy entirely, would require drop-off programs at Bay Lake and either Fort Ripley or St. Mathias. Plastics recycling were suspended in June 1992, due to deteriorating markets.



In late 1992 and early 1993 the Solid Waste Department surveyed business and industry within the County to learn the extent undocumented recycling was taking place. The results of the survey identified 1,864 tons of additional recycling for which had been previously unaccounted.

**1993** - Plastics recycling were resumed in May 1993 for many County programs. The complexion of recycling in the County changed during 1994. Greater opportunities for recycling continue to open and local markets began to develop. For example, Pythons of St. Cloud opened a branch in Brainerd offering recycling opportunities to many recyclable items. Volunteer activities are contracting to drop-off recyclables at Pythons, thus increasing amounts and types of recyclables. Another significant activity was the introduction of Minnesota Waste Wise.

**1994** - Improved data collecting and more activity by existing programs resulted in a better recycling rate.

**1995** - All recycling programs operated throughout 1995.

**1996** - All recycling programs operated throughout 1996. Lower prices for recyclables resulted in a lower recycling rate within the residential programs.

**1997** - The complexion of recycling in the County changed during 1998. Opportunities for recycling decreased as local markets began to close down. Pythons closed on December 1st, eliminating an opportunity to recycle many items. Due to cost and participation rates, the C-I-D Committee evaluated their program and changed its operation starting in 1998 from curbside pickup to drop-off operation. Brainerd Chamber of Commerce reintroduced Minnesota Waste Wise to its membership.

**1998** - All recycling programs operated throughout 1998.

**1999** - All recycling programs operated throughout 1999.

**2000** - All recycling programs operated throughout 2001.

**2001** - Total recycling within the County decreased for the first time. The statewide recycling rate also dropped for the first time. The major reason for this decrease for the County is a drop in the reported recycling within the commercial arena.

**2002** - The decrease continued into this year. All recycling programs operated throughout 2002.

**2003** - Beginning to see an increase in recycling. All recycling programs operated throughout 2003.

**2004** - All recycling programs operated till November 2004. At that time South Long Lake program discontinued its services. Seen an increase for prices for recyclables, if this continues it is expected to have positive effect on the recycling efforts.

**2005** - All recycling programs operated throughout 2005. The increase prices for recyclables continued to have a positive effect on the recycling efforts.

**TABLE 1.1**  
**RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

Year	Total MSW Tons Generated	Tons Recycled SCORE Funded	Overall Cost Residential	Cost per Ton Residential	% of Total Effort	MSW Collected for Recycling	Recycling Rate	Source Reduction Credit	Yard Waste Credit	Recycling Rate with Credits
1991	39,666	255	\$99,021	\$388.21	0.6%	4,464	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
1992	40,706	535	\$123,250	\$230.51	1.3%	7,230	18.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%
1993	44,873	777	\$148,971	\$191.81	1.7%	10,965	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.0%
1994	47,713	1,021	\$165,460	\$162.11	2.1%	14,314	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%
1995	50,471	1,306	\$156,149	\$119.54	2.6%	12,572	25.0%	0.0%	5.0%	30.0%
1996	51,470	1,044	\$170,715	\$163.46	2.0%	17,148	33.0%	3.0%	5.0%	41.0%
1997	55,850	1,173	\$160,855	\$137.11	2.1%	20,569	37.3%	5.7%	5.0%	48.0%
1998	68,767	1,302	\$167,705	\$128.78	1.9%	32,478	45.2%	6.0%	5.0%	56.2%
1999	70,822	1,560	\$167,905	\$107.62	2.2%	34,769	48.5%	6.5%	5.0%	60.0%
2000	73,185	1,798	\$171,005	\$95.09	2.5%	35,118	48.0%	8.0%	5.0%	61.0%
2001	75,581	1,914	\$178,605	\$93.30	2.5%	32,689	43.3%	9.0%	5.0%	57.3%
2002	76,803	2,005	\$188,772	\$94.15	2.6%	33,187	42.9%	7.0%	5.0%	54.9%
2003	77,802	2,164	\$199,760	\$92.33	2.8%	33,973	43.7%	6.0%	5.0%	54.7%
2004	84,234	2,721	\$205,043	\$75.35	3.2%	40,599	48.2%	6.0%	5.0%	59.2%
2005	90,894	2,934	\$222,474	\$75.84	3.2%	46,022	50.6%	6.5%	5.0%	62.1%
2006	90,190	3,142	\$234,424	\$74.61	3.5%	48,058	53.3%	5.1%	5.0%	63.4%
2007	89,993	3,650	\$242,056	\$66.31	4.1%	48,747	54.6%	7.0%	5.0%	66.6%
2008	78,119	4,066	\$261,204	\$64.24	5.2%	39,519	50.6%	8.0%	5.0%	63.5%
2009	64,903	4,696	\$312,027	\$66.44	7.2%	27,767	42.8%	8.0%	5.0%	55.8%
2010	65,544	4,781	\$333,850	\$69.83	7.3%	28,349	43.3%	8.0%	5.0%	56.3%
2011	66,934	4,679	\$334,758	\$71.54	7.0%	29,367	43.9%	8.0%	5.0%	56.9%
2012	69,088	4,517	\$351,801	\$77.88	6.5%	32,272	46.7%	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*

\* Until 2011, a State directive allows a maximum 5 percent for yard waste credit for recycling and a credit for source reduction.

**2006** - All recycling programs operated throughout 2006. The prices for recyclables have remained high, and continue its positive long term effect on the overall recycling efforts. First time saw a decrease in the amount of MSW being generated after fifteen years of record keeping.

**2007** - All recycling programs operated throughout 2007. The prices for recyclables have remained high, and continue its positive long term effect on the overall recycling efforts. Continued to see the trend of the amount of MSW being generated decreasing.

**2008** - Total recycling within the County decreased due to the reduction in commercial/industrial activities. All recycling programs operated throughout 2008, with Maple Grove Township starting in July. The price for recyclables has remained high till the end of the year. If low markets continue, it is expected to have negative long term effect on the overall recycling efforts in 2009. Continued to see the trend of the amount of MSW being generated decreasing.

**2009** - Total recycling within the County decreased due to the reduction in commercial/industrial activities. All recycling programs operated throughout 2009, with Bay Lake Township starting in Jan. Continued to see the trend of the amount of MSW being generated decreasing.

**2010** - Total recycling within the County increased. All recycling programs operated throughout 2010. The prices for recyclables remained high, and continue its positive long term effect on the overall recycling efforts. Saw the trend of the decreasing amount of MSW being generated stop, and actually saw a 1 percent increase.

**2011** - Total recycling within the County increased. All recycling programs operated throughout 2011. The prices for recyclables is beginning to show signs of weakness, this may affect the previous positive long term effect on the overall recycling efforts. Continued to see a trend of a 1 percent increase in the amount of MSW being generated within the County.

**2012** - Total recycling within the County increased to approximately 30,649 tons (not including problem materials). 4,517 tons were recycled by SCORE/County funded residential recycling programs. A total of \$351,801 was dedicated to the SCORE/County funded residential recycling programs resulting in an overall cost of \$77.88 per ton. All recycling programs operated throughout 2012. The price for recyclables has remained stable; it is expected to have positive long term effect on the overall recycling efforts. The total recycling is approximately 32,272 tons when field data for appliances, tires, used oil, and commercial/industrial estimates were added. Estimated waste generation rate of 69,088 tons, estimated recycling rate will be 46.7%.

	<u>TONS</u>		
Landfill*	36,563	Problem Mat's -	2.6
On-site***	252	46.7 %, Res -	7.2%
Recycling	32,273	Ind -	36.9%
	-----		-----
TOTAL	69,088	TOTAL	46.7%

\* Per Annual Report for SW-376

\*\* Per Appendix A, Crow Wing County Solid Waste Management Plan (September 2003)

## 1.5 Summation

The Landfill tipping fee has remained at \$45.00 per ton (this includes the \$6.67 for GMLCF, but does not include state SWMT) since June 1, 1991, and represents only part of the waste disposal cost. When considering the disposal cost with collection costs, a resident in the County pays between \$100 - \$150 per ton for garbage disposal. The cost per ton for recycling for the residential program will be compared with this total cost as an upper limit as a goal. For 2012, the County's cost for the residential recycling program was \$77.88 per ton, which is beneath the goal limit of \$150. It should be noted that this goal only includes the cost to the County, and does not include any additional funding by the individual programs or the haulers. The overall true cost of the residential program would be higher.

The County has made considerable progress in achieving and maintaining the States mandated recycling goals. A key aspect for the most cost effective future increases is to provide consideration and incentive for local businesses to recycle/reduce/reuse different types of material.

Table 1.2 provides a better overview and demonstrates the historical flow of MMSW to the County Landfill. The table shows 1996 had a significant decrease in the waste generation due to:

- The significant recycling/reduction/reuse accomplished by the three large generators within the County; and
- Better accounting of the recycling being accomplished in the C/I/I section through the survey.

Table 1.2 also shows that starting in 2006; another significant decrease in the waste generation was observed. This may be due to:

- In 2006, the County clarified its out-of-county waste policy. This cut off the flow of some out-of-county waste, lowering the volume of waste coming into our facility.
- In 2006 & 2007, the area suffered through a drought. The garbage has reduced moisture content. This reduced the weight of the garbage coming in.
- County may be seeing benefits from the recycling/reduction/reuse programs it has initiated.
- Largest factor was the slow down in the areas economy.

The County did experience another year of a waste generation increase versus the previous four years of a steady decrease. Our sanitary waste tonnage peaked in 2005 at 51,855 tons. In 2012 tonnage was 40,757 or an increase of 1.0% over last year. This includes the following non-MSW:

TABLE 1.2

## Problem/Banned Material Management

## Waste Receipts

Year	Scale* (Tons)	Residential* Bags (Ea)	Loose* Garbage (cv)	Total * MSW (ton)	Asbestos* Bags (Ea)	Asbestos* Bulk (cv)	Total * Asbestos (ton)	Yard** Waste (cv)	Brush (cy)	Used Oil (gal)	Lead Battery (Ea)	Tires (Ea)	Tires Shipped (ton)	Used Electronics Res (Ea)	Electronics Shipped (ton)	Appliance (Ea)	Appliance Shipped (ton)	Demo ** (SW-440) (cv)
1992	25,020	3,632	26,251	29,886	1,343	135	47	Unk	Unk	N/A	Unk	3,097	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,456	Unk	15,836
1993	25,765	3,796	29,856	30,849	158	58	14	Unk	Unk	N/A	Unk	2,641	Unk	N/A	N/A	2,128	Unk	18,172
1994	27,186	4,764	44,037	34,647	1,455	34	29	3,506	Unk	N/A	Unk	4,573	Unk	N/A	N/A	2,649	Unk	18,448
1995	27,634	4,915	42,783	35,270	1,890	235	75	3,735	Unk	N/A	Unk	3,755	Unk	N/A	N/A	2,615	Unk	13,121
1996	29,076	4,891	33,876	32,537	1,141	94	36	2,278	Unk	Unk	Unk	3,486	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,890	254	16,124
1997	30,742	4,641	29,825	33,794	492	84	24	4,892	Unk	1,675	Unk	4,618	269	N/A	N/A	2,901	345	17,422
1998	29,673	5,999	33,110	33,110	1,365	124	45	7,113	Unk	2,605	386	5,843	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,758	173	17,237
1999	29,671	6,420	34,068	33,174	1,613	268	78	8,302	Unk	3,570	548	5,982	182	N/A	N/A	3,370	460	18,990
2000	31,754	5,845	38,899	35,731	519	293	66	12,335	Unk	3,475	606	6,923	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,235	170	19,436
2001	33,919	6,874	46,510	38,673	236	1,269	257	14,392	Unk	4,225	795	7,240	463	N/A	3	4,001	294	26,266
2002	35,911	7,939	65,994	42,630	523	1,125	233	15,056	Unk	5,141	1,040	10,221	215	N/A	10	4,457	437	22,095
2003	38,007	7,684	79,192	46,042	337	91	23	16,889	15,341	5,846	1,069	8,536	161	N/A	11	4,306	445	30,455
2004	38,961	6,875	95,377	48,602	3,044	348	115	18,132	16,499	2,053	1,177	10,138	N/A	N/A	83	4,793	377	25,361
2005	40,534	7,114	111,875	51,828	827	75	27	15,216	18,241	6,879	1,325	9,777	344	N/A	131	4,686	355	21,480
2006	37,706	7,788	94,012	47,224	489	210	49	12,353	12,968	3,064	939	9,197	131	N/A	134	4,624	610	20,386
2007	37,263	7,570	81,087	45,486	235	51	14	12,480	16,346	2,312	750	11,660	215	N/A	162	4,434	415	13,959
2008	35,172	7,132	75,479	42,827	1,393	274	76	10,590	13,557	2,657	590	8,709	76	N/A	137	3,949	388	16,950
2009	33,783	8,571	54,671	39,379	431	76	22	11,873	15,311	2,383	647	6,984	156	N/A	146	4,077	272	14,055
2010	34,109	9,490	55,905	39,842	633	7	11	10,487	12,827	3,617	532	7,145	140	N/A	152	3,801	433	13,124
2011	33,701	9,463	64,802	40,323	43	153	31	11,016	13,105	1,871	469	8,461	147	N/A	152	3,131	246	13,880
2012	34,154	9,562	59,928	40,291	10	2,332	467	9,945	13,270	3,213	376	8,828	141	N/A	144	3,025	282	32,769
Total	689,741	140,965	1,197,898	822,145	18,177	7,336	1,739	200,590	147,465	54,586	11,249	147,814	2,642	N/A	1,127	74,286	5,953	405,566

\* Per Annual Reports for SW-376

\*\* Per Annual Report for SW-440

TABLE 2.2  
MMSW Landfill Waste Receipts

Month	1991-2001* MMSW (tons)	2002* MMSW (tons)	2003* MMSW (tons)	2004* MMSW (tons)	2005* MMSW (tons)	2006* MMSW (tons)	2007* MMSW (tons)	2008* MMSW (tons)	2009* MMSW (tons)	2010* MMSW (tons)	2011* MMSW (tons)
January	22,286	2,746	3,023	2,967	3,198	3,355	3,116	3,049	2,621	2,403	2,588
February	19,982	2,402	2,584	2,806	2,974	2,839	2,617	2,653	2,251	2,293	2,348
March	23,687	2,502	3,058	3,586	3,810	3,577	3,236	2,850	2,695	3,074	2,746
April	26,870	3,638	3,646	4,253	4,314	3,803	3,592	3,538	3,156	3,432	3,198
May	32,244	4,040	4,454	4,334	5,292	4,619	4,452	4,284	3,607	3,454	3,838
June	33,725	4,080	4,495	4,935	5,652	4,548	4,326	4,099	3,818	4,047	4,067
July	35,058	4,873	4,993	5,047	4,987	4,570	4,742	4,609	4,469	4,272	4,172
August	35,590	4,603	4,585	4,902	5,422	5,102	4,776	4,039	4,040	4,234	4,434
September	30,633	3,861	4,407	4,413	4,559	4,068	3,899	4,096	3,602	3,737	3,671
October	29,251	3,824	4,173	3,933	4,224	3,971	4,357	3,915	3,387	3,187	3,627
November	26,905	3,061	3,208	4,042	3,890	3,730	3,491	2,734	2,933	2,984	2,952
December	25,110	3,000	3,415	3,384	3,507	3,041	2,882	2,962	2,802	2,726	2,680
Out-of-County**	6,685	85	90	0	0	108	354	113	0	113	106
Total Landfill	342,008	42,863	46,065	48,717	51,855	47,273	45,500	42,903	39,403	39,854	40,352
Industrial Waste	2,144	1,031	3,914	6,851	8,754	6,795	5,875	5,915	3,856	4,295	4,421
MSW	339,864	41,832	42,151	41,866	43,101	40,478	39,625	36,988	35,547	35,559	35,931
Total Generation	348,694	42,948	46,154	48,717	51,856	47,380	45,854	43,017	39,403	39,967	40,458
% Change Landfill		10.1%	7.5%	5.8%	6.4%	-8.8%	-3.8%	-5.7%	-8.2%	1.1%	1.2%

TABLE 2.2  
MMSW Landfill Waste Receipts

Month	1991-2011*	2012*	2013*	2014*	2015*	2016*	2017*	2018*	2019*	2020*	2021*	TOTAL	03-07	08-12
	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	MMSW (tons)	AVERAGE (tons)	AVERAGE (tons)
January	51,352	2,518	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53,870	3,132	2,636
February	45,749	2,290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48,039	2,764	2,367
March	54,821	2,860	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57,681	3,453	2,845
April	63,440	3,140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66,580	3,922	3,293
May	74,618	3,935	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78,553	4,630	3,824
June	77,792	3,956	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81,748	4,791	3,997
July	81,792	4,498	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86,290	4,868	4,404
August	81,727	4,365	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86,092	4,957	4,222
September	70,946	3,354	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74,300	4,269	3,692
October	67,849	3,450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71,299	4,132	3,513
November	59,930	3,198	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63,128	3,672	2,960
December	55,509	2,726	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58,235	3,246	2,779
Out-of-County**	7,654	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,761	110	88
Total Landfill	786,793	40,757	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	827,550	47,836	40,533
Industrial Waste	53,851	4,194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58,045	6,438	4,536
MSW	732,942	36,563	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	769,505	41,444	36,118
Total Generation	794,448	40,865	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835,313	47,992	40,742
% Change Landfill		1.0%	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			-15.3%

Asbestos  
827,554  
100.00%

%  
of annual Cumulative  
6.47% 6.47%  
5.81% 12.28%  
6.98% 19.26%  
8.08% 27.34%  
9.38% 36.73%  
9.81% 46.54%  
10.81% 57.35%  
10.36% 67.71%  
9.06% 76.78%  
8.62% 85.40%  
7.27% 92.66%  
6.82% 99.49%  
0.22% 99.70%

Total	Annual Growth =	MSW	03-07	08-12	% Increase
Annual Growth =	1.0%	(92 - 12)	Average	Average	
Overall Growth =	20.2%	(92 - 12)	3,047	2,594	-17.5%
5 Year Growth =	-0.3%	(07 - 12)	4,002	3,320	-20.5%
5-Overall Growth =	-9.3%	(07 - 12)	4,872	4,208	-15.8%
10 Year Growth =	-1.6%	(02 - 12)	4,024	3,388	-18.8%
10-Overall Growth =	-14.1%	(02 - 12)	59.9%	62.2%	
Annual Growth =	1.6%	(92 - 12)	21.4%	25.4%	
Overall Growth =	36.2%	(92 - 12)			
5 Year Growth =	-1.3%	(07 - 12)			
5-Overall Growth =	-4.7%	(07 - 12)			
10 Year Growth =	-1.4%	(02 - 12)			
10-Overall Growth =	-11.5%	(02 - 12)			

Average (December - February) Winter  
Average (March - May) Spring  
Average (June - August) Summer  
Average (September - November) Fall  
Percent change from Winter to Summer  
Percent Winter to Spring & Fall  
Percent Spring & Fall to Summer

By Total Tonnage  
2.6%  
-2.7%  
-0.9%

- Part of the requirements of entering into the leachate recirculation phase II program was to more accurately track the industrial waste entering the Landfill. Asbestos was the only industrial waste tracked previously. All industrial waste is now being subtracted out starting in 2002. This amounted to 4,194 tons in 2012, a 227 ton decrease from 2011.
- Starting in 2002, many of the local private demolition landfills strengthened their screening procedures. As a result, there has been a significant increase of this rejected material being deposited at the Landfill. Starting in 2002, haulers are declaring this waste as industrial waste. Industrial waste is being tracked separately from sanitary waste as outlined above.

With the above waste streams removed, the County experienced an overall increase of 1.8 % in the residential waste generation within the County for 2012.

Nationally, waste volumes have also fallen from 2007 till 2009. In 2010, the change year-over-year amounted to a 2.5% increase. The decline might have been a recession-oriented decline or a combination of recession and a change in material use by various sectors. For example, manufacturers are now using more lightweight packaging and sustainability efforts. The State has also shown a waste volume decrease starting in 2008; a total waste generation drop of 3.5 percent in 2008 and a waste generation drop of 4.65 percent in 2009. Experts are predicting when the recession is over that there will be a slower growth in waste generation, even as population grows. The continuing implementation of zero-waste goals by companies will have an impact on the size of the MSW stream. Even if this proves to be correct and waste generations flattens and recycling continues to increase, waste will still be produced and the need to manage it will continue.

SCORE/County funded recycling programs have shown a decrease (3.5%) in tonnage for the second time. MSW generation continues to hold steady, the recycling rate has remained level or has slightly decreased. Key issues remain - the low value for some of the recyclables, the availability/lack of markets for many of the materials, and a stabilized price paid for the recyclable materials collected. Also, in Greater Minnesota the biggest cost component is shipping - moving the materials to the market.

It is felt that education and advertising can increase participation rates and amounts collected. However, the largest factor in lowering the overall cost of the program will require expanding markets for the recyclable materials and a stabilized price paid for the recyclable materials collected. The prices paid for the recyclables gathered has an enormous impact on the revenues that a recycling program can generate. When the value of recyclable materials decreases significantly, the overall cost per ton for this program will go up.





## SECTION 2.0

### SCORE/COUNTY FUNDED RESIDENTIAL RECYCLING PROGRAMS

#### 2.1 Background

SCORE legislation passed in 1989 directs Greater Minnesota counties to achieve a recycling rate of 25 percent of MSW by December 31, 1993. Subsequent amendments set a supplementary recycling goal of 35 percent for Greater Minnesota by December 31, 1996. In comparison, the USEPA has set the national recycling goal at 35 percent by 2005. Very few states have a more stringent goal. California requires cities and counties to reduce their waste by 50 percent by January 2001 compared to 1990 levels. In 2006, California reached their goal of 50% waste reduction.

The following is a brief overview of the State's SCORE programs. Minnesota counties spent \$61.9 million in State and local funds for SCORE-related programs in 2011. This includes the \$14.3 million paid directly to counties from the State as a block grant. Counties spent an additional \$47.6 million in 2011 on SCORE related programs. Counties spent more than 13 times the matching funds (by law they must match 25 percent or \$3.575 million) they are required to provide under statute. It should be noted, the block grant of \$14 million provided by the State has been flat since 1991. During the same period, Minnesota's recycling volumes increased 90 percent even though State funding stayed level. In addition, the buying power of that \$14 million, as measured by the national Consumer Price Index, declined over 20 percent. Even with this flat investment by the State, the tonnage of recyclables processed by the counties has risen significantly. The following table shows what the counties have spent (in millions of dollars) on SCORE:

	<u>1991</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Greater Minnesota	13.5	28.5	30.2	31.3	32.5	35.0	33.7	33.5	36.3
Metropolitan Area	<u>22.4</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>24.1</u>	<u>23.4</u>	<u>23.4</u>	<u>22.9</u>	<u>22.4</u>	<u>24.1</u>	<u>25.6</u>
TOTAL	35.9	51.1	54.3	54.6	55.9	57.9	56.1	57.7	61.9
State Share	14.2	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.9	13.8	14.1	14.3	14.3

Per the recently completed 2012 County SCORE Report (see Appendix 2-A), the County spent \$709,450 on the overall SCORE-related programs, of which the State provided only \$163,732 in funds (or 23.0 percent). It should be noted that the County's cost is only what the County has expended, and does not include additional funding by cities, townships, individual programs or haulers.

The SCORE legislation requires that the County do the following:

- The County must have at least one recycling center in the County and sites for collecting recyclable materials that are located in places convenient for people to use them.

**Compliance Action:** Drop-off site at the Landfill Site meets the definition of a recycling center. Our present recycling system provides convenient drop-off sites to the County rural residents and curbside services in the larger cities.

- The County must insure that cities in the County with a population of 5,000 or more has either curbside pick up, centralized drop-off, or a local recycling center that accepts at least four materials.

**Compliance Action:** The City of Brainerd, with a population of approximately 13,606 (as of 2011), and the City of Baxter, with a population of approximately 7,620 (as of 2011) has mandatory curbside collection. Our present program meets or exceeds this requirement.

- The County must provide information on how, when, and where materials can be recycled.

**Compliance Action:** The Solid Waste Office provides information on how, when, and where materials can be recycled through it annual coupon mailing, County web page, and publishes ads in the Brainerd Daily Dispatch, the Crosby-Ironton Courier, Lake Country Echo, News Hopper, Vacationland brochure, Northland Arboretum Newsletter, County Fair flyers plus special ads as needed.

- The County must insure that facilities under its control collect and remove for recycling at least three recyclable materials.

**Compliance Action:** The County has recycling opportunities at all county buildings and county sub garages. The materials recycled are: paper (office paper, cardboard, shredding paper, and phone books), aluminum cans, batteries, used electronics, toner/ink jet cartridges, fluorescent lamps, used oil/filters, scrap steel, and antifreeze. In 1998, the County expanded its refuse pickup to incorporate a bin specifically for cardboard and another bin for mixed paper for recycling.

Table 2.1 on the following page shows a summation of the SCORE/County funded residential recycling programs. Appendix 2-B denotes the recycling each program accomplished for 2012. These programs are helping the County maintain its compliance to the State mandated recycling rates and are below the established County goal of \$150 cost per ton as an upper limit. Some programs in the more sparsely populated areas of the County will naturally have a higher cost per ton than those in more densely populated areas. However, these programs help provide convenient opportunities for the County residents to recycle. From 1994 to 2011 the County population growth was 1.75 percent; the annual growth of tonnage going into the landfill during the same period was 1.79 percent; the household recycling rate saw a 9.5 percent annual growth. The residential recycling rate is greater than both the growth of MSW and population.

# SCORE Funded Recycling Program Summary

TABLE 2.1

Program	2007			2008			2009			2010		
	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton
Baxter	878.95	\$51,000	\$58.27	391.55	\$32,300	\$82.68	1,079.40	\$32,300	\$29.92	1,127.58	\$32,300	\$28.66
Bay Lake Township	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.83	\$8,000	\$243.68	43.48	\$8,000	\$183.99
Brainerd	1,773.09	\$84,390	\$71.94	1,429.44	\$84,390	\$59.04	1,570.83	\$84,390	\$53.72	1,690.85	\$84,390	\$51.12
C-I-D	272.47	\$17,620	\$64.67	228.56	\$17,710	\$77.15	412.71	\$96,000	\$87.23	345.72	\$47,715	\$138.02
Breezy Point	82.58	\$12,000	\$145.31	168.37	\$12,000	\$75.77	198.50	\$13,758	\$69.31	219.97	\$14,000	\$65.65
Crosslake	200.47	\$25,000	\$124.71	157.85	\$25,000	\$158.38	187.32	\$30,000	\$160.15	184.53	\$30,000	\$162.58
Deerwood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Emily	18.29	\$3,500	\$191.36	59.32	\$12,000	\$202.28	127.29	\$16,000	\$127.84	81.46	\$16,000	\$184.14
Fifty Lakes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Garrison	28.87	\$4,500	\$155.87	32.48	\$3,900	\$120.07	33.77	\$4,140	\$122.59	34.04	\$4,140	\$121.62
Ideal	70.42	\$9,000	\$127.79	65.28	\$8,000	\$122.55	59.43	\$8,000	\$134.61	64.50	\$8,000	\$124.03
Landfill	146.28	\$12,386	\$84.74	133.39	\$12,104	\$90.74	120.35	\$12,438	\$103.35	82.16	\$13,055	\$156.89
Maple Grove Township	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.73	\$6,000	\$1,831.50	33.87	\$4,000	\$118.10	23.12	\$10,000	\$432.53
Merrifield	253.56	\$4,000	\$15.78	279.86	\$4,000	\$14.29	378.29	\$4,000	\$10.57	370.15	\$4,250	\$11.48
Mission	87.41	\$3,500	\$40.04	97.89	\$3,500	\$35.75	111.95	\$5,000	\$44.65	48.42	\$3,500	\$72.28
Nisawa	266.37	\$14,000	\$52.56	243.23	\$16,000	\$65.78	188.78	\$23,000	\$121.83	222.02	\$25,000	\$112.60
Pequot Lakes	131.47	\$11,950	\$88.61	142.47	\$10,000	\$70.19	102.46	\$13,500	\$131.76	175.34	\$15,000	\$85.55
Roosevelt	17.85	\$3,500	\$196.08	16.89	\$6,800	\$384.84	26.17	\$6,500	\$248.38	60.05	\$7,500	\$124.90
Southwest Townships	22.10	\$7,000	\$316.74	25.47	\$8,800	\$345.50	32.53	\$12,000	\$368.89	47.53	\$12,000	\$252.47
South Long Lake	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,650.18</b>	<b>\$242,056</b>	<b>\$66.31</b>	<b>4,065.78</b>	<b>\$281,204</b>	<b>\$69.24</b>	<b>4,686.48</b>	<b>\$312,027</b>	<b>\$66.44</b>	<b>4,780.92</b>	<b>\$335,850</b>	<b>\$69.83</b>

SCORE Funding

\$141,763

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

59%

SCORE Funding

\$150,205

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

58%

SCORE Funding

\$151,386

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

45%

SCORE Funding

\$163,178

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

45%

Program	2011			2012			Total 1997-2012		
	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton	Tons	Funding	Cost/Ton
Baxter	593.25	\$32,300	\$54.28	904.79	\$32,300	\$35.70	10,998.84	\$480,760	\$43.71
Bay Lake Township	58.19	\$4,000	\$74.30	67.57	\$5,500	\$81.40	199.98	\$17,500	\$87.51
Brainerd	1,503.39	\$84,390	\$56.13	1,365.91	\$84,390	\$61.74	17,199.57	\$1,714,420	\$99.68
C-I-D	364.59	\$46,000	\$126.18	348.99	\$86,000	\$167.15	3,873.46	\$466,864	\$120.48
Breezy Point	227.13	\$14,000	\$61.64	229.84	\$14,000	\$60.96	2,359.35	\$186,175	\$70.43
Crosslake	214.75	\$30,000	\$139.70	184.51	\$30,000	\$162.59	3,359.77	\$426,858	\$127.05
Deerwood	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	284.33	\$12,000	\$42.20
Emily	93.14	\$16,000	\$171.78	111.45	\$16,000	\$143.58	684.41	\$106,945	\$156.26
Fifty Lakes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.18	\$1,500	\$105.75
Garrison	35.60	\$3,540	\$107.87	33.53	\$4,140	\$123.47	520.21	\$57,945	\$111.39
Ideal	70.46	\$9,000	\$127.54	58.37	\$8,000	\$137.06	1,299.78	\$130,914	\$100.72
Landfill	81.45	\$11,978	\$147.06	80.38	\$13,721	\$170.70	1,047.08	\$109,703	\$104.77
Maple Grove Township	27.02	\$10,000	\$370.10	42.40	\$10,000	\$235.85	129.14	\$33,250	\$257.47
Merrifield	381.47	\$4,250	\$11.14	411.40	\$4,250	\$10.33	3,190.96	\$77,650	\$24.33
Mission	59.70	\$3,500	\$58.63	62.16	\$8,000	\$98.49	909.41	\$57,740	\$63.49
Nisawa	285.55	\$27,000	\$101.64	265.14	\$27,000	\$100.32	3,325.34	\$240,461	\$72.31
Pequot Lakes	201.59	\$19,000	\$94.29	244.34	\$18,000	\$73.67	1,684.76	\$176,041	\$104.49
Roosevelt	48.87	\$7,500	\$153.47	48.22	\$8,500	\$176.28	411.60	\$75,871	\$184.33
Southwest Townships	55.15	\$12,000	\$217.55	55.28	\$12,000	\$217.08	272.93	\$76,800	\$281.39
South Long Lake	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	224.35	\$36,172	\$161.23
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,579.32</b>	<b>\$334,756</b>	<b>\$73.14</b>	<b>4,517.10</b>	<b>\$351,801</b>	<b>\$77.88</b>	<b>\$1,986.24</b>	<b>\$4,465,366</b>	<b>\$85.89</b>

SCORE Funding

\$153,868

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

45%

SCORE Funding

\$153,308

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

44%

SCORE Funding

\$2,055,600

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

85%

SCORE Funding

\$163,178

% Funded by State SCORE Grant

45%

Curbside collection programs are mandated based on city population. Both collection systems are needed. Quantities of materials collected by the programs have been higher than the previous Solid Waste Management Plan projections suggested. These projections indicated collection of 297 pounds per year per household for the curbside collection programs and 54 pounds per year per capita for the drop-off programs. The following is a discussion of each of the SCORE Funded programs.

## 2.2 Curbside Recycling Program

The following are the cities that offer curbside recycling at least monthly:

1. Brainerd (Waste Management, Waste Partners, Garrison Disposal & Blue Lakes)
2. Baxter (Waste Management, Waste Partners, Garrison Disposal & Blue Lakes)
3. Breezy Point (Waste Partners & Pequot Lakes Sanitation) - started in 2006

The estimated population served by residential curbside recycling programs, based on Minnesota State Demographers Estimate - 2011 is the following:

	Population	Households
1. Brainerd	13,606	5,868
2. Baxter	7,620	2,979
3. Breezy Point	2,388	916
	-----	-----
TOTAL	23,614	9,763

### 2.2.1 Baxter Program

The Baxter curbside collection program started in March of 1991, and was the first curbside recycling program in the County. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. Part of the SCORE funds for 1991 was provided to the City of Baxter in 1990 and does not appear on the table. Therefore, the cost per ton of the program appears much lower in 1991 than is actually the case. The results and funding for 1992 accurately reflect the status of this program except the portion of funding provided by the City of Baxter. In 1993, the County provided all program funding. SCORE funds are provided to the City of Baxter for operating this program.

In the 1992 Recycling Report, commercial office paper was included with the data for this program dramatically lowering the cost per ton. For the 1993 report, only residential data is included. This provides a more accurate representation of the curbside collection program.

In April 1993, Waste Management began to collect commingled recyclables and added some plastics to the materials that would be accepted. In response to this, Blue Lakes Disposal resumed accepting plastics but continued to ask that materials to be separated. The plastics each hauler accepted differ. The differing requirements caused some difficulty with the County's public information efforts.

The program offers twice per month curbside collection of recyclable materials for Baxter residents. The City contracts with Blue Lakes Disposal, Garrison Disposal, Waste Partners, and Waste Management for this service.

When the initial estimates were projected for selecting a recycling strategy, it was projected that the Baxter program would collect 220 tons per year and the cost of curbside programs would be \$121 per ton. The 904.79 tons collected at a cost of \$35.70 per ton in 2012 are within the cost projected. The quantities collected have been increasing annually. Participation rates, assuming 2,979 households were approximately 607 pounds per year per household, which is over the projected figure of 297 pounds.

### **2.2.2 Brainerd Program**

The Brainerd curbside collection program was started in August of 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. The results and funding for both 1991 and 1992 accurately reflect the status of the program except that portion of the funding provided by the City of Brainerd. In 1993 funds was provided entirely by the County, consequently the results and funding accurately reflect this program. In the 1992 Recycling Report, cardboard, scrap metals, and magazines from commercial generators were included. This dramatically lowered the cost per ton of the program. For the 1993 report, only residential curbside data were included. The 1993 - 2012 numbers represent only residential curbside data.

Beginning in April 1993 and extending through the 2010 report period, Waste Management began and continued to collect commingled recyclables and some plastics. Blue Lakes Disposal continues their program directly with the City. Starting in 2000, Garrison Disposal also provides recycling services. Waste Partners started to provide recycling services in 2002. These programs offer weekly curbside collection of recyclable materials for residents of the City of Brainerd. SCORE funds are provided to the City of Brainerd.

When the initial estimates were projected for selecting a recycling strategy, it was anticipated the Brainerd program would collect 801 tons per year and the cost of the curbside programs was anticipated to be \$121 per ton. For 2012, the program collected 1,367 tons at a cost of \$61.74. This exceeds the projected amount by approximately 566 tons, and costs are below the projected amount. The quantities collected were increasing annually. Assuming 5,868 households, approximately 466 pounds per household per year were collected in 2012. This is the sixth year it has been over the projected figure of 297 pounds.

### **2.2.3 Crosby-Ironton-Deerwood (C-I-D) Program**

The C-I-D curbside collection program started in July 1991. Appendix 2-C shows the tabulated results of the program for 1992 - 1997. This program offered twice per month curbside collection of recyclable materials for Crosby, and once per month curbside collection for Ironton, Deerwood, and the south shore of Serpent Lake area.

When the initial estimates were made and a recycling strategy selected, it was anticipated that the C-I-D Recycling Program would collect 207 tons per year and the cost of the curbside program would be \$121 per ton. The overall cost per ton annually from 1992 - 1997 was \$342.57; \$222 more costly than the original projection.

The participation and quantity of material per household were lower than anticipated. Assuming 1,394 households, about 60.5 pounds per household for 1997 was collected rather than the 297 pounds projected. Due to cost and participation rates of a curbside program, the C-I-D Committee evaluated the program and changed operation in 1998 to a drop-off operation. Starting in the 1998 Report, this program is now listed as a drop-off program. The existing drop-off program for Deerwood was incorporated under this program starting in 1998.

#### **2.2.4 Breezy Point Program**

The Breezy Point Drop-off program has been in operation since 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to Breezy Point to operate the program. In October 1993, they contracted with Kenwood Recycling to pick up materials one Saturday each month. The collection site was staffed with volunteers. In November 1993, Nisswa Sanitation placed a permanently located bin thus allowing recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. Garrison/Nisswa Sanitation was providing a bin and hauling recyclable materials to Cass Recycling in Pine River.

In 2006 the program was changed to curbside by the city council. Waste Partners and Pequot Lakes Sanitation are providing this service to this area. The recycling tonnage for 2012 is 229.64 tons. Currently, the cost for recyclable is \$60.96 per ton. The quantities collected have been increasing annually. Assuming 916 households, approximately 501 pounds per household per year were collected in 2012, which is 204 pounds over the projected figure of 297 pounds for curbside programs.

#### **2.3 Drop-Off Program**

The following are the drop-off programs offered within the County:

1. Bay Lake Township
2. C-I-D Area Recycling (Merger of the C-I-D and Deerwood program)
  - Crosby
  - Ironton
  - Deerwood
3. Crosslake Recycling
4. City of Emily Recycling
5. Ideal Township
6. City of Garrison Recycling
7. Maple Grove Township
8. Merrifield Lions
9. Mission Township Recycling

10. City of Nisswa
11. City of Pequot Lakes
12. Roosevelt Township
13. County Solid Waste Disposal Site
14. Southwest Townships

The projections for these programs were based on early results of the Emily Program. This resulted in an estimated 54 pounds per capita per year. Estimate appeared reasonable and the County remains optimistic, if markets expand with a value for recyclable material and outlying drop-off programs can continue to increase their recycling amounts at a reasonable cost.

### **2.3.1 Bay Lake Township Program**

Bay Lake Township started a drop-off program in 2009. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the Township for the program. The County gave a \$2,000 grant in 2009 to Bay Lake Township to enhance their recycling drop-off area by installing a fence around their recycling bins. Garrison Disposal started to provide service in January 2, 2009. Drop-off site will allow recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. This program is operating at a cost of \$81.40 per ton at a total rate of 67.57 tons for 2012.

### **2.3.2 Crosslake Program**

The Crosslake Drop-Off Program has been in operation since 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the City of Crosslake. A curbside service began in August 1993, and ended in 1996. In 1996, a permanent drop-off service was in place by Crosslake Rolloff allowing recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. The Crosslake recycling center is open all week. A hauler started up a curbside service June 2007. Cardboard was added back as a recycled item in 2008, and plastics bottles were added in 2009.

The projected results for this program were 41 tons per year. In 2012, the drop-off program recycled 184.51 tons (including the 42.59 tons for scrap metal). The trend for this drop-off program has been holding steady in their recycled amounts, even if the scrap metal is excluded. Currently, the cost for the recyclable material collected is \$162.59 per ton. When the curbside recycling (not funded through City) is included, the total amount of residential recycling for this area is 277.05 tons. The program has surpassed the original projection which is due to the amount of scrap metal collected and a very aggressive program.



### **2.3.3 Deerwood/C-I-D Program**

The Deerwood Drop-Off Program began operation in July 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds were provided to the City of Deerwood to operate the program. Pythons of Brainerd offered a once-a-month pick up of recyclables up to 1996. This program was operated by Range Disposal till 1997, with the collection site being staffed with volunteers. In 1998, the existing drop-off program for Deerwood was incorporated under the C-I-D program. The drop off location was located at Range Disposal shop till October 2008. In November 2008, Nisswa Sanitation provided a permanently located bin for each city that will allow recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. The County gave a \$5,681.14 grant to the City of Deerwood and \$3,000 grant to the City of Ironton for a permanent recycling drop-off area by installing a concrete pad for their recycling bins to sit on in 2009. The 2012 recycled material's amount is 346.99 tons. The cost for the recyclable material collected is \$167.15 per ton.

### **2.3.4 Emily Program**

The Emily Drop-Off Program has been in operation since 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the Emily Area Recycling Committee. Kenwood provided a once-a-month (third Saturday from 9 a.m. to noon) pick up of recyclables but in 1993 the committee contracted Range Disposal for this service. The contract has remained in place throughout 2007. Volunteers staff the collection site and it is open once a month. The recycling drop-off was located in a church parking lot. Due to liability issues, the City in 2007 relocated the drop-off site.

The County gave an \$8,008 grant to the City of Emily to upgrade their recycling drop-off area by installing a concrete pad for their recycling bins to sit on in 2007. The new drop-off location for recyclables started in April 2008, and allows recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. The projected results for this program were 33 tons per year. This program is operating at a cost of \$143.56 per ton at a total rate of 111.45 tons for 2012. Previously this program showed a decline due to the availability of other drop-off programs, including a permanent drop-off site in Cass County. Once a full time site was up and running we saw an increase.

### **2.3.5 Fifty Lakes Program**

The Fifty Lakes Drop-Off Program began operation in November of 1991 and ended with the closure of the demolition landfill and transfer station in October 1992. Appendix 2-B tables show the results of this program. SCORE funds were provided to the City of Fifty Lakes for the program. City personnel managed the program and materials were picked up by Crow Wing Recycling. Recyclable materials were accepted during all transfer station operating hours.

The Fifty Lakes area residents have accessibility to use either Emily or Crosslake drop-off recycling sites.

### **2.3.6 Garrison Program**

The Garrison Drop-Off Program began in August of 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the City of Garrison for the program. In 2005, the County gave a grant of \$10,000 to Garrison to upgrade their recycling drop-off area by installing a concrete pad for their recycling bins to sit on. Initially, the City contracted with Kenwood (Pythons of Brainerd) Recycling for the pick up. Garrison Disposal is now providing this service. The program offers a drop-off service once each month, at the Garrison City Hall parking lot. The hours of operations are 1 - 4 p.m. on the first Monday of every month. This program is operated by senior volunteers who provide curbside service (seniors unload your vehicle for you). Two containers are used from May to October and drops to one container for the rest of the remaining of the year. The projections for this program were 26 tons per year. The 2012 recycling rate is 33.53 tons, for an operating cost of \$123.47 per ton.

### **2.3.7 Ideal Township Program**

The Ideal Drop-Off Program began September 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are being provided to the Township for their program. In 2002, the County gave a grant of \$6,000 for the Township to update their recycling shelter. This year, the tabulated result does show a percentage for scrap metal collected for recycling at the transfer station because appliances were shipped this year. Cardboard was added in 2008.

The Township accepted materials during all canister station operating hours (open Monday, Wednesday and Saturday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.). The Township has North Country Sanitation remove this material for recycling. The cost of their program is greater than the SCORE funds provided. SCORE funds have been limited to the estimated cost of a drop-off program.

Currently, this program accounts for 58.37 tons of recycled materials at a cost of \$137.06 per ton of recyclable material collected. This program surpassed the original projection when scrap metal that is collected and included in the recycling total.

### **2.3.8 Maple Grove Township Program**

The Maple Grove Drop-Off Program began July 2008. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the Township for the program. The Township initially contracted with Waste Management. Starting in 2010, Garrison Disposal is now providing this service. The Drop-off site allows recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. The drop-off location is at the South Shores Paradise Resort on South Long Lake. The 2012 recycling rate is 42.4 tons at a cost of \$235.85 per ton of recyclable material collected.

### **2.3.9 Merrifield Program**

The Merrifield Drop-Off Program began June 1992. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the Merrifield Lions for the program. The Lions contracts with Blue Lakes Disposal to provide weekly drop-off service (Monday - Friday from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.). The drop off location is at the Blue Lakes Disposal Shop. The projected results for this program were 35 tons per year. The 2012 recycling rate is 411.4 tons, for an operating cost of \$10.33 per ton.

### **2.3.10 Mission Township Program**

The Mission Township Drop-Off Program began June 1992. Appendix 2-B shows the results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to the Township for the program. In 2004, the County gave a grant of \$5,000 for the Township to update their recycling shelter. Previously the program was offering one Saturday (last Saturday of the month from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.) per month drop-off at the Town Hall in the winter and at the transfer station during the summer. Starting in November 2009, the County gave another grant of \$6,000 to move/upgrade their recycling drop-off area so it is now located by the Township Hall (providing 24/7 service). These funds were use to install a concrete pad for their recycling bins and a used oil tank to sit on. The Township contract was with Blue Lakes Disposal, and starting November 2009 it is with Garrison Disposal to handle the recyclable materials. The projected results for the program were 20 tons per year. In 2012, the program accounted for 62.18 tons of recycled material at a cost of \$96.49 per ton.

### **2.3.11 Nisswa Program**

The Nisswa Drop-Off Program began September 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided to Nisswa for the program. In 2010, the County as part of the installation of a used oil tank, the recycling drop-off area was upgraded by installing a concrete pad for the recycling bins to sit on - for \$8,000. The indicated totals for each month are accurate while the individual material quantities are based on percentages of the total. The City contracts with Garrison/Nisswa Sanitation to provide two containers and haul materials to Aitkin Recycling Center. This program provides a permanently located bin rather than a once-a-month service. The projected results for a once-a-month drop-off were 67.6 tons per year. The 2012 cost per ton was \$100.32 for 269.14 tons, with daily drop-off opportunity.

### **2.3.12 Pequot Lakes Program**

The Pequot Lakes Drop-Off Program began January 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. The cost per ton for 1992 was reported as zero because funding was not requested. SCORE funds are provided to the City of Pequot Lakes for the program. In 2005, the County as part of the installation of a used oil tank, the recycling drop-off area was upgraded by installing a concrete pad for the recycling bins to sit on - for \$1,275. Initially, the City contracted with Kenwood (Pythons of Brainerd) Recycling for the pick up. Before April 1993, Kenwood Recycling provided a one Saturday per month drop-off service. Volunteers staffed the site. In April 1993, the City contracted with Nisswa Sanitation to provide a permanently located bin. In 1996, Garrison Disposal bought out

Nisswa Sanitation and they took over this service. In 2000, service was provided by North Country Rolloff. Starting in 2006 Nisswa Sanitation took over this service. Another hauler started up a curbside service in 2006.

Starting in 2005, the Drop-off site will allow recyclable materials to be dropped off any time. The projected results for this program were 58 tons per year. The material collected during 2012 for the drop-off program was 244.34 tons. The cost just considering SCORE funding is \$73.67 per ton. When the curbside recycling (not funded through City) is included, the total amount of residential recycling for this area is 244.34 tons.

### **2.3.13 Roosevelt Township Program**

The Roosevelt Drop-Off Program began August 1991. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. SCORE funds are provided the Township for the program. The Township contracted with Pythons of Brainerd until August 1996. At this time, Garrison Disposal was contracted to provide for a one Saturday per month service (third Saturday from 9 a.m. to noon). The County gave a \$6,000 grant to the Roosevelt Township to upgrade their recycling drop-off area by installing a concrete pad for their recycling bins to sit on in 2009, and the site location was change to be now located by the Township hall (provide 24/7 service). Because this program is in a sparsely populated area of the County, it is unlikely that the results will be comparable to another program. This program does provide a convenient opportunity for the County residents in this area to recycle.

Although limitations for this program exist, it does provide a service for this area of the County. In 2012, the program accounted for 48.22 tons of recycled material at a cost of \$176.28 per ton.

### **2.3.14 South Long Lake Program**

The South Long Lake Drop-Off Program began March 1992, and was ended by the sponsor in November 2004. SCORE funds were provided to the South Long Lake Recyclers for their program. Range Disposal provided once-a-month services up to April 1997. From March 1997 till they closed, Waste Management provided the service. For program flexibility, Waste Management stationed a trailer at the site from Friday evening until Monday morning. This site was self-monitored. Residents could commingle glass, plastic, aluminum, and tin cans into a single bin. Newspapers and magazines were placed in another bin. Instructional signs were posted at the site and area flyers help educate residents about changes. This resulted in good compliance with the self-monitoring program. The longer hours and commingle opportunities increased participation in this program.

During the life of this program it collected 224.35 tons of recyclables. The overall cost to collect this recyclable material was \$161.23 per ton.

### **2.3.15 County Solid Waste Disposal Site**

Pythons stopped taking glass on March 15, 1998. Because of this, the local office of the OEA was able to obtain a grant for local recycling of mixed glass through Cass County and Region Five RDC (Regional Development Commission). A report for the most feasible, cost effective, and beneficial use for glass collected for recycling in this area has been accomplished. Due the readily available and cheap supply of local aggregate it was determined each county could stockpile their glass and utilize it in a construction contract or use it as select fill at the Site.

To address this issue, the County purchased a 20-cubic yard dumpster in 1998, and it was placed at the County solid waste disposal site for self-haulers to place glass into. An area is set aside for the SCORE/County funded recycling programs to stockpile the glass at the Site starting in 1998. This material is being utilized as select fill at the Site and in future construction at the Site.

A more comprehensive drop-off collection program was started in October 2003 to address additional recyclables. Appendix 2-B shows the tabulated results of the program. This program offered drop-off collection of recyclable materials for County residents whenever the Site is open. Summer operations (April - October) is Monday through Saturday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Winter operations (November - March) is Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. In 2012, the program accounted for 80.38 tons of recycled material at a cost of \$170.70 per ton.

### **2.3.16 Southwest Townships**

This is a cooperative effort between St. Mathias, Fort Ripley and Crow Wing Township. The South West Townships program started in 2003 when this was chosen to be a site under the used oil program. Also in 2003, the County gave a grant of \$8,129 for the townships to place a small building at the site for use as a recycling center. SCORE/County funds are provided and the program starting in 2005. Appendix 2-B shows the results of the program.

The drop-off center is located at the Crow Wing Township Hall in Barrows. The actual recycling program started May 7, 2005. The center is open the 1st and 3rd Saturday of the month from 8 a.m. to noon. The 2012 recycling rate is 55.43 tons, for an operating cost of \$216.49 per ton.

### **2.3.17 Drop-off Program Summation**

There is no reasonable comparison between actual and projected results for the programs. The population served by an individual drop-off program is difficult to determine. The County has a large transient population.

Because some programs are in a sparsely populated area of the County, it is unlikely their results will be comparable to another program. However, convenient drop-off sites assist County residents to recycle. As the data suggests, a permanently located bin appears to collect more recyclable material than does a once-a-month drop off. In the future, as costs allow, most of the programs have been expanded to provide increased opportunity by adding additional collection days.

## 2.4 Overall Residential Recycling Program Summation

Recycling consists of three different activities:

- Collection of the recyclable materials;
- Preparing those materials for market; and
- Conversion of these materials by manufacturers into new products.

The greatest problem facing recycling is not the ability to collect the materials. It is the ability of the markets to absorb the quantity of materials being collected and convert it into inexpensive, new products. Market development is the responsibility of the State, and a key factor that is affecting the County's recycling program is the State's effort toward market development. It should be noted that the largest negative impact on the County recycling programs has been the lack of expanding recycling markets, and a stabilized price paid for the materials collected. Providing increased economic incentive for collection activities without simultaneous market development will exacerbate the situation and ultimately end in failure. A desirable end point or goal for the County, and no doubt the State, would be a recycling industry without government subsidies.

County programs can increase their recycling rate but the question is, "Can it be done at a reasonable cost?" Initially, recycling programs were sold on the basis that markets would be developed for recyclable material and market revenue would eventually pay for the programs. Market development has not progressed to a point where the materials can fully support these programs - and it is questionable if this would ever be reached. In Greater Minnesota, another large cost component is shipping - moving the materials to the market.

Recycling's fatal paradox is that increased demand for recyclables does not necessarily equal higher prices for recyclables. Manufacturers do not want to pay top dollar for their raw materials. Many times the low price manufacturer's pay for recyclables is the key to their profitability.

Increased education, public advertising, and increased hours of operation can increase overall participation. However, a point can be reached when recycling practices mature and costs associated with increasing yields exceed the benefits. The recycling rate will become flat because it will reach an inevitable plateau. According to recent research in California, current viable recovery technologies may reach limits when government diverts roughly 35 percent of the solid waste stream. There is some room to improve the existing County system, but there is a limit. Any significant gains in recycling will come from either development of markets for materials presently being thrown away or development of cheaper ways to recycle. After all, waste is waste - materials for, which there is no longer sufficient economic value to rescue from disposal.

Another long-term concern is the changing makeup of the waste stream. One area is the growth of plastics. In 1999, plastic bottle recycling fell to 22.1 percent nationwide playing out a familiar story. More plastic was collected for recycling, but it was dwarfed by an even larger increase in the amount of plastic bottles sold. The recycling rate has not kept pace with the growth of plastics.

Many businesses enter and exit a specific recycling market to insure a profit margin. This indicates a position of fiscal responsibility by the business community. Recyclers tend to compete for items having a high market price and ignore items whose volume, cost of preparation, and price makes them less attractive. The following risks are associated with the loss of profitable materials to the recycling market: the County can be left with the remaining less valuable products in County-sponsored programs and increased operating costs. Recyclable materials are usually considered property, not waste, under law. Thus, the ability to legally control recyclables at the County level is restrictive. When the markets are strong, the County will see significant quantities of valuable materials diverted from the normal County-sponsored recycling programs. The County cannot interfere with these activities since recyclables are considered property and are generally exempt from municipal solid waste regulations.

It appears County-sponsored recycling programs will never have a level playing field. The County must provide financial incentives for these programs when markets are weak and face stiff competition for products when the prices are firm. With today's mandated programs, the natural market mechanisms of supply and demand no longer work. The market was not generated by the private sector. Bottom line is that mandated recycling will not be self-sustaining, and needs to be considered a service - like water, sewer, police and fire protection. Funding a program from revenue raised by selling recyclables is not possible, and a service fee through local property tax and State grants will be required to pay for recycling programs into the foreseeable future. With a continued budget shortfall at the State level, counties have already seen a reduction in State SCORE grants and at the same time, declining State support. This will lead to additional recycling reassessments at the local level. The reality is that recycling competes for taxpayers dollars.

Another problem is that the benefits of recycling accrue globally while the costs are borne locally. Recycling is a resource conservation issue, not a public health issue. Overall, the relevant question at the local level is "how much recycling is good policy?" The reality of the situation is that recycling services require government funding. This was further highlighted in the January 2002, *Office of the Legislative Auditors Program Evaluation Report, Recycling and Waste Reduction* which states,

*"before deciding if and how to pursue options to divert more waste, however, state and County officials need to assess priorities, agree on funding, and better understand the cost and benefits of various alternatives."*

It is time for federal and state policy makers to consider financial measures for recycled material that would create meaningful incentives for recycling and enable local governments to keep and expand the recycling programs they offer.

Crisis is the primary driver to provoke significant change. For the past decade, garbage and recycling have not been among America's significant political issues. Tighter government budgets will make this an issue when program levels are reduced, no new programs are initiated, or programs are stopped all together, while at the same time, recycling mandates are maintained or increased.

**APPENDIX 2-A**  
**2012 SCORE REPORT**





**2012 SCORE reporting form**

for the period January 1 to December 31, 2012

Return to the MPCA by April 1, 2013

Primary Contact: Douglas R. Morris  
 Phone: 218-824-1290  
 Fax: 218-824-1291  
 e-mail: doug.morris@crowwing.us

Financial Contact: Same  
 Phone: Same  
 Fax: Same  
 e-mail: Same

**1. Program survey**On-line survey will be pre-loaded with previous years data (2011) Please update to reflect 2012 as needed

Underlined terms are defined on pages 12-15. Please refer to these definitions as you complete the survey.

**County solid waste collection system**

1. Are all solid waste generators, including farmers, prohibited by county ordinance or county board resolution from:
  - a. Burying or dumping household wastes on-site? X Yes ☐ No
  - b. Burning household wastes on-site? X Yes ☐ No
2. Solid waste hauler licensing (Minn. Stat. 115A.93):
  - a. Are all solid waste haulers who operate in the county licensed by the county? X Yes ☐ No
  - b. Are all solid waste haulers who are not licensed by the county licensed by cities or towns? ☐ Yes ☐ No X N/A
  - c. Do all licenses require a variable-rate pricing structure? ☐ Yes X No
3. Does the county apply a surcharge (Minn. Stat. 115A.919, subd. 2) in addition to the tip fee to waste disposed in the county or charge a service fee (i.e. line item on property tax or utility bill) to residents and/or businesses? Enter zero if not applicable.
  - a. What is the surcharge for county waste?
 

\$ per Ton:	\$ 0
\$ per cubic yard:	\$ 0
  - b. What is the surcharge for out-of-county waste?
 

\$ per ton:	\$ 0
\$ per cubic yard:	\$ 0
  - c. What is the *total* revenue generated from service fees charged to:
 

Businesses?:	\$ 0
Residents?:	\$ 0
If you can't break out by business and residential but know the grand total, list total here:	\$ 0
4. How many sites in the county are available for self-hauling of MSW? Includes sites with one or more public canisters, transfer stations and processing/disposal facilities
 

3

**County solid waste SCORE staffing Question 5-12 will not need to be answered by Counties**How many county full-time equivalent (FTE) staff worked on the following activities?

<u>Example</u>	0.75 FTE
5. <u>Source reduction</u>	
6a. <u>Recycling collection and processing</u>	
6b. <u>Recycling administration/support staff</u>	
7. <u>Yard Waste</u>	
8. <u>Waste Education</u>	
9. <u>HHW &amp; problem materials</u>	
10. <u>Other SCORE program planning and administration</u>	
11. <u>Total County SCORE Staff</u>	
12. <u>How many city and township staff worked on SCORE-related activities?</u>	

**Recycling**

13. How many cities and townships offer curbside recycling at least once monthly? 3
14. Estimate the population served by residential curbside recycling programs. 23,614
15. Do all cities in your county with a population greater than 20,000 (cities greater than 5,000 in metropolitan counties) provide curbside recycling to residents? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
16. Do all cities in your county with a population greater than 5,000 provide curbside recycling and/ or recycling center to residents? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
17. Does the county have a specific program to promote commercial/industrial recycling? ☒ Yes ☐ No
18. How many recycling centers are there in the county? (please read definition, page 13) 1
19. How many recycling stations are there in the county? (please read definition, page 14) 16
20. How many material recovery facilities (MRF's) are there in the county? 0
21. Has the county banned recyclable material from landfills or the disposal system? If so, identify grades (e.g., aluminum, plastic, corrugated) below. Do not include materials banned by state law.
22. Has the county enacted  
 An ordinance requiring:
- a. residents to recycle ☐ Yes ☒ No
- b. businesses to recycle ☐ Yes ☒ No
- c. haulers to provide recycling collection services ☐ Yes ☒ No
23. If not countywide, how many cities  
 in the county have ordinances  
 requiring:
- a. residents to recycle 0
- b. businesses to recycle 0
- c. haulers to provide recycling collection services 3
24. Does the county license recycling collectors? ☐ Yes ☒ No
25. Does the county require recycling collectors to submit tonnage reports? ☒ Yes ☐ No
26. Does the county, or do any municipalities, use the following labor resources for SCORE programs?  
 Please indicate all that apply
- a. volunteer ☒ Yes ☐ No
- b. non-profit ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. private sector ☒ Yes ☐ No
- d. sentence-to-serve ☒ Yes ☐ No

**Yard Waste Management**

27. How many yard waste drop-off sites are there in the county? 9
28. How many yard waste curbside collection programs are there in the county? 2
29. Estimate the population served by yard waste curbside collection programs. 2,963
30. Does the county have an ongoing education program to inform residents how to minimize yard waste generation through on-site composting, mulching and/or low-maintenance or naturalized landscaping? ☒ Yes ☐ No
31. Does the county have an ongoing education program to inform residents how to manage yard wastes through drop-off sites or curbside collection? ☒ Yes ☐ No
32. Has the county informed residents of the prohibition on land disposal of yard waste? ☒ Yes ☐ No

# Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and Problem Materials Questions 33-38 will not need to be answered by Counties

33. Has the county provided residents with educational materials on the reduction, identification and proper management of HHW? ☐ Yes ☐ No
34. Did the county conduct any HHW product exchanges? ☐ Yes ☐ No
35. Does the county operate or cooperate in a permanent HHW facility? ☐ Yes ☐ No
36. How many households delivered HHW directly to a permanent HHW facility?
37. How many HHW collection events were held in the county?
38. How many households participated in HHW collection events?

## Procurement

- 39a. How often does the county use *The Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Guide*? ☐ Often ☒ Sometimes ☐ Never
40. How often did the county explicitly specify recycled materials when putting out a bid? ☐ Often ☒ Sometimes ☐ Never
41. How much money did the county spend on *recycled-content* purchases this year?
42. Does the county procure any of the following products? Check all that apply
- |                   |                                      |   |  |   |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Office</b>     | a. recycled paper                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | k. recycled flooring                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | b. recycled envelopes                | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | l. integrated pest management                | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | c. soy or agri-based inks            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | m. plastic lumber                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | d. energy-efficient office equipment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | n. recycled mulch                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | e. remanufactured toner cartridges   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <b>Vehicle</b> o. alternative based vehicles | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | f. refurbished furniture             | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | p. re-refined oil                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>Bldg maint</b> | g. recycled paper toiletries         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | q. recycled or long-life antifreeze          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | h. less toxic cleaners               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | r. retread tires                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | i. recycled trash bags or bins       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | s. recycled glass road aggregate             | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | j. recycled paint                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | t. recycled traffic cones                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|                   | u. Other (please specify)            | <input type="text"/>  |  |   |
43. How many recycled-content products did the county purchase this year compared to last? ☐ More ☒ Same ☐ Less
44. Do you have any examples of innovative approaches that address a barrier to buying recycled and/or less toxic products? If yes, please attach example. ☐ Yes ☒ No

## Electronic Appliances Questions 45-47 will not need to be answered by Counties

45. Did the county, or did any municipalities within the county, collect waste electronic appliances from residents as part of any recycling or HHW services? ☐ Yes ☐ No
46. Did the county, or did any municipalities within the county, have a contract for use and/or repair of electronic appliances where the county or municipality is responsible for disposal of the electronic appliance at the end of its useful life? ☐ Yes ☐ No
47. Did the county, or any municipalities within the county, have a contract for use and/or repair of electronic appliances where the contractor (usually a vendor or manufacturer) will take back the electronic appliance at the end of its useful life? ☐ Yes ☐ No

— If yes, please list types of equipment under contract:

**Source Reduction Checklist Will be preloaded with previous years data (2011). Please update to reflect 2012 as needed.**

This information will be used to determine which counties will receive up to a three percent source reduction (SR) credit toward recycling goals. Questions pertain to SR activities during the calendar year unless stated otherwise. Cooperation with local units of government such as cities or multi-county efforts are considered eligible if they meet the various criteria listed in the activities below. SR credit will be awarded using the following ranges: 6 or more "Yes" = 1%, 12 or more = 2%, and 18 or more = 3%. If you would like to receive credit for actual tons of MSW that has been reduced, report that information separately using the enclosed SR reporting form.

**Promotion (check all that apply)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Advertise business source reduction success through a county awards program or through local newspapers, radio, television, or other media. (attach case study)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 2. Advertise residential source reduction success through a county awards program or through local newspapers, radio, television or other media. (attach case study) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 3. In the last three years, conduct focus groups or a survey of businesses and institutions about source reduction activities and assistance needs.                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 4. In the last three years, conduct focus groups or a survey of residents about source reduction activities and assistance needs.                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 5. Establish an ongoing source reduction recognition program for county employees.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 6. Promote materials exchange through mailings, presentations or other media including the internet.   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 7. Promote SR through television and radio appearances.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

**General Education/Information (check all that apply)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 8. Hosted events for Pollution Prevention Week.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 9. Distributed materials (brochures, flyers, fact sheets, posters, etc.) to at least 25 percent of county businesses in the last 3 years.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 10. Distributed materials (brochures, flyers, fact sheets, posters, etc.) to at least 25 percent of county residents through county events, mailings or publications in the last 3 years.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 11. Developed/updated a solid and hazardous waste directory for county residents and/or businesses within the last three years.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 12. Integrated source reduction into county employee training and education programs.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 13. Promote MPCA's waste reduction materials or other source reduction curriculum or activities in schools. Please list materials or activities promoted:<br><div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 500px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 14. County staff has used resources from the MPCA's Waste Reduction Campaign to implement SR programs.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 15. Staffed a SR display at a county fair or similar event.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 16. Incorporate SR information into a county website.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 17. Distributed <u>home composting</u> educational materials to county residents.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

**Outreach to County Departments & Local Governments (check all that apply)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 18. A team that meets at least quarterly, including representatives from major county departments, that discusses SR as a formal part of the agenda. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 19. Cooperate with other counties to fund regional SR programs to promote source reduction.  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 20. Attend 2 or more Counties and Cities Involved in Source Reduction and Recycling (CISRR) meetings or a regional SR workshop.                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| 21. Attend 4 or more Counties and Cities Involved in Source Reduction and Recycling (CISRR) meetings.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

**Technical Assistance** (check all that apply)

22. Conduct site visits to 1-10 businesses. ☐ Yes ☒ No
23. Conduct site visits to 11-40 businesses. ☐ Yes ☒ No
24. Conduct site visits to 40+ businesses. ☐ Yes ☒ No
25. Conduct a training session, workshop, or presentation at a business, institutional, or community event. ☐ Yes ☒ No
26. Collaborated on a multi-county SR event (not limited to workshops and trainings). ☐ Yes ☒ No
27. Conduct a waste audit or survey of at least 10 percent of county facilities within the past three years to target SR. ☐ Yes ☒ No
28. Actively promoted and provided technical assistance for Minnesota Waste Wise. ☒ Yes ☐ No
29. Developed a home composting bin distribution program for county residents. ☐ Yes ☒ No
30. Conducted (or co-sponsored) workshops demonstrating proper home composting techniques. ☐ Yes ☒ No
31. Offer permanent home composting demonstration sites. ☐ Yes ☒ No
32. Refer organizations to an existing materials exchange program. ☒ Yes ☐ No
33. Coordinate materials exchange through a HHW program. ☒ Yes ☐ No
34. Coordinate, work with, or provide funding or in-kind support to a local materials exchange program. ☒ Yes ☐ No
35. Actively assist in the exchange of materials between organizations. ☐ Yes ☒ No
36. Work with targeted sector of business community to reduce waste ☐ Yes ☒ No
37. Incorporate green building goals/requirements in county construction, remodeling, and maintenance bid specs and contracts. ☒ Yes ☐ No
38. Coordinate reuse project (other than materials exchange). Please List: ☒ Yes ☐ No  
Homes for Habitat
39. Conduct training with county purchasers about environmentally preferable purchasing ☐ Yes ☒ No

**Policy Initiatives** (check all that apply)

40. Resolution passed by county board on environmentally responsible purchasing guidelines for county facilities. ☐ Yes ☒ No
41. Implement and promote a variable rate pricing system through county ordinance, licensure, or contract for collection. ☐ Yes ☒ No
42. Developed an implementation strategy in county solid waste management plan that is designed to achieve a minimum of 10% per-capita source reduction. ☐ Yes ☒ No
43. Resolution passed by county board on "green building" guidelines for construction, remodeling and maintenance of county facilities and grounds. ☐ Yes ☒ No

## 2. Revenues and Expenditures

On-line form will have preloaded dollars in Revenues

Expenditure, each activity does not need to be broken down, only need to place one dollar amount for each of the activities

Please provide total county revenues and expenditures made during calendar year 2012 (1/1/12-12/31/12) that were dedicated towards SCORE-related activities. If there were no county revenues or expenditures for a particular line item, please enter zero. Reported expenditures should only reflect direct county expenditures. No attempt should be made to quantify spending by other units of government, the private sector or citizens.

### A. Revenues

#### 1. Calendar year 2011 revenues (1/1/11 to 12/31/11)

Balance carried-over from CY 2011 ( refer to appendix for amount)

\$0

Adjust to balance carried-over from CY 2011

\$0

Subtotal A1 :

\$0

#### 2. Calendar year 2012 revenues ( 1/1/12 to 12/31/12)

County local revenue sources:

General revenue

\$ 0

Service fee (\$15 Solid Waste Assessments)

\$453,164

Tip fee (Tires, appliances, electronics, scrap metal, and mattresses)

\$ 87,554

Land disposal facility surcharge

\$ 0

SCORE funds received in CY 2012 (refer to appendix for amount)

\$153,908

Grants-description:

\$ 0

Household hazardous waste (HHW) funding from MPCA

\$ 9,824

HHW funding from regional program sponsor

\$ 0

Material sales

\$ 0

Other-description

\$ 0

Subtotal A2:

\$709,450

Total A:

\$709,450

### B. Expenditures

#### 1. SCORE planning, oversight and administration

Consultant costs

\$ 0

County staff salary (should match FTE's listed in page 1)

\$182,722

Office equipment & supplies (computers, etc.)

\$ 18,101

Training, seminars and conferences

\$ 152

Other-description Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out

\$ 0

Subtotal B1:

\$200,975

#### 2. Recycling

Direct capital expenditures

\$ 0

Direct operating expenditures:

County-contracted private services

\$ 0

Residential curbside collection

\$ 11,563

Recycling centers and/or recycling stations (Landfill site)

\$ 0

Commercial/industrial collection

\$ 0

Processing

\$ 0

Subsidy to private operators

\$ 0

County-operated services

\$ 0

Other-description Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out

\$ 0

Subtotal B2:

\$ 11,583

**3. Yard Waste**

Direct capital expenditures		\$ 0
Direct operating expenditures-county contracted private services		
Curbside collection & processing		\$ 0
Drop-off site management & processing		\$ 0
Subsidy to private operators		\$ 0
County-operated services		\$ 25,366
Other-Description	Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out	\$ 0
Subtotal B3:		\$ 25,366

**4. Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) & Problem Material Management**

Direct capital expenditures		\$ 8,314
Operating expenditures		\$ 8,908
Transportation & disposal		\$ 18,082
Major appliance management		\$ 9,075
Electronic appliance management		\$ 11,962
Used oil management		\$ 0
Household battery management		\$ 0
Household fluorescent tube & HID lamp management		\$ 0
Pass-through grants to counties in regional HHW program		\$ 0
Other-description	Waste tires, mattresses, scrap metal & coupon program	\$ 38,710
Subtotal B4:		\$ 95,051

**5. Source Reduction**

Technical assistance to businesses		\$ 0
Capital investment		\$ 0
Other-description	Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out	\$ 0
Subtotal B5:		\$ 0

**6. Education**

Source Reduction		
Recycling		
Yard Waste		
HHW & Problem Materials		
General public education		
Grants to schools		
Other-description	Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out	
Subtotal B6		\$ 18,798

**7. Market Development (identify)**

Description 1:	Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out	
Description 2:		
Subtotal B7:		\$ 0

**8. Litter Prevention**

Description	Clean up program	\$ 19,599
Subtotal B8:		\$ 19,599



**9: County Grants to Other Local Units of Government**

SCORE planning, oversight and administration

\$ 0

Recycling direct capital expenditures

\$ 0

Recycling operating expenditures

\$ 0

Yard waste direct capital expenditures

\$338,080

Yard waste operating expenditures

\$ 0

HHW and problem materials management

\$ 0

Source Reduction, Education, Market Development and misc.

\$ 0

Other-description: Need to only place one dollar amount in this break-out

\$ 0

Subtotal B9:

\$338,080

Total B (B1 through B9):

\$709,450

**C. Balance**

Total CY 2012 revenues

Total A:

\$709,450

Total CY 2012 expenditures

- Total B:

\$709,450

Balance carry-over to CY 2013

= Total C:

\$ 0

### 3. Materials Collected for Recycling

Please record tonnages of materials collected within the county for recycling. Materials should be counted at the point of collection to avoid double counting materials that are transferred several times before they are recycled. A volume-to-weight conversion table is provided on pages 15-16. Record tonnage in the column that best represents the generator and in the row that best represents the material grade. Unidentifiable materials or materials that do not fit into a material type specified on this form should be entered under "Other recyclables". If a recycler cannot provide tonnages specific to your county, estimate the amount originating in your county. Do not attempt to subtract material tonnage that is refused or rejected from recycling markets, or residuals from those markets.

For purposes of calculating recycling rates, Commercial/Industrial/Institutional (CII) recycling only includes material sold by commercial, industrial or institutional establishment for the purpose of recycling. It does not include material recycled "in-house" or "mill scrap" within a manufacturing operation. Do not include materials recovered from other non-MSW waste streams such as demolition or construction debris, agricultural wastes, or non-hazardous industrial wastes. However the MPCA recognizes and encourages these activities.

State estimates for the recovery of problem materials in each county are provided on an attached sheet. Use these estimates if no reliable information is available but if documented data is available, the MPCA encourages you to use it. If you report both residential and commercial problem materials, you cannot use the state estimates. This is because of double counting since the state estimates take into account both commercial and residential totals.

If you are reporting materials under "CII: Estimated", please attach documentation of your estimation methods and/or a list of recyclers that have withheld recycling data from the jurisdiction along with the tons of material attributed to them.

Paper:	<u>Residential</u>	<u>CII:</u> <u>Documented</u>	<u>CII:</u> <u>Estimated</u>	<u>Mechanical</u> <u>and hand-</u> <u>separated</u>
Corrugated containers	386.94	4,747.08		
Computer paper	0	0		
Magazine & Catalog grade	126.73	2.80		
Mixed grades	1,893.81	584.47		
Newsprint	247.02	344.46		
Office paper	0	0		
Phone Books	0	0		
Other paper:	0	0		
Other paper:	0	0		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>2,654.50</b>	<b>5,678.81</b>		
<b>Metal:</b>				
Aluminum food/beverage can/foil	209.54	8.09		
Commingled aluminum/steel/tin	0	0		
Steel/tin cans	380.78	0		
Other scrap:ferrous & non-ferrous	61.40	17,987.29		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>651.72</b>	<b>17,995.38</b>		
<b>Glass:</b>				
Food & Beverage container	995.76	194.11		
Other glass:	0	0		
Other glass:	0	0		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>995.76</b>	<b>194.11</b>		

	<u>Residential</u>	<u>C/I/I:</u> <u>Documented</u>	<u>C/I/I:</u> <u>Estimated</u>	<u>Mechanical</u> <u>and hand-</u> <u>separated</u>
<b>Plastics:</b>				
Film plastics	0	0		
HDPE (SPI Code 2)	0	0		
Mixed plastics (SPI Code 1-6)	659.93	983.89		
PET (SPI Code 1)	0	0		
Polystyrene (SPI Code 6)	0	0		
Other:	0	0		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>659.93</b>	<b>983.89</b>		
<b>Organics:</b>				
Food (livestock)	0	552.48		
Food (food-to-people)	0	0		
Food (source-separated compost)	0	0		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>552.48</b>		
<b>Other Recyclables-Part 1</b>				
Major appliances	532.25			
Used oil	50.2			
Used oil filters*	33.39			
Vehicle batteries	415.29			
Waste tires	207.00			
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>1,238.13</b>			
<b>Other Recyclables-Part 2</b>				
Antifreeze	0	19.52		
Carpet	0	0		
Fluorescent & HID lamps**	0	28.09	8.43	
Electronics	131.13	77.85	2.78	
HHW	0	2.02		
Textiles	0	277.04		
Unspecified/Other	0	0		
Pallets	0	0		
Latex Paint	22.78	0		
Mattresses and Box Springs	92.21	0		
Other: Wood	0	5.25		
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>246.12</b>	<b>409.77</b>	<b>11.2</b>	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>5,208.03</b>	<b>27,052.57</b>	<b>11.2</b>	

**GRAND TOTAL 32,271.81**

\*To obtain credit for used oil filter recycling, provide in the space below or on a separate sheet the name of at least one collector of used oil filters in the county. If no collectors are identified the county will not receive credit for used oil filter recycling.

East Side Oil

\*\*To calculate tons of fluorescent lamps recycled, multiply the number of lamps collected for recycling by 0.625 lbs. (estimated average weight of a four-foot bulb) and divide by 2000.

#### 4. Waste Generation

##### 1. On-site-disposal of uncollected MSW

To estimate the quantity of waste generated in the county that is not collected and disposed of in the formal waste management system, please estimate the county population without MSW collection service that does not self-haul:

539

persons.

The MPCA will estimate the tons of MSW managed on-site using the following formula: (# of persons x 2.3 lbs./person x 365 days)/(2000 lbs./ton). The result is the total tons of county waste considered to be disposed on-site each year. The OEA will calculate this number:

226

tons per year.

##### 2. Managed MSW

2A. Estimate the percent of MSW generated by the C/I sector:

9 %

2B. **Greater Minnesota counties only** (Metropolitan area counties submit this information using Form IV in the County Certification/Annual Report).

Identify facilities that receive MSW from the county. See attached lists of facilities for proper spelling and permit numbers. Record tons of MSW hauled to transfer stations or hauled directly to land disposal or solid waste processing facilities (MSW compost, RDF, incinerators). Avoid double-counting. Rejects and residual waste from processing facilities may be counted at the processing facility or at the land disposal facility, but not at both.

Transfer Station #1: Permit # \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Permit #	Name of final destination facility	Tons delivered
<b>Total Tons:</b>		

Transfer Station #2: Permit # \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Permit #	Name of final destination facility	Tons delivered
<b>Total Tons:</b>		

Waste hauled directly to final destination(s)

Permit #	Name of final destination facility	Tons delivered
SW-376	Crow Wing County Sanitary Landfill	36,564
<b>Total Tons:</b>		

Douglas R. Morris

Solid Waste Coordinator

Thank you for your assistance in completing this form. Please direct questions or comments to: Arlene Vee at (507)476-4276; Cell number is 507-829-1860 or [arlene.vee@state.mn.us](mailto:arlene.vee@state.mn.us) or Marshall Office Front Desk 507-537-7146 or (800) 657-3864.



**APPENDIX 2-B**  
**2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT**  
**(RESIDENTIAL)**



**WEIGHT IN TONS**

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
Crosby														
1/31/2012	3,049				18,966		284	603		5,318	7,232			35,452
2/28/2012	3,309				20,587		308	654		5,772	7,650			38,480
3/31/2012	2,382				14,820		222	471		4,155	5,651			27,701
4/30/2012	2,233				13,889		208	441		3,894	5,296			25,961
5/31/2012	3,655				22,802		341	725		6,393	8,694			42,620
6/30/2012	3,355				20,870		312	663		5,852	7,958			39,010
7/31/2012	2,640				16,425		246	522		4,905	6,263			30,701
8/31/2012	2,958				18,399		275	585		5,159	7,016			34,392
9/30/2012	2,817				17,527		262	557		4,914	6,683			32,760
10/31/2012	2,975				18,506		277	588		5,189	7,056			34,591
11/30/2012	3,437				21,384		320	679		5,996	8,154			39,970
12/30/2012	2,858				17,778		266	565		4,985	8,779			33,231
Subtotal LB	35,678	0	0	0	221,953	0	3,321	7,053	0	62,232	84,632	0	0	414,869
Subtotal TN	17.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.98	0.00	1.66	3.53	0.00	31.12	42.32	0.00	0.00	207.43
Iron/ton														
1/31/2012	723				4,499		67	143		1,262	1,718			8,412
2/28/2012	695				4,323		65	137		1,212	1,548			8,080
3/31/2012	830				5,163		77	164		1,448	1,969			9,651
4/30/2012	328				2,038		30	65		572	777			3,610
5/31/2012	1,135				7,062		108	224		1,980	2,693			13,200
6/30/2012	789				4,906		73	156		1,376	1,871			9,171
7/31/2012	1,133				7,046		105	224		1,976	2,687			13,171
8/31/2012	561				4,114		62	131		1,154	1,569			7,691
9/30/2012	593				3,692		55	117		1,035	1,408			6,900
10/31/2012	628				3,906		58	124		1,095	1,489			7,300
11/30/2012	1,019				6,340		95	201		1,778	2,417			11,850
12/30/2012	766				4,767		71	151		1,337	1,818			8,910
Subtotal LB	9,300	0	0	0	57,856	0	864	1,837	0	16,225	22,064	0	0	108,149
Subtotal TN	4.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.93	0.00	0.43	0.92	0.00	8.11	11.03	0.00	0.00	54.07
Deerwood														
1/31/2012	1,120				6,966		104	221		1,953	2,656			13,020
2/28/2012	691				4,296		64	137		1,205	1,638			8,031
3/31/2012	1,010				6,281		94	200		1,761	2,395			11,741
4/30/2012	1,253				7,795		117	248		2,186	2,972			14,571
5/31/2012	952				5,922		89	188		1,661	2,258			11,070
6/30/2012	1,969				12,246		183	389		3,434	4,670			22,891
7/31/2012	1,551				9,651		144	307		2,706	3,680			18,039
8/31/2012	611				3,799		57	121		1,065	1,448			7,101
9/30/2012	1,182				7,351		110	234		2,061	2,803			13,741
10/31/2012	1,769				11,005		165	350		3,086	4,196			20,571
11/30/2012	1,594				9,919		148	315		2,781	3,782			18,539
12/30/2012	1,001				6,227		93	198		1,746	2,375			11,640
Subtotal LB	14,703	0	0	0	91,458	0	1,368	2,908	0	25,645	34,873	0	0	170,955
Subtotal TN	7.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.73	0.00	0.68	1.45	0.00	12.82	17.44	0.00	0.00	85.48
Total LB	59,681	0	0	0	371,267	0	5,553	11,798	0	104,102	141,569	0	0	693,970
Total TN	29.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	185.63	0.00	2.78	5.90	0.00	52.05	70.78	0.00	0.00	346.99
SCORE TOTALS/COST PER TON														
\$167.15														
\$58,000.00														

SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON



[illegible]

### Breezy Point

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
(WASTE PARTNERS/Pine River Recycling Center)														
1/31/2012					7,796		277	1,165		3,384	555			13,177
2/28/2012					7,299		229	963		2,798	459			11,748
3/31/2012					7,469		236	893		2,893	473			12,054
4/30/2012					7,681		246	1,032		2,998	492			12,448
5/31/2012					8,731		334	1,404		4,079	669			15,217
6/30/2012					9,056		287	1,207		3,506	575			14,631
7/31/2012					8,140		435	1,825		5,302	869			16,571
8/31/2012					8,466		378	1,589		4,615	757			15,805
9/30/2012					6,905		284	1,191		3,459	567			12,406
10/31/2012					7,365		273	1,147		3,332	546			12,663
11/30/2012					6,963		285	1,197		3,478	570			12,513
12/30/2012					7,553		243	1,020		2,962	486			12,264
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	93,444	0	3,507	14,733	0	42,796	7,018	0	0	161,468
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.72	0.00	1.75	7.37	0.00	21.40	3.51	0.00	0.00	80.75
(PEQUOT LAKES SANITATION/Pine River Recycling Center)														
1/31/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
2/28/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
3/31/2012					35,702		840	5,560		14,457	2,224			58,793
4/30/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
5/31/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
6/30/2012					53,060		720	5,975		15,535	2,390			83,680
7/31/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
8/31/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
9/30/2012					57,780		780	7,880		20,488	3,152			90,080
10/31/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
11/30/2012					0		0	0		0	0			0
12/30/2012					42,870		560	5,452		14,175	2,181			65,238
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	195,412	0	2,900	24,867	0	64,655	9,947	0	0	297,781
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	97.71	0.00	1.45	12.43	0.00	32.33	4.97	0.00	0.00	148.89
Total LB	0	0	0	0	288,856	0	6,407	39,800	0	107,451	16,965	0	0	459,279
Total TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	144.43	0.00	3.20	19.80	0.00	53.73	8.48	0.00	0.00	229.64
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON														\$14,000.00

WEIGHT IN TONS

(WASTE MANAGEMENT/PELTZ, St Cloud, LPi & PINE RIVER)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012					4,164		278	416		1,874	208			6,940
2/28/2012					6,216		414	622		2,797	311			10,360
3/31/2012					6,948		463	695		3,127	347			11,580
4/30/2012					10,848		723	1,085		4,882	542			18,080
5/31/2012					10,644		710	1,064		4,790	532			17,740
6/30/2012					12,600		840	1,260		5,670	630			21,000
7/31/2012					18,204		1,214	1,820		8,192	910			30,340
8/31/2012					18,312		1,221	1,831		8,240	916			30,520
9/30/2012					14,952		997	1,495		6,728	748			24,920
10/31/2012					11,292		753	1,129		5,081	565			18,820
11/30/2012					8,724		582	872		3,926	436			14,540
12/30/2012					10,836		722	1,084		4,876	542			18,060
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	133,740	0	8,916	13,374	0	60,183	6,887	0	0	222,900
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.87	0.00	4.46	6.69	0.00	30.09	3.34	0.00	0.00	111.45
SOURCE FUNDS/COST PER TON													\$16,000.00	\$143.56

2012  
WEIGHT IN TONS

**SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON**

Nisswa

**SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON**

(GARRISON/MARKET)

SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON

## 2012

2012  
ROW WING C

(GARRISON/Pine River Recycling Center)

(GARRISON/Pine River Recycling Center)

(WASTE PARTNERS/Pine River Recycling Center)

(WASTE PARTNERS/Pine River Recycling Center)

COST PER TON

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE	MAGS	MIXED	PHONE	ALUM.	TIN	SCRAP	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD	OTHER	TOTAL
(WASTE MANAGEMENT/PELTZ, ST. CLOUD, LPI & PINE RIVER)														
1/31/2012					16,888		1,125	1,689		7,600	844			25,147
2/28/2012					21,204		1,414	2,120		9,542	1,050			35,340
3/31/2012					21,108		1,407	2,111		9,498	1,055			35,180
4/30/2012					23,489		1,566	2,349		10,570	1,174			39,148
5/31/2012					21,088		1,408	2,108		9,489	1,054			35,148
6/30/2012					25,156		1,744	2,615		9,209	1,038			43,568
7/31/2012					20,485		1,384	2,047		8,507	1,023			34,108
8/31/2012					14,460		954	1,448		5,807	723			24,100
9/30/2012					23,775		1,584	2,376		10,690	1,188			39,512
10/31/2012					19,220		1,281	1,922		8,649	981			32,034
11/30/2012					11,354		767	1,135		5,109	568			18,924
12/30/2012					8,532		575	893		3,884	432			14,387
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	227,840	0	15,188	22,782	0	102,819	11,351	0	0	379,720
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	113.92	0.00	7.59	11.35	0.00	51.25	5.70	0.00	0.00	189.86
(GARRISON/Pine River Recycling Center)														
1/31/2012					33,266		497	1,057		9,927	12,685			62,779
2/28/2012					34,149		511	1,085		9,575	13,021			63,630
3/31/2012					35,358		529	1,124		9,914	13,462			69,091
4/30/2012					34,812		521	1,108		9,761	13,274			65,072
5/31/2012					46,978		702	1,493		13,172	17,913			87,810
6/30/2012					37,653		563	1,196		10,557	14,359			70,360
7/31/2012					48,673		636	1,483		13,086	17,797			87,240
8/31/2012					46,266		592	1,470		12,969	17,638			86,461
9/30/2012					34,459		515	1,095		9,652	13,140			64,410
10/31/2012					39,611		592	1,259		11,705	15,104			74,039
11/30/2012					35,069		524	1,114		9,630	13,368			65,531
12/30/2012					28,141		421	894		7,890	10,730			52,600
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	452,415	0	6,765	14,378	0	126,849	172,510	0	0	845,643
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	226.21	0.00	3.38	7.19	0.00	63.42	86.26	0.00	0.00	422.82
(WASTE PARTNERS/Pine River Recycling Center)														
1/31/2012					19,345		686	2,661		8,398	1,377			32,669
2/28/2012					18,114		599	2,390		8,943	1,139			29,154
3/31/2012					18,564		587	2,467		7,167	1,175			29,959
4/30/2012					16,132		612	2,571		7,469	1,224			31,008
5/31/2012					21,702		631	3,491		10,140	1,652			37,876
6/30/2012					22,511		714	3,000		8,715	1,429			36,369
7/31/2012					26,290		1,404	5,896		17,125	2,807			53,522
8/31/2012					27,345		1,222	5,131		14,905	2,443			51,046
9/30/2012					22,568		927	3,892		11,306	1,853			40,546
10/31/2012					28,985		1,075	4,514		13,113	2,150			49,837
11/30/2012					30,784		1,256	5,276		15,325	2,512			55,133
12/30/2012					27,284		877	3,693		10,698	1,754			44,296
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	282,604	0	10,762	45,202	0	131,304	21,524	0	0	491,365
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	141.30	0.00	5.38	22.60	0.00	65.65	10.76	0.00	0.00	245.70
(BLUE LAKES/Pine River Recycling Center)														
1/31/2012					4,710		6,930	11,690		23,490	12,250			85,040
2/28/2012					4,900		6,970	11,100		23,850	11,880			82,630
3/31/2012					4,860		6,810	10,560		24,260	12,300			81,820
4/30/2012					4,800		5,930	10,570		24,020	12,560			81,660
5/31/2012					4,950		5,930	10,750		24,100	13,140			83,220
6/30/2012					5,120		5,260	11,680		24,510	13,270			86,100
7/31/2012					5,330		6,410	11,860		25,090	13,330			87,940
8/31/2012					5,350		6,450	10,980		24,280	13,330			84,080
9/30/2012					4,650		6,350	11,330		23,430	12,650			84,260
10/31/2012					4,900		6,970	11,010		23,920	12,330			83,960
11/30/2012					4,750		6,600	12,120		26,770	12,510			89,630
12/30/2012					4,350		6,760	11,970		24,450	12,480			87,340
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	59,960	0	70,550	135,680	0	292,160	152,030	0	0	1,011,070
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.48	0.00	39.28	67.94	0.00	146.08	76.02	0.00	0.00	508,544
Total LB	69.17	48.68	0	59,960	1,028,669	0	108,265	218,242	0	652,632	367,465	0	0	2,733,829
Total TN	211,056	97,350	0	59,960	1,028,669	0	108,265	218,242	0	652,632	367,465	0	0	1,366,911
Grand Total	105.63	48.68	0.00	29.48	514.33	0.00	54.63	109.12	0.00	326.42	176.73	0.00	0.00	\$84,390.00

WEIGHT IN TONS

MONTH	OC	NEWS	OFFICE	MIXED	PHONE	ALUM.	TIN	SCRAP	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD	OTHER	TOTAL
(WASTE MANAGEMENT/PELITZ, St Cloud, LP & PINE RIVER)													
1/31/2012				12,740		849	1,274		5,733	637			21,233
2/28/2012				15,966		1,066	1,600		7,198	600			26,960
3/31/2012				15,924		1,062	1,692		7,168	796			26,540
4/30/2012				17,719		1,181	1,772		7,974	886			29,532
5/31/2012				15,908		1,061	1,591		7,169	795			26,514
6/30/2012				19,732		1,316	1,973		8,679	987			32,686
7/31/2012				15,439		1,038	1,544		6,947	772			25,731
8/31/2012				10,908		727	1,091		4,909	545			18,180
9/30/2012				17,821		1,195	1,792		8,084	896			29,666
10/31/2012				14,500		967	1,450		6,525	725			24,168
11/30/2012				8,568		571	857		3,855	428			14,768
12/30/2012				6,512		434	651		2,922	326			10,545
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	171,864	0	11,458	17,186	0	77,337	8,563	0	0	286,432
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.93	0.00	5.73	8.59	0.00	38.67	4.30	0.00	0.00	143.22
(GARRISON/Pine River Recycling Center)													
1/31/2012				13,632		204	433		3,822	5,198			23,480
2/28/2012				10,486		157	333		2,940	3,998			19,600
3/31/2012				11,678		175	371		3,275	4,453			21,630
4/30/2012				13,479		202	428		3,779	5,139			23,261
5/31/2012				13,788		205	438		3,869	5,261			25,191
6/30/2012				14,365		215	458		4,028	5,477			26,850
7/31/2012				12,294		184	381		3,447	4,688			22,890
8/31/2012				11,797		176	375		3,306	4,498			22,048
9/30/2012				17,388		260	553		4,878	6,634			32,520
10/31/2012				15,237		228	484		4,272	5,810			28,480
11/30/2012				16,624		293	624		5,502	7,483			36,680
12/30/2012				168,356	0	2,518	5,349	0	47,206	54,168	0	0	314,700
Subtotal LB	27,053	0	0	168,356	0	2,518	5,349	0	47,206	54,168	0	0	314,700
Subtotal TN	13.53	0.00	0.00	84.18	0.00	1.26	2.87	0.00	23.60	32.10	0.00	0.00	167.36
(WASTE PARTNERS/Pine River Recycling Center)													
1/31/2012				14,155		504	2,115		6,145	1,007			23,926
2/29/2012				13,254		416	1,749		5,081	833			21,333
3/31/2012				13,644		432	1,813		5,287	853			22,019
4/30/2012				14,152		453	1,902		5,525	906			22,838
5/31/2012				16,094		616	2,589		7,520	1,233			26,082
6/30/2012				16,789		533	2,238		6,500	1,066			27,129
7/31/2012				15,354		820	3,443		10,001	1,640			31,258
8/31/2012				15,969		713	2,987		8,705	1,427			29,811
9/30/2012				13,217		543	2,279		6,621	1,035			23,745
10/31/2012				13,631		505	2,123		6,167	1,011			23,437
11/30/2012				10,812		441	1,854		5,386	883			19,376
12/30/2012				10,510		388	1,419		4,121	676			17,064
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	167,581	0	6,314	26,521	0	77,039	12,630	0	0	290,085
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	83.79	0.00	3.16	13.26	0.00	38.52	6.32	0.00	0.00	145.04
(BLUE LAKES/Pine River Recycling Center)													
1/31/2012				4,380		7610	12,240		11,960	10,880			76,750
2/28/2012				3,950		7,550	11,810		11,210	10,300			73,870
3/31/2012				3,940		7,450	11,770		11,070	9,960			73,190
4/30/2012				4,100		7,280	11,920		10,920	9,900			72,480
5/31/2012				4,070		7,140	11,920		10,530	10,570			73,590
6/30/2012				4,350		7,340	12,260		11,300	10,250			75,370
7/31/2012				4,510		7,490	12,830		12,930	10,750			77,970
8/31/2012				4,570		7,610	11,630		11,870	9,110			71,540
9/30/2012				6,210		7,110	11,650		12,330	9,950			78,470
10/31/2012				4,680		7,320	11,610		12,230	9,900			77,570
11/30/2012				4,630		7,400	12,250		9,975	9,670			76,765
12/30/2012				4,890		7,570	13,010		9,980	10,140			79,370
Subtotal LB	130,240	165,930	0	52,840	79,330	86,770	144,270	0	136,295	120,790	0	0	918,365
Subtotal TN	85.12	82.92	0.00	26.42	39.67	44.39	72.14	0.00	66.15	60.40	0.00	0.00	458.18
Total LB	157,303	165,930	0	52,840	587,141	103,060	193,326	0	337,871	206,211	0	0	1,809,582
Total TN	78.65	82.92	0.00	26.42	293.57	54.35	98.66	0.00	166.94	103.11	0.00	0.00	904.78
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON \$52,300.00 \$35.70													

WEIGHT IN TONS  
2012

[illegible]

**SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON**

(BLUE LAKES/Pine River Recycling Center)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	7,790	12,820		4,840	6,770		5,890	9,430		12,980	8,120			68,630
2/28/2012	7,550	12,340		4,780			5,770	8,950		12,560	7,920			66,380
3/31/2012	7,440	12,120		4,650	5,380		5,670	8,680		12,430	7,810			65,390
4/30/2012	7,610	12,430		4,890	6,210		5,710	8,660		12,250	7,770			65,530
5/31/2012	7,870	12,630		4,970	6,440		5,830	9,190		12,320	7,920			67,270
6/30/2012	7,970	12,720		5,290	6,610		6,280	10,340		12,490	8,270			69,970
7/31/2012	7,850	12,810		5,370	6,720		6,310	10,770		12,450	8,210			70,490
8/31/2012	7,910	12,440		4,670	6,250		7,540	8,600		12,780	7,850			68,050
9/30/2012	7,610	12,350		4,570	6,140		7,430	8,580		12,380	7,760			67,190
10/31/2012	7,610	12,140		4,440	5,960		6,910	8,560		12,200	7,610			65,450
11/30/2012	8,910	13,430		7,950	6,880		6,130	9,860		13,430	8,250			74,840
12/30/2012	9,340	14,050		8,150	6,930		6,250	9,910		13,650	8,310			73,600
Subtotal LB	95,660	152,280	0	61,570	77,900	0	75,810	111,930	0	151,940	95,800	0	0	822,790
Subtotal TN	47.83	76.14	0.00	30.79	38.90	0.00	37.91	55.97	0.00	75.97	47.90	0.00	0.00	471.40
													\$4,250.00	\$10.33

**SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON**

(GARRISON/MARKET)

[illegible]

**SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON**

## ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (RESIDENTIAL)

Roosevelt (GARRISON/MARKET)

CROW WING COUNTY  
2012  
WEIGHT IN TONS

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	554				3,445		52	109		966	1,314			5,440
2/28/2012	588				3,553		55	116		1,028	1,395			6,841
3/31/2012	327				2,033		30	65		570	775			3,800
4/30/2012	702				4,366		65	139		1,224	1,865			8,161
5/31/2012	643				4,002		60	127		1,122	1,528			7,480
6/30/2012	504				5,623		84	179		1,577	2,144			10,511
7/31/2012	537				5,628		87	165		1,634	2,222			10,951
8/31/2012	551				5,429		61	109		962	1,308			6,410
9/30/2012	857				5,334		80	169		1,496	2,034			9,970
10/31/2012	562				3,494		52	111		980	1,332			6,531
11/30/2012	747				4,646		70	148		1,304	1,773			8,631
12/30/2012	921				5,730		86	182		1,607	2,185			10,711
Subtotal LB	8,283	0	0	0	51,590	0	772	1,638	0	14,570	19,673	0	0	96,457
Subtotal TN	4,15	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.80	0.00	0.39	0.92	0.00	7.24	9.84	0.00	0.00	48.22
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON														\$8,500.00
														\$176.28

Landfill (GARRISON/MARKET)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	630				5,163		77	164		1,448	1,969			9,651
2/28/2012	660				4,109		61	131		1,152	1,567			7,680
3/31/2012	1,335				8,303		124	284		2,328	3,166			15,520
4/30/2012	900				5,566		84	173		1,569	2,134			10,481
5/31/2012	1,390				6,646		129	275		2,424	3,257			16,161
6/30/2012	1,580				9,828		147	312		2,758	3,747			18,970
7/31/2012	1,482				9,218		138	285		2,395	3,515			17,231
8/31/2012	1,179				7,335		110	233		2,067	2,797			13,711
9/30/2012	1,128				7,019		105	223		1,998	2,676			13,119
10/31/2012	1,546				9,619		144	306		2,697	3,688			17,980
11/30/2012	1,300				8,089		121	257		2,268	3,084			15,119
12/30/2012	495				3,076		46	98		893	1,173			5,751
Subtotal LB	13,825	0	0	0	86,001	0	1,296	2,734	0	24,115	32,793	0	0	180,754
Subtotal TN	6.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.00	0.00	0.64	1.37	0.00	12.06	16.40	0.00	0.00	80.38
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON														\$13,720.54
														\$170.70

Misc. - Residential (BLUE LAKES/Pine River Recycling Center)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	8,270	6,390		6,710	5,920		4,930	8,620		10,150	7,910			58,600
2/28/2012	7,950	6,230		6,500	5,870		4,780	8,320		9,850	7,810			57,310
3/31/2012	8,040	6,190		6,350	5,780		4,810	8,270		9,890	7,770			57,100
4/30/2012	8,100	6,240		6,360	5,670		4,790	8,120		9,750	7,740			56,770
5/31/2012	8,250	6,590		6,580	5,740		4,820	8,290		9,810	7,870			58,200
6/30/2012	8,470	6,710		6,580	5,820		4,890	8,310		9,930	7,930			58,580
7/31/2012	8,410	6,670		6,660	5,910		4,940	8,440		9,950	8,120			59,130
8/31/2012	8,120	6,450		6,570	6,200		5,080	8,670		10,260	7,260			59,210
9/30/2012	8,370	6,650		7,230	6,200		5,760	8,110		9,630	7,310			59,040
10/31/2012	8,280	6,610		6,720	5,930		5,620	8,100		9,880	7,350			58,470
11/30/2012	8,690	7,010		6,750	6,130		5,900	8,390		10,110	7,590			60,240
12/30/2012	8,950	6,840		6,850	7,120		6,280	8,230		10,640	7,940			61,330
Subtotal LB	99,880	76,580	0	80,080	71,200	0	62,360	99,870	0	116,780	92,530	0	0	704,280
Subtotal TN	49.34	39.29	0.00	40.04	35.60	0.00	31.18	49.34	0.00	59.89	46.27	0.00	0.00	362.74
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON														\$0.00
														\$0.00

GRAND TOTAL

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	773,867	494,040	0	259,450	3,761,611	0	419,095	761,542	122,798	1,991,330	1,318,857	0	0	9,923,813
TOTAL TN	386.34	247.02	0.00	126.73	1,983.81	0.00	208.54	380.78	61.40	995.76	659.93	0.00	0.00	4,981.97
SCORE FUNDS/COST PER TON														\$70.90
														\$150.00

GOAL/COST PER TON





## SECTION 3.0 COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL (CII) RECYCLING

### 3.1 Introduction

Commercial and industrial activities represent the largest portion of the ongoing recycling efforts within the County. In 2012, commercial/industrial documented recycling was 25,687 tons. Of that total, 14,864 tons were recycled using out-of-county recycling infrastructure. Commercial and industrial recycling accounts for 80 percent of all materials collected this year in the County. This matches the statewide average of 75 percent for CII recycling.

### 3.2 Survey of CII Recycling Effort

In late 1992 and early 1993, the Solid Waste Department sent a survey to most businesses to learn if there was unreported commercial recycling and to detect barriers to recycling. Almost 61 percent of the businesses did not respond to the survey. To ensure comprehensive data for business recycling, an annual mass mailing to local business was started in 1996 and was continued to 2010. This provides an opportunity for business to request information from the County Solid Waste Office. Starting in 2011 will only mailed survey to those businesses whose recyclables in previous years was not incorporated within the local haulers recycling reports. Then every five (5) years do a mass mailing to all businesses. The survey serves as the source of the documented in-county commercial recycling total. Lack of reporting from business interest remains a significant barrier.

The following are the results of this survey (Appendix 3-A):

- The survey identified approximately 14,863 tons of out-of-county recycling. This is the bases of the documented in-county commercial recycling total.
- The response rate (55 replies to 82 sent out) to our survey was 67 % - last year response rate was 30%.

The survey provides a more accurate picture of the recycling effort within the CII sector. Besides the survey, information on the following available resources was provided:

- Minnesota Waste Wise;
- Recycling/Reuse Business Assistance Center (RBAC); and
- Minnesota Technical Assistance Program (MnTAP).

Also, handouts of the following resources were provided as part of the survey:

- Used Electronic Equipment Questionnaire
- Very Small Quantity Generator (VSQG) Questionnaire

### **3.3 Large CII Recycling Efforts**

A significant portion of the County's CII recycling rate is related to the reduction/reuse/recycling efforts of our large CII in the County. Much of the materials generated by these industries (i.e., Lakeland Mold) have historically been accepted at the County MMSW facility. The large CII has reduced their volume of waste going to the Landfill as noted in the 1996 Recycling Report.

### **3.4 Event Recycling**

In 2008, staff worked with the County Fair Board to establish a new recycling program for the county fair. By working with local Pepsi distributorship, recycling containers were obtained in the shape of a bottle. This recycling program is primarily targeting cardboard and beverage containers.

Also in 2008, a grant proposal was submitted to the State and received ten recycling bins in the shape of a beverage container. Two containers are located at Chamber of Commerce information facilities south of Brainerd and in Pequot Lakes, two are located at Ideal Township hall, two are at the Brainerd Civic Center, four went to the county fair grounds, and remaining two are at the Solid Waste Office to sign out for special occasions. In January 2012, six recycling bins were given to Mat Seamore to establish a beverage container recycling program at the Pine and College Square gas stations. Five recycling bins were also given the Crosby school for their recycling program.

### **3.5 Overview of Entire CII Program**

Appendix 3-B is the tabulated data regarding the CII recycling effort for which data is available. Due to concerns voiced in 1996, the information gathered to document the CII recycling effort; business's has an option if they wanted to be identified by name in this Report. Those choosing not to be identified are consolidated and listed under "Proprietary." The data is presented to eliminate double counting of materials, i.e., the material collected by the Baxter Curbside Program does not appear with the data for Waste Management. The large commercial recycling in the County consists primarily:

#### **In-County Assets:**

Waste Management	( 954 tons)
Garrison Recycling	( 583 tons)
Blue Lakes Recycling	( 1,100 tons)
Waste Partners	( 1,111 tons)

If Appendix 3-B appears cryptic, perhaps the following explanation will help. "OCC" are old corrugated containers or cardboard boxes. The other headings should be self explanatory.

### **3.6 Summary**

While the County has selected and carried out a comprehensive residential recycling strategy, it has not developed a business recycling system other than providing information concerning waste prevention and recycling opportunities. Although unintended, the Landfill tipping fee increase from \$25 to \$45 per ton in mid 1991 greatly increased the incentive for businesses to recycle/reuse/reduce. Waste generation prevention is likely having an impact in the business sector. Many businesses, through a combination of waste prevention and recycling, have significantly reduced the amount of solid waste sent to the Landfill. This resulted in large savings to them by reducing operational expenses such as time, labor, storage, procurement, and in avoidance costs for collection and disposal. It remains less costly to landfill material, except perhaps where a relatively homogenous recyclable waste stream is generated. Nonetheless, some businesses have recycled significant amounts of material with limited County support.

Nationally, starting in 2007 waste volumes has fallen due to the recession. When the recession is over, some experts expect that the commercial and industrial waste streams will continue to decline. They have discovered the value of producing less waste. They now view what they once called "waste" as a material to be managed in the most productive way possible. Businesses have demonstrated that they see bottom line benefits in producing less waste.

Another important factor making the business programs more viable than residential programs are that their waste streams, in some cases, contain a high quantity of quality recyclables. In addition, businesses wishing to be certified for ISO 9000 and ISO 14000 need to establish an infrastructure for waste-reduction and recycling, and documentation to qualify for certification. This including the economic factors discussed above makes business recycling the most beneficial avenue for County support.



**APPENDIX 3-A**  
**2012 SURVEY FORM**



# Land Services Department

Mark B. Liedl.....Land Services Director  
Environmental Services  
Christopher Pence.....Land Services Supervisor  
Douglas R. Morris.....Solid Waste Coordinator  
Paul Herkenhoff, PLS.....Survey Coordinator  
Property Valuation and Classification  
Gary Griffin.....Land Services Supervisor  
Public Land Management  
Kirk Titus.....Land Services Supervisor

15728 State Highway 210  
Brainerd, MN 56401

Telephone (218) 824-1290  
FAX (218) 824-1291  
Doug.Morris@crowwing.us



## CROW WING COUNTY

BRAINERD, MINNESOTA 56401

January 18, 2013

Re: 2012 Area Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional (CII) Recycling Data Collection

Thank you for your cooperation in sending the information I requested in the previous year. Due in part to your inputs, the County was able to document **exceeding the established recycling goal of 35%** of our Waste Management stream as required by the State Legislature. Your continual support and assistance are critical in tracking our recycling rate, and to ensure Crow Wing County will continually to exceed the established goal. I now ask your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaires concerning your businesses 2012 efforts.

Many businesses in Crow Wing County recycle large quantities of many types of materials, using recycling services such as local garbage/recycling haulers. It is important that recycling totals are not duplicated. Since I receive information from the local haulers and recyclers listed on the top of the attached questionnaire, complete tonnage information **ONLY** for materials that you market directly to an end-user or for which you use a recycling collection firm other than the ones listed on the top of the questionnaire.

As in previous years, results of these questionnaires will be compiled in aggregate and used by our office to complete the required annual SCORE Report, which is sent to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

A special concern is the disposal of electronic equipment and small quantities of hazardous waste. Additional information is enclosed to assist you in disposing of these items.

The enclosed questionnaires are for your use in reporting your recycling and source reduction/reuse activities. Please send the completed questionnaires back to my office. This information needs to be sent **by February 20, 2013.**

If you would like to send us your information to us electronically, please scan your information, and e-mail to: [Doug.Morris@crowwing.us](mailto:Doug.Morris@crowwing.us).

Thank you for completing the attached questionnaires, and please call if you have questions or concerns.

Sincerely,  
Douglas R. Morris  
Crow Wing County Solid Waste Coordinator  
Enclosures:





Crow Wing County  
2012 Commercial, Industrial & Institutional (CII) Questionnaire

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN TO CROW WING COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE BY February 20, 2013.

The following is a listing of materials that are **banned** from being landfill. To ensure proper management of these items, please annotate how you dispose of these items. If you have any questions concerning the proper disposal of these items please contact my office at 218-824-1290 or the Regional office of the MPCA at 218-828-2492.

(Circle appropriate units)

1. Material: **Fluorescent and/or HID Bulbs**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ per: \_\_\_\_\_ Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Lbs, # of 4' bulbs, # 8' bulbs, # of bulbs) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

2. Material: **Lead Acid Batteries and/or Household Rechargeable**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

3. Material: **Used Oil and/or Oil Filters**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, gallons) Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

4. Material: **Waste Tires**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)  
(# car, # truck, lbs, tons)

5. Material: **Major Appliances**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

6. Material: **Used Electronic Equipment**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

7. Material: **Hazardous Waste**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) Delivered to/Picked up by: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME



Crow Wing County  
2012 Commercial, Industrial & Institutional (CII) Recycling Questionnaire

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN TO CROW WING COUNTY SOLID WASTE BY FEBRUARY 20, 2013.

Our organization recycles YES NO (Circle appropriately)

Do you recycle materials through any of the following businesses?

_____	Waste Management	_____	Waste Partners
_____	Nisswa/Garrison Disposal	_____	Blue Lakes Disposal
_____	Crosslake Recycling	_____	Pequot Lakes Sanitation
_____	Crow Wing Recycling		

Any materials that are recycled through the above businesses DO NOT need to be included in the amounts recycled below. IF YOU RECYCLE MATERIALS ONLY THROUGH THE ABOVE BUSINESSES, STOP NOW WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

The County needs to track the amount of materials leaving the County to document the proper tonnage of items being recycled. Example, you directly haul your cardboard to Minneapolis:

(Circle appropriate units)

1. Material: **Cardboard**  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (# Bales, lbs, tons)  
Delivered to: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)  
(if bales, approximate weight of bale is: \_\_\_\_\_)
2. Material: **Scrap Metal**  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons)  
Delivered to: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)
3. Material: **Textiles**  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons)  
Delivered to: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)
4. Material: **Used Electronics**  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons)  
Delivered to: \_\_\_\_\_  
per: (week, month, quarter, year)

OVER

5. Material: **Food/Grease** Delivered to:  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)
6. Material: **Other**  
Material: Paper - \_\_\_\_\_ Delivered to:  
(Type - Magazines, Office Paper, Etc.)  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)
7. Material: \_\_\_\_\_ Delivered to:  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

Does your business provide any recycling opportunities to the public concerning these materials? (Please Circle)

- |        |                                    |      |     |
|--------|------------------------------------|------|-----|
| 1.     | Material: Recyclable Batteries     | Yes: | No: |
| 2.     | Material: Car Batteries            | Yes: | No: |
| 3.     | Material: Used Oil                 | Yes: | No: |
| 4.     | Material: Printer Toner/Cartridges | Yes: | No: |
| 5.     | Material: Cell Phones              | Yes: | No: |
| Other: |                                    |      |     |
| 6.     | Material: _____                    | Yes: | No: |
| 7.     | Material: _____                    | Yes: | No: |

The information gathered from this questionnaire will be utilized to document the CII recycling effort within the County for the annual State SCORE report. Also, this information will be used for the County recycling report. Please choose one of the following:

- YES** My business can be identified by name in the County report.
- NO** Do not identify my business (All these efforts will be consolidated and listed under Proprietary).

Notes for completing this Questionnaire:

1. Recycling quantities should not include materials recovered from other waste streams such as demolition debris.
2. Do not include prepared or unprepared steel scrap such as I-beams, structural steel, heavy machinery, cast iron, automobile parts, or agricultural machinery under scrap metal.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

**CROW WING COUNTY**  
**2012 CII Source Reduction/Reuse Questionnaire**

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN TO CROW WING COUNTY LAND SERVICES DEPARTMENT LOCATED AT THE CROW WING COUNTRY LANDFILL IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE BY FEBRUARY 20, 2013.**

The County needs to track the amount of source reduction/reuse activities occurring within the County. Source reduction is reducing the amount of materials needed to accomplish a task, thereby reducing or preventing the generation of waste material. Examples: Reusing pallets instead of throwing them away, changing a process so less waste is generated, etc. Please complete this questionnaire to account for all the materials that are being affected by source reduction activities within your organization.

List of materials that are being affected by source reduction/reuse activities within your organization and the amount it has reduced your waste generation.

(Circle appropriate units)

1. Material: **Reuse Pallets**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

2. Material: **Utilize Recap Tires**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

3. Material: **Packing Materials (packing peanuts, etc.)**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

4. Material: **Printer Toner/Cartridges**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

5. Material: **Drums/Containers**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

6. Material: **Paper**

Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

OVER

(CON'T - 2012)

7. Material: **Cardboard**  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons) per: (week, month, quarter, year)
8. Material: **Other**
9. Material:  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)
10. Material:  
Quantity: \_\_\_\_\_ (lbs, tons, ea) per: (week, month, quarter, year)

NOTE

It is relatively inexpensive and simple to start a program to prevent waste. There are many programs available to assist you in establishing your own waste prevention program. If you wish, please contact these Offices for information concerning the listed programs below. Key sources of waste prevention assistance are:

1. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) 1-800-657-3843  
Through the Recycling/Reuse Business Assistance Center (RBAC), they offer technical, business, financial, and marketing help to Minnesota business. There are some grant funds available to help get projects started.
2. Minnesota Technical Assistance Program (MnTAP) 1-800-247-0015  
This program offers non-regulatory advice for business on Waste Management source reduction, pollution prevention and waste management. Also, provides telephone assistance, site visits, interns and wide variety of fact sheets and printed material.
3. Minnesota Waste Wise 1-800-821-2230  
The program is designed to increase waste prevention and recycling among businesses, nonprofit, and government organizations. This program is sponsored by the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and OEA.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

**ATTENTION CROW WING COUNTY BUSINESS  
DISPOSING OF HAZARDOUS WASTE (VSQG)**

Crow Wing County has an agreement with Stearns County Environmental Services to take business waste.

If your company needs to dispose of hazardous waste, you will need to contract Stearns County Environmental Services at 320.656.3613 or 800.450.0852. Point of Contact: Troy Freihammer.

If you have any questions concerning business hazardous waste please contact my office at 218-824-1290 or the Regional office of the MPCA at 218-828-2492.

**ATTENTION CROW WING COUNTY BUSINESS  
USED ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT DISPOSAL**

A special concern to MPCA is the disposal of electronic equipment. To ensure proper management of these items, the Crow Wing County Waste Management Department will host a two (2) one day collection event in 2013 for government/public entities. These events will be held at the Crow Wing County Landfill site.

**If you wish to participate, in the 2013 Electronics Equipment Disposal the dates are: May 15<sup>th</sup> and September 18<sup>st</sup> from 9 am to 1 pm at the Crow Wing County Landfill.**

The County will utilize Arrow Global Asset Disposition, formally known as Asset Recovery Corporation. The cost is \$0.35 per pound processing fee. This fee is due within 30 days of receipt of invoice. If your business has a large quantity (50 or more units) or high value equipment, they can help you recover resale value. To determine prices, please contact Arrow Global Asset Disposition. They will not award credit for remarketable equipment without prior arrangements, so call them at least one week before the event.

For a more detail cost, contact Joy McClellan with Arrow Global Asset Disposition at 800-472-2081.

1. If you are interested in participating, please send an e-mail to:  
[Doug.Morris@crowwing.us](mailto:Doug.Morris@crowwing.us). or call our office at: 218-824-1290.
2. **COSTS ARE CALCULATED BASED ON THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF WASTE TO BE DISPOSED.** You will be responsible for paying for the disposal cost.
3. You will be responsible for transporting the waste to the County collection site.

**PLEASE KEEP FOR YOUR FILES**





**APPENDIX 3-B**  
**2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT**  
**(CII)**



**ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (C/I)**  
**CROW WING COUNTY**  
 2012  
**WEIGHT IN TONS**

Waste Partners (In-County Hauler)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	SCRAP METAL	OIL FILTERS	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	74,425	45,720							0	10,060				130,205
2/28/2012	78,738	58,140							0	25,080				161,958
3/31/2012	96,435	50,840						26	0	18,900				166,201
4/30/2012	108,004	54,680							0	17,820				180,304
5/31/2012	149,575	67,040							0	16,180				232,795
6/30/2012	141,548	62,480							0	22,760				226,788
7/31/2012	135,720	46,540							0	25,860				208,120
8/31/2012	130,586	63,200							0	36,880				230,466
9/30/2012	96,525	51,080							0	21,400				169,005
10/31/2012	96,587	57,280							0	20,860			3,000	174,527
11/30/2012	85,858	74,260							0	19,020				179,138
12/30/2012	86,230	57,660							0	17,600				161,490
Subtotal LB	1,280,231	688,920	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	251,820	0	0	3,000	2,220,997
Subtotal TN	640,12	344,46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	125.91	0.00	0.00	1.50	1,110.50

Waste Management (In-County Hauler)

MONTH	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MAGS	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
1/31/2012	133,080				0		0	0	11,320	0	0	0		144,400
2/28/2012	153,520				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		153,520
3/31/2012	157,860				0		0	0	4,840	0	0	0		162,700
4/30/2012	182,860				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		182,860
5/31/2012	144,180				0		0	0	8,900	0	0	0		153,080
6/30/2012	139,920				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		139,920
7/31/2012	180,060				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		180,060
8/31/2012	162,720				0		0	0	14,260	0	0	0		176,980
9/30/2012	134,520				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		134,520
10/31/2012	174,140				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		174,140
11/30/2012	128,340				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		128,340
12/30/2012	176,960				0		0	0	0	0	0	0		176,960
Subtotal LB	1,868,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39,320	0	0	0	0	1,907,480
Subtotal TN	934,08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	953.74
(Residential Recycling Programs subtracted out)														
Subtotal LB	1,868,160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39,320	0	0	0	0	1,907,480
Subtotal TN	934,08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	953.74
PG SUBTOTAL LB	3,148,391	688,920	0	0	0	0	0	26	39,320	251,820	0	0	0	4,128,477
PG SUBTOTAL TN	1,574,20	344,46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	19.66	125.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,064.24

## (In-County Hauler - Commercial Accounts to Pine River)

[illegible]

(In-County Hauler)  
(Residential Recycling Programs subtracted out)

[illegible]

(In-County Hauler)  
(Residential Recycling Programs subtracted out)

[illegible]

(In-County Hauler)  
(Residential Recycling Programs subtracted out)

BUSINESS AREA	OCC	NEWS	OFFICE PAPER	MIXED PAPER	PHONE BOOKS	ALUM. CANS	TIN CANS	SCRAP METAL	GLASS	PLASTIC	FOOD WASTE	OTHER	TOTAL
2012									0				0
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136,400	0	0	0	136,400
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	68.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	68.20

0	3.5
0.00	1

**ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (C/I)**  
**CROW WING COUNTY**  
2012  
**WEIGHT IN TONS**

BUSINESS	OCC	News	Office Paper	Mags	Mixed Paper	Phone Books	Alum.	Tin Cans	Scrap Metal	Glass	Plastic	Food Waste	Other	Total
<u>Christmas Lights Program</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,345	0	0	0	0	4,345
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.17
<u>Christmas Tree Program</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Wood	10,500
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,500	10,500
<u>Central Converting</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,800,000	0	0	1,800,000
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	900.00	0.00	0.00	900.00
<u>Goodwill</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Cloth & Fiber	360,000
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	360,000	360,000
<u>Lakeland Molds</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180.00
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	180.00
<u>Midwest Grease</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275,000	0	275,000
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	137.50	0.00	137.50
<u>MN Community NET/Quality Enterprise</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>PROPRIETARY (NAMES NOT LISTED IN REPORT)</u>														
Subtotal LB	2,954,000	0	5,600	0	1,188,946	0	16,179	0	35,930,885	0	167,780	829,954	194,086	41,277,430
Subtotal TN	1,482.00	0.00	2.80	0.00	584.47	0.00	8.09	0.00	17,965.44	0.00	83.89	414.98	97.04	20,638.72
<u>St Joseph's Med Center</u>														
Subtotal LB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal TN	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>PG SUBTOTAL LB</u>	2,954,000	0	5,600	0	1,188,946	0	16,179	0	35,935,230	0	1,967,780	1,104,954	564,586	43,727,275
<u>PG SUBTOTAL TN</u>	1,482.00	0.00	2.80	0.00	584.47	0.00	8.09	0.00	17,967.62	0.00	983.89	552.48	282.29	21,863.64

ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT (CII)  
CROW WING COUNTY

2012

WEIGHT IN TONS

BUSINESS	OCC	News	Office Paper	Mags	Mixed Paper	Phone Books	Alum.	Tin Cans	Scrap Metal	Glass	Plastic	Food Waste	Other	Total
TOTAL LB	9,494,151	688,920	5,600	0	1,168,946	0	16,179	26	35,974,550	388,220	1,967,780	1,104,954	564,586	51,373,912
TOTAL TN	4,747.08	344.46	2.80	0.00	584.47	0.00	8.09	0.01	17,987.28	194.11	983.89	552.48	282.29	25,686.96
TOTAL - UTILIZING IN COUNTY RECYCLER														
TOTAL LB	6,530,151	688,920	0	0	0	0	0	26	14,039,320	388,220	0	0	0	21,645,637
TOTAL TN	3,265.08	344.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	7,019.66	194.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,823.32
TOTAL - NOT UTILIZING AN IN COUNTY RECYCLER														
TOTAL LB	2,964,000	0	5,600	0	1,168,946	0	16,179	0	21,935,230	0	1,967,780	1,104,954	564,586	29,727,275
TOTAL TN	1,482.00	0.00	2.80	0.00	584.47	0.00	8.09	0.00	10,967.62	0.00	983.89	552.48	282.29	14,863.64
						2,069.27			10,975.70					

## SECTION 4.0 OTHER SOLID WASTE/NON-LANDFILL PROGRAMS

### 4.1 Introduction

Other aspects of the County's integrated solid waste program are; yard waste management, household hazardous waste (HHW) management, problem material (items banned from the Landfill) management, waste reduction, public education, and illegal dumping. In many cases, the County's problem material program compliment existing retailer programs to ensure in-depth coverage. The goal is maximum recovery, and to encourage residential participation; convenient times, location, and ease of disposal are key features of the County's program.

The County's Solid Waste Disposal Site complex is located between the two major population centers for the County: Brainerd/Baxter and Crosby/Ironton/Deerwood. The "One-Stop-Service" provides convenient access for proper disposal for these materials at a reasonable price. Prices are set to promote the proper management of waste, eliminate illegal dumping, and halt backyard burn barrels. Programs have been established to be sustainable, economically feasible, and environmentally sound. The status of the County's efforts in each of these areas and others are discussed within this chapter. Appendix 4-A is the tabulated data regarding these programs within the County.

The lined municipal solid waste (MSW) Landfill, which opened in 1991, is the foundation of the County's integrated solid waste management program. The Landfill was the first greenfield MSW landfill in Minnesota that met RCRA Subtitle D requirements. The initial construction included a leachate management system with two treatment and storage ponds. This expedited permit and construction was recognized in 1992 as one of the Seven Wonders of Engineering by the Minnesota Society of Professional Engineers.

The Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) has an Excellence in Solid Waste Management Awards Program that recognizes members and their programs that promote socially, environmentally and economic waste management. In 2004, Crow Wing County won the GOLD Special Waste Excellence Award. Although all the County's special waste management programs provide environmental benefits, the application for this award focused on HHW, yard waste, used oil/filters, antifreeze, and tires.

The North America Hazardous Material Management Association (NAHMMA) has an Awards Program to promote and recognize programs engaged in pollution prevention, hazard reduction, and waste stream toxicity reduction. In 2004, Crow Wing County won the Program Excellence Award. This recognizes outstanding programs which addresses household and CESQG hazardous waste management at the state or local level. The County application for this award focused on HHW, used oil/filters, antifreeze, electronics, lead-acid batteries, and our Very Small Quantity Generator (VSQG) program.

Through both awards, the entire special waste management has been recognized nationally for its excellence.



The Interagency Pollution Prevention Advisory Team (IPPAT) recognizes projects that demonstrate a high degree of commitment and leadership and provide substantial benefit to the environment. They give out the Minnesota Government Reaching Environmental Achievements Together (MnGREAT!) Awards to recognize environmental achievements by government employees in the areas of pollution prevention, toxicity reduction, waste reduction and recycling. Our used oil collection program received a MnGREAT! Award in 2004.

The Minnesota Environmental Initiative (MEI) builds innovative partnerships to develop solutions to Minnesota's environmental problems. MEI works with nonprofit, business and government partners to develop consensus on critical issues and move collectively toward action that has positive impacts. Under their 2006 Environmental Initiative Awards - Public Sector Innovations, Crow Wing County was one of the top three finalist concerning our used oil program. These awards recognize projects that have used collaborative methods to produce tangible environmental outcomes.

The U.S. EPA Landfill Methane Outreach Program was launched in 1994 to reduce methane emissions by facilitating the development of projects that capture and utilize landfill gas as a source of energy. The Crow Wing County Sanitary Landfill On-Site Landfill Gas Recovery Project was selected to receive a 2010 LMOP Project of the Year Award. This project was also chosen as a 2010-11 Local Government Innovations Award winner. The Local Government Innovation Awards recognize outstanding cities, counties, and schools that demonstrate results in improving local services. The Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota partnered with the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC), the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC), and the Minnesota School Boards Association (MSBA). This was their 5<sup>th</sup> annual Local Government Innovation Awards. In addition, the National Association of Counties (NACo) recognized this project as a 2011 Achievement Award Program. For more than three decades, they have administered this non-competitive awards program to recognize innovative county government programs that modernize and streamline county government and increase its service to its citizens.

#### **4.2 Yard Waste**

The State of Minnesota banned yard trimmings (§115A.931) from all landfills within the State in 1992. By 1998, 24 states representing more than 50 percent of the nation's population had legislation reducing disposal of yard trimmings. The pre-ban estimate for yard waste was 18 percent of the State's waste stream. Immediately afterward, it declined to 2.7 percent. Through two waste composition studies, the State has concluded yard waste making its way to landfills declined by more than 80 percent as soon as the ban went into effect. A second composition study conducted in 1999 found a nominal decrease in yard waste to 2.3 percent of the waste stream, providing no evidence of backsliding. The increased use of mulching lawn mowers has also reduced the amount of yard waste generated. Until 2011, a State directive allows a maximum 5 percent for yard waste credit for recycling.

The following are the locations of the yard waste collection programs within the County:

- Yard Waste Drop-off Sites:
  - Northland Arboretum
  - Breezy Point
  - County Landfill Site
  - Emily (Leaves only)
  - Mission Township Canister Station
  - Ideal Township Canister Station
  - Roosevelt Township
  - City of Baxter
  - Pelican Lake Conservation Club
  
- Yard Waste Curbside Collection Program: Crosby
  - Ironton

Estimated population served by residential curbside yard waste program: (Population based on Minnesota State Demographers Estimate - 2011)

1. Crosby	2,389
2. Ironton	574
	-----
TOTAL	2,963

The County's yard waste (leaves, grass clippings, pine needles, garden debris) management program includes a yard waste compost area at the Site complex, and the prohibition of yard waste in the County's Landfill. Yard waste is taken from the residents for free at the Site complex. As part of the County's leachate recirculation efforts, a yard waste composting area was established on the bermed intermediate crown of Cells 1 and 2 of the Landfill in 2002. Annually, the Landfill operator transfers the accumulated yard waste to Cells 1 and 2, placing a three to six-foot lift. Pretreated leachate from the leachate ponds is then sprayed over the yard waste, three times per month, from May through September. A typical application is about 70,000 gallons. Application of the leachate is accomplished by using a trailer mounted spray gun.

Leachate recirculation in the MSW Landfill has resulted in an accumulation of ammonia and a depletion of carbon (i.e., reduction of biochemical oxygen demand - BOD) in the leachate. Yard waste composting on the Landfill crown is an innovative approach to augment the nitrification-denitrification process in the leachate. Due to aerobic conditions and the addition of organic carbon material from the yard waste, nitrification is promoted. The leachate then enters an anaerobic environment as it migrates into the Landfill, promoting denitrification, thus reducing the nitrogen fraction within the leachate as nitrate is converted to nitrogen gas. The compost layer also serves as a biofilter for the release of landfill gas (LFG) including methane and volatile organics.

Once the compost is mature, it is removed from the Landfill crown and stockpiled to be used as a topsoil supplement on Landfill construction projects (e.g., final cover), and erosion control on intermediate slopes. This product has been very beneficial since the Site is extremely topsoil poor. One growing season is required to generate a mature product. Testing completed by the County verifies that the compost has a high nutrient content with no concern of contamination. Fresh yard waste is subsequently applied on the Landfill crown to renew the composting process.

Cost savings are also realized by the County when yard waste compost is used to amend topsoil on construction projects. Delivery of topsoil from off-site sources costs about \$10 per cubic yard. If the compost is blended 50:50 with Site soil to create a topsoil mix, the County saves about \$5,000 per acre of construction. This assumes a 6-inch thick topsoil or erosion control lift and some costs to move and blend the material on-site. As an example, the total savings due to compost utilization for a partial closure of the demolition Landfill in 2004 is estimated to be \$12,000. This material was used in conjunction with the construction of Cell 4 and Pond 4 in 2007. The saving in this project is estimated to be \$21,000. In 2008, this material was used in conjunction with the construction of the new leachate land application area for an estimated saving of \$50,000. This material was critical to ensure a viable seed bed material for the success of this project.

In 2006, the County utilized 60 cubic yards of this compost to construct rain gardens as part of the Judicial Center construction. The islands within the Judicial Center parking lot were designed as rain gardens. Research has shown that rain gardens can trap and retain up to 99 percent of pollutants in urban runoff, protecting against metals, oils, fertilizers, etc. Rain gardens significantly reduced the impact of storm water reaching storm drains. These will serve as an example and to promote storm water management techniques for all new construction county wide.

In April 2007, the Master Gardeners in conjunction with the Extension Office contacted the County about having a composting system similar to Morrison County. They brought the issue to the Board on the Sept 18th Committee of the Whole meeting. The County was open in providing support through a grant to help them construct any needed infrastructure. A request was received from the Northland Arboretum (this was a group effort, the City of Brainerd, the City of Baxter, the Master Gardeners, and the Arboretum) in 2008. The County provided a grant of \$13,785, and the facility opened on October 14, 2008.

In October 2010, the MPCA awarded a waste reduction grant (\$41,615) to the Crow Wing Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) to establish a backyard composting program throughout the County. SWCD has partnered with the CWC Master Gardeners, and the Northland Arboretum to host regional workshops on backyard composting, sell low-cost backyard compost bins, and test and turn the Northland Arboretum compost site. Compost bins and workshops have been available to County residents since spring 2011. By the end of 2012, over 500 compost bins were sold by the Northland Arboretum; municipalities and the SWCD selling and additional 300 backyard compost bins; over 19 workshops with 290 adults in attendance were held in the Brainerd Lakes area; and provided backyard composting school lessons for 450 students.

Prior to 1994, yard waste data was not recorded at the Site, yard waste was handled separately prior to this. The following are the quantities of yard waste handled at the Site complex since 1994:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (cy vds)</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (cy vds)</u>
1994	3,506	2005	15,216
1995	3,735	2006	12,353***
1996	2,278	2007	12,380
1997	4,892	2008	10,590****
1998	7,113	2009	11,873
1999	8,302	2010	10,487
2000*	12,335	2011	11,016
2001**	14,392	2012	9,945
2002	15,056	TOTAL	200,590
2003	16,889		
2004	18,132		

\* Upgraded yard waste disposal area

\*\* Annual solid waste coupon initiated

\*\*\* Area went through a major drought

\*\*\*\* Northland Arboretum Program started

Since this is a free service to our residents, the source of funding for this program is through the \$15 County Solid Waste Assessment charged to every resident. The County Board established this rate. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated.

#### **4.2.1 Christmas Tree Recycling Program**

As a result of cooperative advertising in 2012, the Christmas tree recycling program collected 300 trees. Minnesota Power, Brainerd Public Utilities, Crow Wing Power, and Lake State Tree Service provided the tree shredding service. Waste Management, Waste Partners, Nisswa Sanitation, Range Disposal, and Blue Lakes Disposal assisted. The Brainerd, Baxter, Crosby, and Ironton area is serviced by this program. Christmas tree chips are used for trail maintenance at the Northland (formerly Paul Bunyan) Arboretum located in Brainerd. In addition, Mille Lacs Electric Cooperative also started a Christmas tree recycling program in 1998, servicing the Garrison area. Christmas trees are dropped off at the ball field behind the fire hall in Garrison.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>
1992	1,122	2005	600
1993	Unk	2006	300
1994	Unk	2007	300
1995	Unk	2008	30
1996	815	2009	500
1997	1,500	2010	100
1998	800	2011	320
1999	1,000	<u>2012</u>	<u>300</u>
2000	1,200	TOTAL	10,287
2001	500		
2002	300		
2003	300		
2004	600		
2005	600		

#### 4.2.2 Brush

A separate area is set aside at the Site for brush management. Open burning is prohibited at the Site, with the exception of brush and grass which is allowed by Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Burning Permit. This service is free to residents of the County. The following are the quantities of brush handled at the Site since 2003:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (cy yds)</u>
2003	15,341
2004	16,499
2005	18,241
2006	12,968
2007	16,346
2008	13,557
2009	15,311
2010	13,124
2011	13,015
<u>2012</u>	<u>13,270</u>
TOTAL	147,762

With the growth of biomass market, in 2009 there was a vendor who utilized much of the brush material on a trial basis. Approximately 221.6 tons of woody biomass were produced at the Landfill and transported to Benson, Minnesota. It was used by a facility that generates electricity using a single, biomass stoker boiler and a conventional steam turbine generator. This facility generates 50 MW of electricity. Poultry litter comprises over 75% of the biomass with woody biomass being one of the secondary vegetative matter.

### **4.3 Hazardous Waste Program**

#### **4.3.1 HHW Program**

Chemical-based products from a single home may seem insignificant, but the cumulative effects of all households that handle and dispose of hazardous material improperly can become a major problem. According to the USEPA, Americans generate 1.6 million tons of household hazardous wastes (HHW) per year. The average home can contain as much as 100 pounds of HHW. HHW makes up less than 1 percent of the solid waste stream, but can contribute significantly to the level of toxins in the total waste stream. For example, paint can contain volatile organic compounds as well as fungicides. Old paint can include hazardous metals such as lead, mercury, cadmium, and hexavalent chromium.

The MPCA is required by Minn. Stat. §115A.96 to establish a statewide program to manage HHW. Minn. Stat. §115A.96, subdivision 3, provides that the statewide HHW program may be provided directly by the State or by contract with public or private entities.

State law required counties to include a section on HHW management as part of their solid waste management plan (§115A.96 subd. 6). Also, HHW management must be addressed as part of any application to permit/repermit a MSW sanitary landfill in the State. MPCA provides technical assistance and grant funding to counties that administer a HHW program. In addition, counties can utilize a statewide disposal contract negotiated by MPCA. The statewide disposal contract has made managing HHW more affordable for the counties. In 2002, the law was changed to also provide indemnification to the counties for any waste disposed of through the State contract.

The County HHW Facility was built as part of a Landfill Maintenance Building in 1992, and opened in August 1993. The HHW operation began to utilize the entire building in 2002, when the Landfill operator was moved to a new maintenance facility located at the Site complex. The HHW Facility is 40 feet by 78 feet with areas for storage, processing and bulking, product exchange, and administration. County personnel operate the Facility with assistance provided by the County's Sentence-to-Serve (STS) program since 1997. The County's HHW Facility is open 2 days per month, the second Saturday and Wednesday each month, May through October. In the winter, November through April, the facility is open by appointment only. Information, including purchasing and disposal techniques, is distributed through the County's HHW Brochure, County web page, the E-911 website, Solid Waste Coupon, by radio and newspaper public services advertisements.

In 2003, the County started its own Regional Program. Previously, the County was a member of the Tri-County (Stearns, Benton, and Sherburne) Regional Household Hazardous Waste Program. Morrison and Todd County joined Crow Wing County's Regional Program in 2003. The program was created to provide local program managers with central fiscal disbursement, an ongoing technical education program for HHW management, processing, information and a materials clearinghouse. Additional benefits include recommendations about equipment, a conduit to MPCA's HHW Program staff, and meeting location for local program managers.

All HHW is either reused in product exchange, recycled, fuel blended, or incinerated. The HHW vender (through the state contract) transports solvent-based and other flammable liquid waste (that does not contain unwanted constituent) to be used for fuel in high-temperature cement kilns. These kilns are EPA approved. Also, the HHW vender transports bulk latex paint to be used as a feedstock at cement kilns.

A can crusher was purchased in 1997 to help bulk oil-base and latex paint. An aerosol can crusher was purchased in 2002 to bulk those contents. This equipment, along with the STS personnel, has enabled staff to process the increased traffic volume. An additional benefit is the crushed metal cans are recycled versus being disposed of in the landfill. The following is the amount of metal recycled and the cost savings of avoiding landfill disposal:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (tons)</u>	<u>Cost Saving</u>
1997	7.8	\$402
1998	8.4	\$433
1999	10.2	\$526
2000	7.5	\$388
2001	8.2	\$421
2002	9.1	\$470
2003	9.7	\$500
2004	8.9	\$456
2005	9.3	\$476
2006	13.6	\$698
2007*	10.6	\$545
2008	10.9	\$562
2009	6.7	\$545
2010	13.4	\$693
2011	9.8	\$504
<u>2012</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>\$411</u>
TOTAL	152.1	\$7,836

\* Starting to see more plastic 1-gallon containers

A local company, Central Converting Inc., started to take #2 HDPE plastic 5-gallon containers for recycling in 2009. In 2010, the company also took the black plastic 1-gallon containers on a trail basis for recycling. An additional benefit is the plastic containers are recycled versus being disposed of in the landfill. The following is the amount of containers recycled and the cost savings of avoiding landfill disposal:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea)</u>	<u>Cost Saving</u>
2009	1,000	\$64
2010	600	\$38
2011	500	\$32
<u>2012</u>	<u>547</u>	<u>\$35</u>
TOTAL	2,647	\$169

Table 4.1 on the following page provides an idea how the County residents are using this service. As Table 4.1 shows, in the past five years, almost 6 percent of the County households utilized this service annually. Factoring in repeat customers and nonresidents, approximately 41 percent of the total County households (including seasonal homeowners) have utilized this service at least once since this program started in 1993. In 2012, 61.4 tons of material was managed through the County programs and Table 4.1 shows the quantities of hazardous materials collected at the HHW facility for each of the previous years. In the past five (5) years, the average amount of HHW disposed through this program is 49 pounds per household. To put this in perspective, a full one gallon cans of paint weights about 10 pounds.

As Tables 4.1 shows, old paint (latex/oil-base) is the largest item and thus the largest cost when the County conducts HHW collection events. The USEPA estimates that between 8.8 percent and 20 percent of all paint sold could become leftovers headed for the waste stream. In 2007, Minnesota was chosen to undertake a paint product stewardship initiative by the National Paint and Coating Association. A statewide demonstration was desired in order to best inform the creation of the national system and Minnesota was chosen as the state for the demonstration project. The bill that would have authorized the establishment of a paint stewardship organization funded by a fee was vetoed by the Governor in 2008 and 2009. Oregon then initiated this program, and in addition California, Connecticut, and in 2012 Rhode Island has enacted the PaintCare program.

In 2012, participation rates went up, including the amount of repeat customers. With this, there also was an increase in the amount of waste per load in 2012. This increase may be due the increased foreclosures trend. Usually repeat customers have less material than people using the service for the first time, and provide a better quality of material that can be placed on the Product Exchange shelf. As more people become aware of this county service, it has resulted in an occasional "large" load of HHW. These large residential stockpiles of HHW within the County are slowly being brought into the program.

The extent of material being reused through the Product Exchange Program is outlined in Table 4.1. This action has reduced the amount of material being disposed of as hazardous waste. The County will accept HHW for Product Exchange if a product is usable, stored in the original container, and is in good condition (i.e., latex/oil-base paint, automotive supplies, etc.). Any resident or organization of the County can utilize the product for free. Examination of the program indicates that 18 percent of the material brought in the last five years was reused through this program. The quantity of usable products from the HHW facility for 2012 is as follows:



TABLE 4.1  
CROW WING COUNTY HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM

	1990 - 2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
Number of Households	22,810	23,262	23,851	24,356	24,793	25,271	25,563	26,053	26,423	26,843	27,263	27,683	
Assume 30% nonresidents	29,653	30,241	31,006	31,663	32,231	32,852	33,232	33,869	34,350	34,843	35,336	35,829	
Households to Site	5,530	1,233	1,350	1,408	1,262	1,277	1,216	1,337	1,303	1,390	1,392	1,392	18,598
Households Participating	6,669	1,397	1,726	1,806	1,452	1,378	1,367	1,499	1,522	1,571	1,571	1,567	21,754
% Participation - residents	6.1%	7.4%	6.7%	6.0%	5.6%	5.4%	5.9%	5.8%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	6.0%
Repeat User Rate	39%	44%	44%	44%	45%	47%	52%	49%	51%	54%	54%	54%	
Households (exclude repeat)	4,694	849	969	895	786	729	657	771	739	723	723	725	12,538
Participating (Excluding repeat, including nonresidents)													37%
Types of Waste													
Items bulked into 55-gallon drums													
Oil Base Paint	195	49	49	50	47	43	50	42	39	37	45	45	646
Latex Paint	168	36	44	49	44	48	55	55	61	61	59	59	683
Antifreeze	15	3	3	11	18	19	20	22	26	16	28	28	181
Fuel Blend	43	18	13	11	10	10	7	11	12	8	10	10	153
# of 55-gal drums	421	106	109	121	119	120	135	130	138	122	142	142	1,663
Est Weight (Pounds)	225,170	55,990	58,190	64,130	62,370	62,810	71,280	67,870	71,720	64,460	73,920	73,920	877,910
Items labpacked													
55-Gal drum	160	1	3	2	3	6	1	4	2	4	3	3	189
30-Gal drum	72	2	0	1	1	1	4	0	2	0	1	1	84
17-Gal drum	37	2	5	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	48
10-Gal drum	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
5-Gal drum	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2	27
Weight Sub Total	37,400	558	1,405	514	1,088	1,137	583	1,495	639	757	1,315	1,315	46,901
SUBTOTAL WEIGHT (TONS)	131.29	28.27	29.80	32.32	31.73	31.97	35.93	34.68	36.18	32.51	37.62	37.62	462
Waste Disposed per household (pounds)	40	41	35	41	46	47	53	47	48	43	49	49	43
Waste Brought in per household (pounds)	44	46	41	47	52	57	60	55	60	51	62	62	50
Product Exchange (Pounds)	27,029	7,397	9,607	10,073	8,822	13,287	9,062	11,149	17,731	12,597	20,293	20,293	147,047
Cost Saving (Disposal & shipping)	\$15,663	\$3,995	\$4,714	\$4,119	\$3,017	\$3,899	\$3,959	\$3,905	\$4,753	\$5,074	\$5,845	\$5,845	\$58,942
% Reused	9%	11%	14%	13%	12%	17%	11%	14%	19%	16%	21%	21%	13%
AG Pesticide Program													
- Farm	7,342	N/A	526	N/A	109	N/A	441	0	0	0	0	0	8,418
- Household	4,535	894	787	450	2,728	1,080	970	1,280	1,199	2,448	2,000	2,000	18,371
# of Businesses Participating	0	N/A	8,033	4,639	4,684	2,894	9,668	6,363	5,278	2,478	3,634	3,634	47,671
Started Program			10	9	12	6	12	11	10	5	6	6	6
TOTAL Haz Waste (tons)	150.7	32.4	39.3	39.9	39.9	40.6	46.0	44.1	48.3	41.4	50.6	50.6	573.2

TABLE 4.1

[illegible]

### Quantities of Hazardous Materials Collected

<u>Product</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Cost Saving(disposal)</u>	<u>Shipping</u>
Latex Paint	533 Gallons	\$ 1,248.95	
Oil-Base Paint	309 Gallons	\$ 544.96	
Aerosols	1,330 ea.	\$ 798.19	
Auto Supplies	1,783 Pounds	\$ 1,569.04	
Reused Fuel	536 Gallons	\$ 506.76	
Acid	70 Gallons	\$ 616.00	
Base	216 Pounds	\$ 189.64	
Compressed Gas	72 Cylinders	\$ 64.08	
Anti-Freeze	114 Gallons	\$ 114.00	
<u>Household Supplies</u>	<u>2,837 Pounds</u>	<u>\$ 2,496.56</u>	
2012 TOTAL	20,553 Pounds	\$ 8,148.19	\$374.00

Since the HHW program is available to all residents with no direct costs, the primary source of funding for this program is through the \$15 County Solid Waste Assessment charged to every resident with about 10 percent coming from an annual MPCA grant. The County Board established this rate. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated.

#### **4.3.2 Waste Pesticides and Empty Pesticide Containers**

The Waste Pesticide Program was created in 1990 as required by Minn. Stat. §18B.065, and administered through the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA). Initially MDA provided (with County assistance) a waste pesticide collection program for the area every two years by Statute. In 2009 this was modified to every two years for agricultural waste pesticides, and annually for nonagricultural waste pesticides. In 2009 this was modified to every two years for agricultural waste pesticides, and annually for nonagricultural waste pesticides. The last MDA sponsored event for our County was August 22, 2012.

There was no cost for the participants under this program. Funding is through the Pesticide Regulatory Account (PRA) that is funded by a fee charged to pesticide manufacturers for both agricultural and nonagricultural products that sell pesticide in Minnesota. The fee is set at 0.4 percent of the annual gross pesticide sales within the State. This was agreed to by the manufactures and legislature as an effective product stewardship policy for proper disposal of unwanted or unusable waste pesticides, with the costs paid up-front. Initially by statute, at least \$600,000 per fiscal year must be transferred from PRA to the Waste Pesticide Account. In the 2003 Legislation, this was lowered to \$300,000 and the fee remained at the same level.

The program had two parts - the first part was an empty pesticide container collection effort, and the second part consisted of the collection of actual pesticides. These events were previously held at Barrett Ag Supply south of Brainerd on Highway 25. Starting in 2000, the event was held at the HHW Facility located at the Site. Collection and disposal cost was managed through the MDA. The following is a comparison of the empty pesticide container collection effort. Due to the low number, this aspect of the program was discontinued after 2000:

### Empty Pesticide Containers Collected

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Total</u>
# of Containers Collected	469	577	600	150	1,330	699	3,825

Additionally all pesticides, including aerosols, gathered under the County's HHW program was disposed through the MDA program at no cost to the County. This started in mid-1997 (state fiscal year starts midyear), and the County's second shipment of pesticides for that year went through this program. Starting in 1998, all household pesticide was managed through this program.

Initially in 2002, counties were informed there will be no more shipping of household pesticides through the MDA. This decision was based on the MDA's revised budget for the waste pesticide program, a revision prompted by the announcement of the \$2 billion state budget shortfall for 2002-2003 biennium. All expenses not directly related to waste pesticide events including organization and collection of waste from farms, businesses and other pesticide end users were to be cut. The shortfall for the 2004-2005 biennium of \$4.6 billion reduced the amount of funds from \$600,000 to \$300,000. The aspect of the MDA organizing and collecting waste from farms was discontinued after 2003. Starting in 2004, the MDA set up a Pesticide Partnership. Under this program, the MDA was promoting Waste Pesticide Collection Program Agreements with county HHW programs. In the Agreement, the MDA pays up to a certain limit for any farm and household pesticides that is brought into a county HHW facility. It acted as a "debit card." When a county makes a shipment of HHW, they annotate the drums that are pesticides and MDA will pay for its disposal charges up to the limit set for each county. Starting in 2009 the MDA modified this program, removing any limits that the counties could take in, but required in-depth inventory and weights of the material brought in.

Table 4.1 has a comparison of the second part (actual collection of pesticides) of this effort. Minnesota's program ranks among the top five states nationally in total pounds of waste pesticide collected. A summary of pesticides addressed through our County's HHW program is provided in the following table:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of People Who brought in Pesticides</u>	<u>Amount Disposed (pounds)</u>	<u>Cost Savings</u>
1999	180	1,036	\$ 746
2000	196	1,216	\$ 876
2001	201	894	\$ 796
2002	157	787*	\$ 701
2003	267	450**	\$ 401
2004	257	2,728***	\$ 2,455
2005	261	1,080	\$ 972
2006	268	970	\$ 873
2007	272	1,280	\$ 1,006
2008	267	1,199	\$ 980
2009	269	2,448	\$ 2,001
2010	293	2,000	\$ 1,640
2011	286	1,267	\$ 1,039
<u>2012</u>	<u>351</u>	<u>1,379</u>	<u>\$ 1,130</u>
TOTAL	3,525	18,734	\$15,616

\* MDA did take HHW pesticides that were collected up to July 2002.

\*\* From July - June

\*\*\* July 2003 - Nov 2004

#### **4.3.3 VSQG (Very Small Quantity Generator)**

Federal law prohibits the disposal of certain quantities of hazardous waste into the solid waste stream. This type of waste must be managed separately. Minnesota hazardous waste rules allow Very Small Generators (VSQGs), those who generate 220 pounds or less hazardous waste per month, to deliver their own waste in their own vehicle to a licensed VSQG collection program. Collection programs consolidate waste from many businesses, and then ship it to a permitted treatment, recycling or disposal facility. Although program participants still pay the disposal charges, the programs are intended to provide a convenient and cost-effective disposal option. Each program determines the waste(s) it will accept, the area it serves, its hours of operation and associated charges.

Under the existing County HHW program through the MPCA, organization and business hazardous waste is prohibited at this time. Due to the limited amount of waste generated, many businesses find cost-effective methods to dispose of their hazardous waste very limited. This was an area of concern to the County for the following reasons:

1. In 1993, the Lake Superior Basin did door-to-door site visits to locate hazardous waste generators. Through this effort, 611 additional generators were identified, accounting for 54 percent of the known generators at that time. Of those newly identified generators, 360 or 59 percent was mismanaging a total of 40 tons of hazardous waste; and

2. In addition, Olmsted County, another Greater Minnesota County, completed a survey in 1995. This survey indicated that 9 out of 10 businesses produce hazardous waste. This county has about 3,500 businesses of which only 700 were listed in the State's database, for an estimated compliance rate of 23.3 percent. Crow Wing County maintains an active database that lists more than 2,000 businesses.

With the two case studies listed above, there exists a need to provide assistance to smaller businesses in Greater Minnesota. In most cases, there are inadequate technical and financial resources for obtaining information, assessing waste management methods, and developing and applying waste reduction techniques. Starting in 2002, in conjunction with the Northwest Minnesota Household Hazardous Waste program located in Bagley, Minnesota, the County hosted two VSQG days - Spring and Fall. They were unable to continue the support for the County VSQG program in 2005. Stearns County has a mobile VSQG collection vehicle, and Crow County was able to utilize this VSQG program starting in 2005. Stearns County could not continue the support for the County VSQG program in 2008. In 2008, Crow Wing went back to the Northwest Minnesota Household Hazardous Waste program located in Bagley, Minnesota. Due to staffing issues, this was discontinued in 2011. In 2011, the County was able to utilize Stearns County program again, provided the business could transport the waste to St. Cloud. The result of the VSQG efforts is outlined in Table 4.1.

#### **4.3.4 Mercury Waste**

In 1992, the Legislature enacted legislation prohibiting disposal of waste mercury thermostats, thermometers, electric switches, gauge, or medical or scientific instruments from businesses and households from which the mercury has not been removed for reuse or recycling (Minn. Stat. §115A.932 and 119.92).

The national Thermostat Recycling Corporation (TRC) was formed in 1997 to operate a national wholesaler reverse-distribution system. For a nominal deposit, TRC provides postpaid bins that hold about 100 thermostats. The program was expanded to HVAC contractors in 2005. In 2006, Minnesota's HHW program was part of a test program with TRC. After the test program, the entire household hazardous waste programs in Minnesota are also now eligible to obtain bins and participate directly in the TRC program. MPCA obtained and provided a TRC bin to our HHW program in 2008. All local HVAC and electrical contractors have been notified of this disposal option for any thermostats they need to dispose of. Starting in 2009, demolition contractors will also be notified of this program being available through our HHW program. The first shipment of thermostats was shipped in 2009.

Prior to this, the County HHW program could only handle thermostats from residents and had to pay the disposal cost for this item. Now the County will be able to take both residential and business thermostats and dispose of them for free through TRC.

#### **4.3.5 Pharmaceutical Waste**

In the spring of 2011, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and its national and community partners/the County Sheriff gave the public an opportunity to prevent pill abuse and theft by ridding homes of potentially dangerous expired, unused, and unwanted prescription drugs. On Saturday, April 30<sup>th</sup>, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., DEA and its partners held their second National Prescription Drug Take-Back Day at sites nationwide. The service was free and anonymous, no questions asked.

This initiative addresses a vital public safety and public health issue. Medicines that languish in home cabinets are highly susceptible to diversion, misuse, and abuse. Rates of prescription drug abuse in the U.S. are alarmingly high--more Americans currently abuse prescription drugs than the number of those using cocaine, hallucinogens, and heroin combined, according to the 2009 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Studies show that a majority of abused prescription drugs are obtained from family and friends, including from the home medicine cabinet. Crime associated with prescription drug abuse also is on the rise. Another issue is pharmaceuticals have been detected in water samples collected from U.S. waterways that are considered susceptible to contamination from various wastewater sources.

The Crow Wing County program to address the disposal of old residential pharmaceutical medications was initiated in 2012. As part of a regional effort, our County also assisted Cass County with five sites, and one site at the Aitkin County Sheriff's Department. The Crow Wing County sites are at: Crow Wing County Law Enforcement Center, Breezy Point Police Department, and Crosby Police Department. The program officially started on April 9<sup>th</sup> for the Breezy Point and Crosby site, and April 10<sup>th</sup> for the Law Enforcement Center. The result of Crow Wing's pharmaceutical efforts is 680 pounds and is outlined in Table 4.1. For the initial year; Cass County took in 279 pounds and Aitkin County took in 248 pounds.

#### **4.3.6 Summation**

Even though handling HHW is more costly, time consuming, and subject to more regulatory oversight than any other of the components of the waste stream that we manage; these programs that deal with hazardous waste provide a direct benefit to the County by offering proper disposal actions for these items to the residents/businesses of the County. This waste stream does require special handling. As Table 4.1 outlines, since 1990 over 684.7 tons of hazardous waste/materials were brought in through these County/State programs that would not have been otherwise. This action has greatly reduced the risk of illegal dumping, or disposal into the County Landfill. If placed in the Landfill, this quantity of chemicals would have had a profound effect on the leachate quality. If disposed of inappropriately elsewhere, these chemicals may contaminate land, ground water or surface water, and air quality. Removal of this material from the general MSW waste stream has also minimized the health risk to waste haulers and Landfill operators. It is felt that these programs are and will continue to be successful. The State should continue to bear the risks for the transportation, management, and disposal of household hazardous waste and pesticides collected in the County.

County staff foresees the volume accepted at the HHW facility to remain near the current disposal level. Initially, much of the waste going through the facility was manufactured over 10-years ago. A reason may be homes in the rural area historically did not have a high turnover rate as in the Metro area. A farmstead or home in the County may stay in the family for multi-generations allowing a build up of HHW versus throwing it away - the old adage, "We may need it!" When things are cleaned up, there is a significant quantity of HHW and some of it was quite old. Now the County staff is seeing much of the waste going through the facility was manufactured within 10-years. Overall, it will take time before all of the existing waste is disposed of properly.

#### **4.4 Problem Materials**

The County's integrated solid waste management program also addresses problem materials, and prohibition of these materials in our County Landfills. The problem material challenge consists of two main components: items that reach the end of their useful life and disposed of, and those items that are in stockpiles and/or storage. As outlined below, many of the County's problem material programs compliment retailer programs ensuring in-depth coverage.

The State provided estimate for used oil was utilized for the SCORE Report.

##### **4.4.1 Waste Tires**

There exist many reasons to regulate the management and disposal of waste tires. The primary concern is public health. Tires can become a prime breeding ground of disease carrying mosquitoes, and a potential fire hazard. In addition, burying tires in a landfill consumes valuable landfill space and wastes a resource. Waste tires represent approximately two (2) percent of total solid waste generation in the United States.

Typical scrap tire management before 1985 consisted of sending whole tires to landfills for burial. Another means of managing scrap tires was for someone to collect scrap tires and place them onto a pile. In 1985, Minnesota enacted the first legislation in the nation specific to scrap tires. Since then, the State of Minnesota has enacted a landfill ban (§115A.904) on tires. Currently, 38 states have banned whole tires from landfills.

To address the stockpile issue, the County worked closely with MPCA under a grant program to remediate inactive waste tire disposal sites within the County in 1991. Approximately 100,000 tires or 1,456.5 tons were collected from motor vehicle salvage yards and other stockpiles. Of which, 423.44 tons were from the County Landfill. Today, there are no longer any large stockpiles located within the State or any known "large" tire dumps within the County. As part of the 2002 Legislative actions, Chapter 382 repealed the authority for the MPCA to make grants and loans to eliminate waste tires stockpiles.



In 2005, per the Rubber Manufacturers Association, the annual tire replacement amounted to 299 million tires nationwide. In 2007, it was estimated that the end-use markets consumed 89.3 percent by weight of the annual take off produced. By comparison, in 2005, about 82 percent of tires were consumed by weight. In 1990, only eleven percent of tires were consumed on a per tire basis. Scrap tire for energy is currently the largest market. In 2007, 54 percent of scrap tires disposed of in the US was used for tire derived fuel.

As done nationally, local tire retailers are processing the majority of the used tires generated annually within the County. Since April 1, 1989 in Minnesota, retailers who sell tires have been required by statute (Minn. Stat. §325E.32) to take one waste tire for each new tire they sell. The local retailers are allowed, and do charge a small fee for this disposal service. According to a document distributed by Goodyear titled "Scrap Tires Recovery, An Analysis of Alternatives," 90 percent are returned by the consumer to the thousands of retail locations across the country when worn out tires are replaced by new ones. EPA estimates that 95 percent of tires are collected through the commercial waste stream, and only five (5) percent or less through the household waste stream.

To address the remaining five - ten percent that is not returned by the consumer to the retail locations across the County when worn out tires are replaced by new ones, there is a drop-off location for waste tires at the Site complex for the residents. Mission and Ideal Township canister stations also handle tires. In addition, another disposal option people utilize is the many area "Cleanup Days". These events offer residents convenient opportunities to bring waste tires to a central location for disposal at a minimum charge. The tires gathered at these events are brought either to the Site complex or to an area tire retailer.

The Site complex is permitted to store up to 10,000 tires. The County does not accept tires from the local tire retailers. The tire disposal area was upgraded in 2000 to provide improved access for the residents and maintenance by the Landfill operator. Waste tires are accepted at the Site complex for reuse/recycling for a fee. The Site complex receives mostly tires that have been on residential property, and residents are willing to utilize the One-Stop-Service disposal system at the Site complex.

The Table below shows how the five – ten percent goal is being met. The following are the quantities of tires that are being handled just at the Site complex since 1992:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Estimated*</u> <u>Generation</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Handled at Site</u>	<u>Tonnage</u> <u>Shipped</u>
1992	3,097	45,772	6.8 %	N/A
1993	2,641	46,512	5.7 %	Unk
1994	4,573	47,299	9.7 %	Unk
1995	3,755	48,437	7.8 %	Unk
1996	3,486	49,560	7.0 %	N/A
1997**	4,618	50,578	9.1 %	269.21
1998	5,843	51,605	11.3 %	N/A
1999	5,982	52,698	11.4 %	182.45
2000***	6,923	55,099	12.6 %	N/A
2001****	7,240	56,281	12.9 %	463.04
2002	10,221	57,132	17.8 %	215.47
2003	8,536	58,391	14.6 %	161.13
2004	10,138	59,395	17.1 %	N/A
2005	9,777	60,194	16.0 %	343.76
2006	9,197	61,038	15.1 %	130.74
2007 *****	11,660	61,390	18.7 %	215.43
2008	8,709	61,739	14.1 %	76.32
2009	6,984	62,370	11.0 %	156.49
2010	7,145	62,500	11.4 %	139.57
2011*****	8,461	62,745	13.5 %	146.93
2012	8,828	63,474	13.9 %	140.98
TOTAL	147,814	1,174,209	12.6 %	2,641.52

\* Estimated generation is 1 tire/person/year

\*\* County began assisting area "Cleanup Day" events

\*\*\* Upgraded tire disposal area

\*\*\*\* Annual solid waste coupon initiated

\*\*\*\*\* 3,931 came from a one day cleanup event held at Crow Wing Township

\*\*\*\*\* 1,661 came from a cleanup event held at Brainerd

Waste tires collected by private retailers are disposed/recycled through arrangements between the retailer and a collection/recycling transporter. At this time, the County has no contract with a tire disposal/recycling facility. When sufficient tires have accumulated, they are sent to the facility with the lowest prices. Historically, waste tires collected at the County Landfill drop-off location were sent to BFI. BFI transported the tires to South Dakota where they have them chipped and used for road bedding material. Some chipped tires may have been used in a WTE facility. Since 1997, waste tire shreds have been used in the Landfill's leachate recirculation program, replacing recirculation lateral aggregate. Tire shreds are also used during liner construction, placed to mark the top of the drainage sand around a cell perimeter and at LFG well locations. The tire shreds provide a

The County's tire program has become self-sustaining with all tires reused on Site. All tires collected have been shredded and used on-site for recirculation lateral and liner construction. The difference in price between washed aggregate and shredded tires is about \$16 per in place cubic yard. Currently, nineteen (19) recirculation laterals have been installed, each having an average length of 420-feet within a 4-foot by 4-foot trench. This is equivalent to about 4,702 cubic yards and a construction cost savings of almost \$75,236. Metal rims are recycled.

The County has used First-State Tire in East Bethel, Greenman Technology, Monitor Tire, and Liberty in Minnesota for tire processing. Unfortunately, there are only two processors left within the state (Liberty and First-State Tire).

The source of funding for this program is primarily through the tire tipping fee at the Site complex, which is established by the County Board. This fee is set at a level sufficient to cover the cost of handling and low enough not to encourage illegal dumping. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated. This year, the County will use the weight from the shredded in 2012 for the SCORE report.

#### **4.4.2 White Goods (Household Appliances)**

By weight, the typical appliance consists of about 60 percent steel. The steel used in appliances is made with a minimum of 25 percent recycled steel. The purpose of a ban is to extend the life of the State's landfills and require the public sector to carry out the recycling of these goods. The most recent data available (2011) concerning the nationwide appliance recycling rate was 90.0 percent. The overall steel recycling rate is 92 percent.

White goods are large items defined by statute (Minn. Stat. §115A.03, subd. 17a) as refrigerators, freezers, dishwashers, heat pumps, furnaces, garbage disposal, clothes washers and dryers, ranges and stoves, hot water heaters, conventional and microwave ovens, dehumidifiers, trash compactors, and air conditioners. These products comprise about 2 percent of the MSW produced in the US.

The State of Minnesota has enacted a landfill ban for appliances, and tasked each county (§115A.9561, subd. 2) to ensure there is an opportunity for its residents to recycle used major appliances. As of 2000, 18 states enacted landfill bans for appliances, which helps drive successful recycling toward an ultimate goal of total recycling. This strategy appears to be working.

Appliance disposal options are provided at the Site complex, area "Cleanup Days," Mission and Ideal Township canister stations, and an area private Recycling Facility for a fee per appliance. The area at the Site complex was upgraded in 2000 to provide improved access for the residents and the contracted processor. Appliances collected from the Site complex are processed by Curtis Whitegoods (bought out by Cohasset White Goods/Bass Brook Recycling in 2005) and transported to a scrap yard in Winnipeg, Canada. The Site fee to accept appliances for recycling is five dollars per appliance.

The County has an agreement with the Landfill operator to remove freon (§116A.731), PCB contaminated capacitors and mercury switches (§115A.932). The Landfill operator is certified with all applicable local, state and federal regulations for proper capture of hazardous products contained in the appliances. Disposal of the PCB contaminated capacitors and mercury switches is accomplished through the County HHW program.

At the Site complex the Servel gas refrigerator rebate program is promoted. This refrigerator was popular in hunting cabins, vacation cottages and remote areas where electricity was unavailable and gas was the preferred energy source. Servels manufactured between 1933 and 1957 are linked to 22 deaths from carbon monoxide poisoning nationwide. Proper disposal of a Servel refrigerator will receive a \$100 rebate from the manufacturer.

The Site complex is accepting a significant amount of used appliances generated within the County. In addition, a local scrap metal dealer accepts a large amount of used appliances. With this in mind, the County is generating more than the State/national average. This may be due to people who live on the lakes and people who are cleaning up their property. Nonresidents with summer lake homes bring old appliances from their permanent residence for use at their lake homes and dispose of them in our County. This transient population, which is not included in our population total, maybe is adding a significant amount of appliances to our solid waste system.

The following are the quantities of appliances handled at the Site complex since 1992: (Note tonnage also includes scrap metal)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Estimated*</u> <u>Generation</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Handled at Site</u>	<u>National**</u> <u>Recycling</u> <u>Rate</u>	<u>Tonnage</u> <u>Shipped</u>
1992	1,456	4,577	32 %	55.0 %	Unk
1993	2,128	4,651	46 %	61.8 %	Unk
1994	2,649	4,730	56 %	70.2 %	Unk
1995	2,615	4,844	54 %	74.3 %	Unk
1996	2,890	4,956	58 %	76.4 %	253.72
1997***	2,901	5,058	57 %	81.0 %	344.61
1998	3,758	5,161	73 %	72.1 %	172.54
1999****	3,370	5,270	64 %	77.3 %	460.12
2000*****	3,235	5,510	59 %	84.0 %	169.73
2001*****	4,001	5,628	71 %	85.0 %	293.89
2002	4,457	5,713	78 %	86.5 %	437.10
2003	4,306	5,839	74 %	89.7 %	445.01
2004	4,793	5,940	81 %	89.4 %	377.00
2005	4,686	6,019	77 %	90.0 %	354.60
2006	4,624	6,104	76 %	90.0 %	610.38
2007	4,434	6,139	71 %	90.0 %	414.65
2008*****	3,949	6,174	64 %	90.0 %	387.54
2009*****	4,077	6,237	65 %	90.0 %	271.62
2010*****	3,801	6,250	61 %	90.0 %	432.79

2011*****	3,131	6,275	50 %	90.0 %	245.71
2012*****	3,025	6,356	48 %		282.25
TOTAL	74,286	117,429	63 %		5,953.26

- \* Estimated generation rate is 0.1 item/person/year
- \*\* Per the Steel Recycling Institute
- \*\*\* County began assisting area "Cleanup Day" events
- \*\*\*\* Area scrap metal recycler began to work in conjunction with the local Cleanup day efforts.  
Scrap metal is no longer coming to Site from these events.
- \*\*\*\*\* Upgraded appliance collection area
- \*\*\*\*\* Annual solid waste coupon initiated
- \*\*\*\*\* Scrap steel prices, record highs -- people utilizing local Recyclers to obtain cash.

The source of funding for this program is primarily through the appliance tipping fee at the Site complex, which is established by the County Board. This fee is set at a level sufficient to cover the cost of handling the appliances and low enough not to encourage illegal dumping. There will be no substantial changes to the existing major appliance program. This year, the County did not use the State's estimated weight for appliances, but actual tonnage from Cohasset Recycling.

#### 4.4.3 Used Oil & Used Oil Filters

Due to its potential value, the EPA term is "used oil" rather than "waste oil." Oil recycling is very common. After it is collected, nearly 89 percent of used motor oil from vehicles is recycled/reused for use as industrial fuel or space heating. Because it usually has a thicker viscosity, used oil possesses more energy than #2 fuel oil. A typical gallon of used oil contains 163,000 to 240,000 BTU -- more than twice the energy value of LP gas or coal. This creates a valuable form of energy, which helps our economy by avoiding the need to refine new commercial heating from imported crude oil.

The State of Minnesota has enacted a landfill ban for these items (§115A.916). In 1987, legislation was passed (§325E11 (a)(1)) in Minnesota requiring all retailers of motor oil to collect used oil or post signs saying where the nearest location for acceptance of used oil is found. In 2004, the County contacted and provided a sign (94 were posted in area motor oil retailers) promoting the eight used oil dropoff sites to all the motor oil retailers located within the County. During this visit only 2 of the 94 stores had a sign posted.

In addition, motor oil legislation (§325E112, subd. 1, (2)) was passed in Minnesota in 1997 specifically requiring the industry to ensure each county has at least one free site, in addition to any free government site. Currently, this site is Valvoline Oil in Baxter. Valvoline Oil will take up to 5 gallons of used oil and 10 oil filters. A local business (Waste Partners) provides residential/commercial used oil filters collection service in the County. Tonnage from this business is used in the SCORE Report.

The County informs residents through its public education program that disposal of motor oil in or on the land is banned and that improperly disposed waste oil impacts ground and surface water, human health, and the environment. All retailers of motor oil must either offer collection of used oil to the public, or indicate the nearest collection site.

Area service stations or shop specializing in oil changes are processing the majority of the used oil/filters generated in the County. The sites outlined below are geared toward "do-it-yourselfers" (DIY) to utilize as their disposal system. In addition, people bring in used oil during the HHW collection events are informed of the used oil tanks and their availability.

The January 1999 MPCA report, "Do-It-Yourselfers Used Oil and Filter Recycling - A Report to the Environmental and Natural Resources Committees of the Senate and the House of Representative" estimates that there are approximately 3.5 million gallons of DIY used oil generated annually in Minnesota. The total amount of used oil collected from DIY's in Minnesota is approximately 2.5 million gallons. Approximately 775,000 gallons or 22% is mismanaged (e.g., illegally disposed) and approximately 225,000 gallons is burned for heat or reused.

This is further strengthened by the *1999 Used Motor Oil and Oil Filter Study* (OEA, January 2000), according to a telephone survey, 68 percent of vehicle owners pay to have their oil changed at a service station or shop specializing in oil changes. Eighteen percent change their oil at home, and another 14 percent changes their oil both at home and commercially. As this outlines, the majority of people are utilizing commercial oil changing opportunities versus doing-it-yourself. However, there still remains a significant amount of people who change their oil at home, and there seems to be an increase in utility vehicles (lawnmowers, four wheelers, etc.) that have oil filters requiring people to change their own oil.

The County Solid Waste Department and Highway Department entered into a joint venture to install above ground waste oil storage tanks (560 gallons) at four locations in the County in 1995. This was part of the OEA used oil storage tank grant program. These locations are at the following County Highway garages:

- |                                       |                         |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Pequot Lakes (Shop closing in 2004) | - Emily (upgraded 2003) |
| - Deerwood                            | - Pine Center           |

An additional tank was installed at the Site. Collection of used oil at the Site started in 1995 and data collection began in 1997. The following are the quantities of used oil collected at the Site complex from 1997 through 2002:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (gal.)</u>	<u>Generated</u>	<u>Estimated* % Handled at Site</u>
1997	1,675	202,312	0.83 %
1998	2,605	206,420	1.26 %
1999	3,570	210,792	1.69 %
2000	3,475	220,396	1.58 %
2001	4,225	225,124	1.88 %
<u>2002</u>	<u>5,161</u>	<u>228,528</u>	<u>2.26 %</u>
TOTAL	20,711	1,293,572	1.60 %

\* Estimated generation rate is 4 gallons/person/year

The County's 2002 Comprehensive Local Water Plan identified illegal dumping of used oil as a pollution source of concern and recommended the development of a program for used oil collection.

The County received an additional grant in 2002 from OEA to assist in the upgrade of the used oil storage tank at the Site complex and to install a tank in the City of Crosby in addition to six other sites. The majority of the funding came from the County. There were initially 4,000 gallon underground storage tanks (UST). The placement of the drop-off sites offers convenience for County residents; each location has been strategically placed to be within 10 miles of any County resident. Most collection sites are self-service centers that are open 24 hours, seven days a week. In 2003, the additional six (6) sites were installed throughout the County. The reuse and recycling of these fluids remove the potential for environmental impacts to the County's water resources. The following are the location of these six sites:

-	Brainerd	-	Baxter	-	Fort Ripley Area/Crow Wing Twp.
-	Garrison	-	Crosslake	-	Emily

2004 was the first year all 8 sites listed above was operational for the entire year. In 2005, a ninth UST was installed at Pequot Lakes. A tenth tank, a 2,000 gallon aboveground storage tank (AST), was installed in 2009 for Mission Township by their township hall/fire station. An eleventh tank, another 2,000 gallon AST, was installed in 2010 for the City of Nisswa.

The County has granted ownership to the host cities and townships and the sites have been a welcomed addition by the communities and residents. The host cities and township are responsible for inspection and maintenance of the tanks and sites. This used oil collection service is offered at no charge to County residents, with oil filter and antifreeze disposal offered for a small fee of: \$1 per gallon for antifreeze, and \$0.50 per oil filter. The program relies on the honor system for oil filter and antifreeze payments. A payment collection box is located at each drop-off site. Starting in 2010, these items no longer have a disposal fee. The attached Table 4.2 shows the quantities of used oil collected at these individual sites starting in 2002.

TABLE 4.2  
USED OIL PROGRAM

	Site	2007				2008				2009				2010				2011			
		Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum		
1	Baxter	6,603	192	6.50	5,781	142	10.75	5,310	110	10.00	4,964	225	10.50	5,145	180	10.50	5,145	180	10.50		
2	Brainerd	8,814	291	15.75	11,649	453	15.50	10,851	210	21.50	11,776	471	18.50	9,857	340	15.50	9,857	340	15.50		
3	Crosby	4,301	152	8.00	4,934	260	9.00	3,613	118	9.75	4,451	211	10.50	4,326	160	10.50	4,326	160	10.00		
4	Crosslake	3,306	106	5.00	2,381	45	2.75	2,409	120	4.00	2,221	80	4.00	2,202	65	4.00	2,202	65	6.00		
5	Crow Wing Twp	1,805	40	0.50	1,929	36	2.00	2,252	40	1.00	2,183	70	1.50	2,066	45	3.50	2,066	45	3.50		
6	Emily	2,496	70	6.00	2,988	50	5.50	4,058	125	7.00	2,891	85	5.50	2,623	90	5.50	2,623	90	5.50		
7	Garrison	518	50	1.50	2,119	75	3.25	832	0	2.00	2,375	30	4.00	1,524	50	4.00	1,524	50	4.00		
8	Nisswa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	680	50	2.00	793	0	1.00	793	0	1.00		
9	Mission Twp	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Installed in Nov	120	9.00	533	0	1.00	1,740	0	1.00	1,740	0	3.00		
10	Pequot Lake	2,096	121	5.00	4,632	120	6.50	4,706	120	9.00	3,709	165	9.00	3,262	125	9.00	3,262	125	8.00		
11	Landfill Site	2,312	72	6.50	2,657	150	4.50	2,383	45	5.50	3,617	115	6.00	1,871	140	6.00	1,871	140	3.50		
	Deerwood	0	N/A	0.00	0	N/A	2.00	0	N/A	4.00	0	N/A	N/A	3.00	0	N/A	0	N/A	0.00		
	Pine Center	497	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	490	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A		
	TOTAL	32,748	1,094	54.75	39,070	1,331	61.75	36,424	888	73.75	39,890	1,502	75.50	34,409	1,195	75.50	34,409	1,195	69.00		
	Estimated * Generated	245,560			246,956			249,480			250,000			250,980			250,980				
	% by DYT**	22%			22%			22%			22%			22%			22%				
	% Handled	13.3%			15.8%			14.6%			16.0%			13.7%			13.7%				

	Site	2012				TOTAL			
		Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)	Oil Filters 55-gal drum	Used Oil (Gallons)	Antifreeze (Gallons)
1	Baxter	4,668	245	9.00	51,776	1,575	88.50	51,776	1,575
2	Brainerd	8,511	305	17.00	94,791	3,142	162.00	94,791	3,142
3	Crosby	3,886	180	10.00	46,892	1,851	98.75	46,892	1,851
4	Crosslake	2,292	45	5.00	21,172	647	42.25	21,172	647
5	Crow Wing Twp	2,222	100	2.00	12,701	396	12.50	12,701	396
6	Emily	2,455	85	5.00	26,810	770	60.50	26,810	770
7	Garrison	1,416	40	1.50	15,046	270	22.25	15,046	270
8	Nisswa	2,702	80	4.00	4,175	130	7.00	4,175	130
9	Mission Twp	535	40	2.00	2,808	40	6.00	2,808	40
10	Pequot Lake	4,566	219	9.00	29,261	945	52.00	29,261	945
11	Landfill Site	3,213	1,130	6.00	39,596	2,887	65.25	39,596	2,887
	Deerwood	0	N/A	0.00	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
	Pine Center	0	N/A	N/A	2,454	N/A	N/A	2,454	N/A
	TOTAL	35,576	2,469	70.50	347,282	12,453	625.00	347,282	12,453
	Estimated *	253,896			2,681,472			2,681,472	
	% by DYT**	22%			22%			22%	
	% Handled	14.4%			13.0%			13.0%	

\* Generation rate is 4 gallons/person/year

\*\* Do-it-yourselfers (DIY), Oil generated by this sector, goal is to reach this level



A licensed used oil hauler services these tanks. Used oil is a source of fuel for asphalt production. This alternative fuel option conserves other fuels such as natural gas, heating oil, and diesel fuel. Used oil filters are crushed and the metal is recycled. Antifreeze is shipped for refurbishing and reuse.

In addition, annually the Environmental Services/Solid Waste Office uses about 1,500 gallons of used oil collected from the County Highway Department vehicle maintenance shop to heat the HHW Facility. The used oil heater was purchased in 1999. Review of the heating bill for propane in the four years prior to 1999 indicates an average annual cost of \$2,800. Since the heater installation, the County only uses propane as a backup in early fall and late spring. As a result, the costs have gone down to less than \$650 per year. The initial cost of the heater was \$8,900; therefore, the program has provided a 4 to 5-year payback.

The primary source of funding for this program is through the \$15 County Solid Waste Assessment charged to every resident with a small amount coming from an OEA's grant for the installation of the tanks. The County Board established this rate. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated.

#### **4.4.4 Vehicle Batteries**

Lead-acid batteries have the highest recycling rate of any product sold in the United States. Based on Battery Council International, the national recycling rate for batteries is more than 97 percent. This is because batteries are easily returned when a new battery is purchased and because battery's lead and plastic components have value. Typically a new battery contains 60 to 80 percent recycled lead and plastic.

The State of Minnesota has enacted a landfill ban for lead acid batteries (§115A.915). It has been illegal since January 1, 1988 to place these in the waste stream. Minnesota law (§325E.1151 subd. 1) established a five-dollar refundable surcharge when a motor vehicle battery is purchased; this was changed to a ten-dollar refundable surcharge in 2010. The law (§325E.1151, subd. 2) also requires motor vehicle battery retailers to accept up to five (5) motor vehicle batteries free of charge, whether or not the consumer is making a purchase. When a new battery is purchased, the customer may avoid the surcharge by turning in a used motor vehicle battery. Lead-acid battery laws in 44 states require the collection and recycling of batteries.

The private sector provides the primary collection opportunities for lead-acid batteries. Battery disposal options are also provided at the Site complex, area "Cleanup Days," Mission and Ideal Township canister stations, and a local private Recycling Facility. There is a receptacle for the lead-acid batteries at the Site complex. A new container was purchased in 2000. The lead-acid batteries are removed as required for recycling. Lead-acid battery recycling is a free service to County residents. The Site complex typically receives used batteries that have been stored at residential properties, and are delivered when residents are utilizing the One-Stop-Service disposal system at the Site complex.

Collection of batteries at the Site complex started in 1992 and data collection began in 1998:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Estimated*</u> <u>Generation</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Handled at Site</u>
1998	386 (April - Dec)	17,030	2.27 %
1999	548	17,390	3.15 %
2000**	606	18,183	3.32 %
2001***	795	18,573	4.28 %
2002	1,040	18,854	5.49 %
2003	1,069	19,269	5.55 %
2004	1,177	19,600	6.01 %
2005	1,325	19,864	6.67 %
2006	939****	20,143	4.66 %
2007	750****	20,259	3.70 %
2008	590****	20,374	2.90 %
2009	647****	20,582	3.14 %
2010	532****	20,625	2.58 %
2011	469****	20,706	2.27 %
2012	376****	20,946	1.80 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>292,397</b>	<b>3.85 %</b>

\* Estimated generation rate is 0.33 batteries/person/year

\*\* Upgraded battery drop-off area

\*\*\* Annual solid waste coupon initiated

\*\*\*\* Recyclers offering fee, people removing batteries from container to obtain the fee.

#### **4.4.4.1 Rechargeable Batteries**

The State of Minnesota has enacted a landfill ban for rechargeable batteries (§115A.9157). It has been illegal since January 1, 1988 to place these in the waste stream. The private sector provides the primary collection opportunities for rechargeable batteries. The Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation (RBRC) has a national program that works with local interested retailers with a no-cost recycling service through its Call2Recycle initiative. The RBRC is a nonprofit group, funded by more than 300 manufacturers and marketers of portable rechargeable batteries and products. More than 30,000 North America retailers, businesses and communities serve as collection points. In addition, the County gives residents a disposal option for Ni-Cad and other rechargeable batteries through the HHW program. Batteries are subsequently disposed through the State contract for the HHW program. It is estimated the rechargeable battery recycling rate in 2002 to be at 10 to 13 percent nationwide. The following are local businesses that also will accept used Ni-Cd batteries:

Brainerd	ACE Hardware
	Batteries Plus
Baxter	Best Buy
	Office Max
	Home Depot
	Radio Shack
	Target
	Wal-Mart
Crosby	True Value Hardware

Below is the generation data from RBRC and others for collection sites located within the County:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (lbs.)</u>
2006	4,585
2007	2,872
2008	1,787
2009	1,989
2010	6,569
2011	6,875
<u>2012</u>	<u>4,040</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>28,817</u>

Conventional dry cell and alkaline batteries are disposed along with the MSW.

Since this is a free service to residents, the source of funding for this program is through the \$15 County Solid Waste Assessment charged to every resident. The County Board established this rate. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated.

#### **4.4.5 Fluorescent & HID Lamps**

Fluorescent lights and other high-intensity discharge (HID) lights are banned (§115A932) from disposal in MSW. This ban became effective August 1, 1994 and applies to households as well as businesses, and includes all shapes of fluorescent lights. Per the EPA's *Characterization of Products Containing Mercury in the United States*, they estimate fluorescent lamps account for 0.09 percent of all solid waste. In 2008, legislation was passed (§325E127) in Minnesota requiring any person who sells fluorescent lamps at retail to post a notice visible to consumers stating that the light bulbs contain mercury and must be recycled at the end of use.

According to the Association of Lighting and Mercury Recyclers, the national lamp recycling rate in 2003 was 23 percent. Since lamps are banned from the MSW in Minnesota, the recycling rate will be much higher for Minnesota than the national average due to the success of local programs and multiple recyclers locally. The amount of mercury contained in fluorescent lamps has declined significantly, from an average of 48.2 mg per four-foot bulb in 1995 to less than 5 mg in the Philips Alto lamp. At the same time, the quantity of fluorescent lamps in use has increased.

There are businesses in the County and throughout the State offering disposal opportunities for fluorescent tubes and HID intensity lamps. Many local business interests have a direct contract with a commercial establishment too pickup and dispose of lamps. Residents can properly dispose of their lamps through area hardware stores or during some of the area "Cleanup Days" for a fee per bulb. In addition, some of the power companies give out coupons that give \$0.50 off the recycling fee for each bulb people recycle at designated hardware stores within the County. Every city within the County has a business that will take these bulbs. For this reason, the County does not handle this item through the HHW program.

As part of the annual SCORE report, the County used actual tonnage. This is based on responses received back from mass mailing to individual businesses and from the commercial interests processing these items. It appears the majority of bulbs are recycled versus illegal disposal. The following is the amount of bulbs recycled:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (lbs)</u>	<u>Equivalent 4 foot bulbs*</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (lbs)</u>	<u>Equivalent 4 foot bulbs*</u>
1997	25,372	40,595	2006	39,517	63,227
1998	30,858	49,373	2007	37,129	59,406
1999	23,871	38,194	2008	37,708	60,333
2000**	63,930	102,288	2009	36,708	58,733
2001	34,400	55,040	2010	29,795	47,672
2002	39,920	63,872	2011	26,079	41,726
2003	26,421	42,274	2012	56,182	89,891
2004	39,135	62,616	TOTAL	296.6 tons	949,267
2005	46,112	73,779			

\* 4 foot bulb is 0.625 pounds

\*\* Started to received data directly from bulb recyclers for Crow Wing County

There will be no substantial changes to the existing program.

#### **4.4.6 Electronic (Browngoods/e-waste)**

As much as 40 percent of the heavy metals (including lead, mercury and cadmium) found in landfills come from electronic equipment discards. End-of-life (EoL) electronics continues to grow rapidly and contribute two (2) percent of the municipal solid waste stream, if we continue to replace old or outdated electronic equipment at our current rate, this percentage will continue to grow.

On April 1, 2000, Massachusetts became the first state to ban cathode-ray tubes (CRTs) from landfills. Twenty five (25) states, including Minnesota, currently have e-waste legislation in place. A 2010 report by the Hinkley Center for Solid and Hazardous Waste Management, funded by Florida Department of Environmental Protection, has found that the peak quantities of CRTs being disposed or recycled in the Sunshine State will occur in "the next few years, between 2012-2016."

In 1999, OEA partnered with Sony Electronics, Inc., the Asset Recovery Group of Waste Management, Inc., and the American Plastic Council to examine and evaluate recycling options for used household electronic products. Their Report came out July 2001 concerning this effort. The northern Minnesota counties of Beltrami, Cass, Clearwater, Crow Wing, Hubbard, Norman, Red Lake, Lake of the Woods, and Roseau participated in this project. In total, collections were held at 64 sites in 32 counties. Through this program, the County collected eight (8) tons of material. The entire program collected 575 tons of used products during the three-month collection phase of the project.

In 2003, Minnesota required that CRTs may not be placed in municipal solid waste after July 1, 2005. In 2005, this ban (§115A.9565) was extended to July 1, 2006 due to the legislature body unable to come to an agreement on a management strategy for waste electronics. In 2007, additional legislation was passed. Under this new law, manufacturers of video display devices sold to Minnesota households must recycle 60% the first year (starting July 1, 2007) and 80% of the total weight of video display devices (VDDs) sold in subsequent years of the program.

Federal law required television broadcasters to switch from analog to digital transmission signals in 2009. An estimated 21 million US households, or 19 percent, own analog TV sets that receive only free broadcasts. When the analog broadcasts stopped, those viewers had to connect their old sets to converter boxes to get programming, whether delivered via broadcast, cable or satellite.

To assist local government agencies in the proper management of these items, the County in 2001 coordinated a one-day drop-off event for all government/public entities in the County. The State contract with Asset Recovery was utilized to manage these items. The event was held on September 21, 2001 to coincide with National Pollution Prevention Week, a week dedicated to pollution prevention awareness and publicity. The drop-off location was the County HHW facility. This program was expanded in 2002 to two events - spring and fall - and to include businesses. Under this program, the business only has to pay the disposal cost for their used electronics. The County paid for the transportation and to have the contractor at the Site complex.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (tons)</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>(tons)</u>	<u>Participants</u>
1999	8.0	152 (OEA Pilot Program)			
2000	N/A	N/A	2010	13.9	34
2001	3.0	5	2011	11.6	21
2002	9.7	20	<u>2012</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>40</u>
2003	10.7	33	TOTAL	199.9	
2004	16.1	41			
2005	30.4	56			
2006	24.7	48			
2007	23.5	62			
2008	20.0	58			
2009	15.0	36			

A used electronics storage facility was built at the Site in 2003, and opened in May 2004. This proactive County residential electronic waste program (Computers/Laptops and Components - CPU, monitor, keyboard, and mouse - Fax, Copier/Printer, Microwave\*, TVs, VCRs/DVDs, Scanners, Electric Typewriter, and Stereos) has a per item fee of \$5. Other used electronic disposal options are provided at area "Cleanup Days," Mission and Ideal Township canister stations for a fee. Used electronics collected from the commercial program are processed through the State contract (Asset Recovery). Starting in 2008 utilized low bid for the residential program.

The following are the quantities of used residential electronics handled at the Site complex since 2004:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (tons)</u>	<u>Amount (ea)</u>
2004	66.6	2,321
2005	100.2	3,635
2006*	108.8	4,378
2007	138.5	5,570
2008	117.2	5,059
2009	130.9	6,020
2010	138.2	5,872
2011	140.0	6,983**
<u>2012</u>	<u>131.1</u>	<u>5,836</u>
TOTAL	1,071.6	45,674

\* Starting in May 19, 2006 microwaves were recycled with the other appliances (white goods).

\*\* 1,220 came from a cleanup event held at Brainerd

The primary source of funding for this program is through the \$5 tip fee with a small amount coming from the \$15 County Solid Waste Assessment charged to every resident. The County Board established this rate. The County will maintain its current program with no substantial changes anticipated.

#### **4.5 Source Reduction/Reuse**

In 1995, the Minnesota Legislature established a statewide goal to reduce the amount of waste generated by 10 percent by the year 2000. Waste reduction (sometimes called source reduction) refers to actions taken to prevent the generation of waste. Source reduction activities affect the waste stream at or before the point of generation. MSW is considered to have been generated if it is placed at curbside, in a receptacle such as a dumpster for pickup, or it is taken by the generator to another site for disposal or other management alternative.

Source reduction can be accomplished through changes in product designs to use less material and by changes in consumer practices that reduce the amount of MSW produced. This is different from recycling and reuse, which while being able to extend the life of some materials, by and large are delaying tactics to disposal.

Source reduction measures encompass a very broad range of activities by private citizens, communities, commercial establishments, institutional agencies, manufacturers and distributors. In general, source reduction activities include:

- Designing products or packages to reduce the quantity of resultant waste materials or the toxicity of the materials used and waste material generated;
- Reducing amounts of products or packaging used through modification of current practices;
- Reusing products or packaging already manufactured;
- Lengthening the life of products to postpone disposal; and
- Managing non-product organic waste (food wastes, yard waste) through backyard composting or other on-site alternatives to disposal.

The extent of source reduction/reuse activities is difficult to quantify. In an attempt to gather information, a questionnaire was sent along with a request concerning recycling to all area businesses. In 1999, the questionnaire provided enough data to enable the County to claim a waste reduction/reuse rate greater than 3 percent. This option is available to any county that is able to demonstrate actual tons of MSW that was reduced above and beyond the 3 percent credit available through the SCORE checklist. Crow Wing County is the only one of the 87 counties that used this option. In 2011, the County received an 8 percent credit for quantifiable source reduction activities. The 2012 Legislation removed this credit beginning in 2012.

Prior to 2012 a survey was accomplished annually. This survey indicates many businesses did have some type of source reduction in place. This generally occurs as a cost-effective business practice. In fact, the normal economic pressures in a free market system guarantee that manufactures are constantly figuring out how to use fewer raw materials when making products or packages. They create less trash in the process. Lighter weigh products are easier to use, less expensive to transport and more convenient for consumers. For example, steel cans contain one third less metal than they did 20 years ago. Transportation costs are particularly important. Markets, not government mandates, have given us less waste and a more efficient economy.

An EPA report, *Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: 2000 Facts and Figures*, chronicle the solid waste generation and recovery rates over the past few decades. The EPA estimates if the level of source reduction did not occur in 1999, 22 percent more MSW would have been generated. On-site yard waste composting, use of mulching mowers, and reduction in the weight of beverage containers have been the main reason for the 22 percent reduction. One of the major problems with source reduction for residents is that it runs counter to the public's present-day consumption ethic. Also, it is felt significant source reduction for residents require actions outside a county's sphere of influence, and a large reduction in waste production would require national influences. With industry, source reduction does have an impact on their ledger. Manufactures will continue to find ways to use fewer materials to make more products - light weighting is a guaranteed economical reality.

#### **4.5.1 Lakeland Mold Sand Cores Disposal**

The sand molds discarded by Lakeland Mold were significantly reduced. Lakeland Mold was also one of the largest waste generators in the County. The Lakeland Mold Company installed equipment which breaks-up the molds that were previously delivered whole to the Landfill. They received a grant from the OEA in 1994 for \$20,000, and are now reusing its sand molds that were previously delivered whole to the County Landfill (SW-376). This not only reuses the sand, but has a savings of \$5,000 in annual purchasing expenses for the company. Also, benefiting from this reclamation process is the County. The sand cores were problematic at the Landfill. First, there are a large number of them. Second, the sand cores are large, difficult to handle, and do not break apart easily. This causes voids in the fill and inefficient use of space. Crushing the molds back to near the original fineness of the sand has proven beneficial to Lakeland Mold, our Landfill operation, and is helping the State meet its reuse/source reduction goals. This program has shown to local industry that taking the initiative to reduce waste can make a difference to a company profit.

#### **4.5.2 Bike Program**

In 1998, a bike reuse program was initiated. This program was through a couple of avenues. First, several local organizations (Wal Mart in Baxter, Shriners, Kiwanis, local haulers, and other county agencies) worked together to reuse bikes that individuals no longer have a use for. Second, the juvenile Sentence to Serve (STS) work crew is working with two Brainerd bicycle shops, Easy Rider Bicycle and Sport Shop and Trailblazer Bikes. The juveniles learned the skills of bike repair alongside professionals at these two shops. The program was geared to provide a bike to people in need throughout the county; age is not an issue with senior citizens being as eligible for repaired bikes as youngsters.

In 2001, the Brainerd Rotary Club took over the bike program. They fixed the bikes up for shipment to Haiti. They collected about 300 bikes, of which, 2/3 of them came from the Landfill and the "cleanup" days held throughout the County - Crosby, Southeast Brainerd, Kiwanis (Wal-Mart) and Nisswa Lions. Of the 300 bikes collected, 150 bikes were disassembled and boxed and about 50 more are worthy of boxing up for shipment to Haiti. The remainder will be stripped for parts or "recycled." The Rotary's planned the "Bikes for Haiti" to be an ongoing project. Overall, they consider the project a huge success. In 2002, it is estimated they collected 200 bikes. No other organization took up this program from 2003 - 2007. Kinship Partners picked up the program in 2008 and has continued it to 2012. In 2012 they did 108 bikes.

#### **4.5.3 Material Exchange Program**

This program was initiated from a two (2) year grant from OEA in 1999 with Crow Wing, Cass and Hubbard County. Due to the available staffing and its central location, Cass County is the lead and provides the office space for the project director.

The regional residential and commercial material exchange program (North Central Materials Exchange - MATEX) is continuing to develop. The program came online in 2000.



In 2004, the program serving the three counties of Cass, Crow Wing and Hubbard County continued at a service level of ten hours per week. In summary, the MATEX program has been able to help many County people and businesses, and kept tons of material out of landfills and unauthorized dumps. The business visits provide a great opportunity to talk with business owners and managers about waste disposal in general. Each site visit prompts questions and answers on topics such as fluorescent bulbs, recycling, hazardous waste, waste haulers, and the location of construction and demolition waste sites.

Residents and businesses alike are happy to learn that there is a program which will help to dispose of unwanted, yet still provide useable materials. Many are genuinely pleased that someone else will be able to use the items. Enthusiasm is not fueled entirely by an interest in saving money on disposal costs, but an interest by conservation of resources as well.

#### **4.6 Mattress Recycling**

Bulky items are an ongoing issue for residents, haulers, and County Landfill operations. The largest concerns have been mattresses. Haulers find them difficult to deal with, and they are an operational issue in Landfill operations. For example, the wire from mattresses tends to wrap around the wheels of the trash compactor and cause maintenance problems. In addition, the average mattress consumes a cubic yard of landfill space and does not compact as normal refuse would, thus cause a loss of valuable landfill space. The County had been looking for a viable alternative for the disposal of these items.

WLSSD established a local pilot program in Minnesota in 2000 with the federal prison. WLSSD, OEA, and members of NEWAC established a Mattress Recycling/Disposal Work Group (Crow Wing County was part of this group) in 2003 for the purpose of developing and implementing a program to deal with mattress disposal practices in the region. This is a public-private partnership between Goodwill Industries (GWI), the northeast counties, retail sales operations, and other businesses and institutions that collectively generate a steady stream of used mattresses. The goal of the program was to establish a stable, self-supporting market mechanism to divert mattresses from the waste stream, recycle by-products, and provide training and employment for individuals working within GWI. The small-scale pilot testing began in June 2004. By January 2005, larger scale pilot operations began as other county partners implement some form of mattress collection with full scale operation being initiated in June 2005. Crow Wing County started to utilize this program on August 17, 2006. With this item now being recycled, it will increase the County recycling rate, remove an operational issue at the Landfill, and extend the life of the County Landfill.

The Minnesota Environmental Initiative (MEI) builds innovative partnerships to develop solutions to Minnesota's environmental problems. MEI works with nonprofit, business and government partners to develop consensus on critical issues and move collectively toward action that has positive impacts. Under their 2012 Environmental Initiative Awards – the mattress recycling program won the Business and Environmental Sector Innovations aspect. These awards recognize projects that have used collaborative methods to produce tangible environmental outcomes. In this case, a decade-long collaboration to reduce landfill space, create jobs and revolutionize the mattress recycling industry.

Started to track the amount of used mattresses collected at the Site complex in 1998:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Landfilled Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Weight (tons)*</u>	<u>Recycled Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Weight (tons)</u>	<u>Estimated** Generated</u>
1998	3,244	89.2	N/A	0	7,225
1999	3,283	90.3	N/A	0	7,378
2000	3,494	96.1	N/A	0	7,714
2001	4,254	117.0	N/A	0	7,879
2002	5,232	143.9	N/A	0	7,998
2003	5,106	140.4	N/A	0	8,175
2004	6,224	171.2	N/A	0	8,315
2005	5,694	156.6	N/A	0	8,427
2006***	4,761	130.9	768	22.1	8,545
2007	3,004	82.7	2,467	67.8	8,595
2008	2,646	72.8	2,304	63.4	8,643
2009	2,223	61.1	2,251	61.9	8,732
2010	2,203	60.6	2,383	65.5	8,750
2011	3,061****	84.2	2,286	62.9	8,784
2012	2,405	66.1	3,138	86.3	8,886
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56,834</b>	<b>1,562.9</b>	<b>15,597</b>	<b>428.9</b>	<b>124,047</b>

\* Estimated weight, 55 lbs/mattress

\*\* Estimated generation rate is 0.14 mattress/person/year

\*\*\* Recycling program started August 17, 2006

\*\*\*\* 669 came from a cleanup event held at Brainerd, sat outside and before they could be picked up they were rained on - could not use the mattress recycle program

#### **4.7 Education**

The public education program is designed to compliment existing retailer programs and to target the portion of the population that has improperly or illegally disposed of waste in conjunction with maintaining adequate Site infrastructure. The County believes maintaining aesthetics and updating infrastructure at the Site has a parallel effect to a proficient public education program. A proficient education program will bring customers to utilize the solid waste disposal resources, but facility infrastructure that is aesthetically pleasing and user friendly will ensure customers will return.

The County's public education efforts include monthly ads from April - October in area newspaper regarding when the HHW facility is open, a regular booth at the County Fair, public speaking engagements, part of County web page, Earth 911 database ([www.Earth911.org](http://www.Earth911.org)) and distribution of educational materials and brochures to - area schools, the technical and community college, earth week events, and to professional, service, and volunteer organizations. Radio advertising and newspaper advertising remains an effective tool for promoting the Household Hazardous Waste Facility, Product Exchange and recycling opportunities at the Site, i.e., appliances, tires, and used oil.

In 2012, Land Services through the Solid Waste Office revised the brochures for HHW, recycling, demolition, and yard waste program. In addition, the following are other activities accomplished by our office:

- February, continued the \$5 coupon for services provided at the County Site. 35,345 coupons were mailed. Part of the mailing included information on the area recycling programs and problem material management programs.
- As part of each HHW event, all participants received the following items:
  - Trash bag for their car
  - County brochure on our HHW program
  - County brochure concerning Demolition and Yard Composting
  - Magnet with pertinent County Solid Waste Services listed
- Bill Board campaign this year was concerning Pharmaceutical Program – “Take It To The Box”.
- Advertising of Landfill and used oil program in the Crosslake Area & Crow Wing County Fun Spot Map. Map distributed by the Crosslake Fire Fighters Relief Association.
- Advertising of the used oil and HHW program in the Vacation Land Highway 6 Map.
- Advertising of the recycling in Nisswa, Baxter and Brainerd Map.
- Advertising of Landfill hours and services in the Northland Arboretum – ArbLIFE yearly four editions.
- Monthly advertising (May – October) concerning HHW events through Brainerd Dispatch, Crosby Courier, Lakes Country Echo, and News Hopper.
- Quarterly advertising concerning recycling and used oil program through the News Hopper.
- March 16<sup>th</sup>, accomplish news snippets for KLKS Radio, to be used during month to promote green programs concerning environmental issues.
- March 27th Press Release concerning Landfill summer hours.
- April 9th Press Release concerning the first HHW event on April 25<sup>th</sup>.
- April 12th tour of Landfill site for the Brainerd School AEC.

- April 24<sup>th</sup> Press Release concerning upcoming summer events scheduled at the Landfill.
- April Press Release concerning Pharmaceutical Program initiation.
- April 24<sup>th</sup> – participated in the Brainerd High school TV media center. Covered the solid waste programs being offered by our Office.
- April 26th Press Release concerning Business Electronics day on May 16th.
- May 5th, assisted in the Pequot Lake cleanup day. Handed out brochures concerning the counties integrated solid waste management system.
- May 7th, Landfill operator gave presentation of Landfill operations at Kiwanis.
- May 19th, assisted in the Crosby cleanup day. Handed out brochures concerning the counties integrated solid waste management system.
- June 2nd, assisted in the Garrison cleanup day. Handed out brochures concerning the counties integrated solid waste management system.
- July 31 – Aug 4th, manned fair booth to promote the Counties integrated solid waste management programs. Fair Board, third year of having a recycling program for the fair. Our office provided containers for beverage container recycling this year.
- Advertising of Landfill services in the Crow Wing County Fair Information Booklet.
- Aug 1<sup>st</sup>, gave talk to Rotary Club on the Landfill site and operations.
- Aug 3rd Press Release concerning Department of Ag waste pesticide collection event.
- Aug 31st Press Release concerning the fall business electronics event on Sept 19th.
- Sept 26th Press Release concerning the last HHW events on Oct 10th and 13th.
- Sept 27th tour of Landfill site for the Brainerd School AEC.
- Oct 15<sup>th</sup> Press Release concerning the Landfills winter hours of operations.
- Lakeland News on Oct 10<sup>th</sup> - HHW program.
- Oct 18<sup>th</sup> Press Release on “Take it to the Box” program update.
- Lakeland News on Oct 31<sup>th</sup> - mattress program.

- Dec, in coordination with Kenwood Recycling, and Sunrise Sertoma accomplished an advertising campaign concerning the collection of Christmas lighting and extension cords.
- Lakeland News on Dec 13<sup>th</sup> - Christmas tree light program.
- Dec, in coordination with Minnesota Power, Brainerd Public Utilities, Crow Wing Power, Lake State Tree Service, Waste Management, Waste Partners, Nisswa Sanitation, Range Disposal, Blue Lakes Disposal, and Northland Arboretum accomplished an advertising campaign concerning the collection of Christmas trees.
- Dec, mailing to some local businesses. They received the following:
 

Listing of programs available to assist them in establishing their own waste prevention program.

Questionnaire concerning their willingness to participate in a VSQG and used electronics program.

#### 4.7.1 Coupon

Starting in 2001, a \$5 coupon for services provided at the Site complex was initiated. Labels are obtained through the Auditors' office for the households that paid the County \$15 solid waste assessment. The County has one of the largest nonresident ownership populations in Minnesota. About 1/3 of the coupons mailed are to these seasonal recreational property owners. The rationale for this program are:

- Reduce illegal dumping. With this coupon, residents can now get rid of items for free at the Landfill, for example - 5 tires or 1 appliance. This is an issue with large bulky items. People have small garbage cans and larger discards (e.g., appliances, broken furniture, mattresses, etc.) typically do not get thrown away as part of their service.
- Provide a monetary saving back to the residents. Previously it was discussed during the Board meeting that lowering tipping fees will not necessarily be passed to the residents by the haulers.
- Incentive to get people to utilize the solid waste disposal services being provided by the County, and it will prevent some of the ongoing illegal burning and dumping that is occurring.
- Excellent education opportunity/tool to provide information to all our residents on the services the County is offering as part of its integrated solid waste management system. Part of the mailing includes information on the area recycling programs and problem material management.

TABLE 4.3  
Coupon Receipts

Year	Demolition # Coupons	Demolition \$ Coupons	Garbage # Coupons	Garbage \$ Coupons	Furniture # Coupons	Furniture \$ Coupons	Mattress # Coupons	Mattress \$ Coupons	Appliance # Coupons	Appliance \$ Coupons	Electronics # Coupons	Electronics \$ Coupons	Oil Filter Coupons	\$ Coupons	# of Coupons Sent out
2001	228	\$1,123.60	754	\$3,727.17	97	\$485.00	87	\$435.00	329	\$1,645.00	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	28,977
2002	258	\$1,290.40	1,035	\$5,060.26	195	\$975.00	128	\$640.00	486	\$2,430.00	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	27,675
2003	356	\$1,754.80	1,320	\$6,450.18	257	\$1,285.00	195	\$975.00	548	\$2,740.00	0	\$0.00	1	\$4.50	27,351
2004*	318	\$1,558.40	1,548	\$7,590.51	218	\$1,090.00	206	\$1,030.00	540	\$2,700.00	521	\$2,605.00	0	\$0.00	29,909
2005	237	\$1,157.00	1,462	\$7,181.65	192	\$960.00	181	\$905.00	534	\$2,670.00	340	\$1,700.00	0	\$0.00	30,343
2006	230	\$1,122.40	1,531	\$7,495.64	255	\$1,275.00	251	\$1,255.00	603	\$3,015.00	623	\$3,115.00	1	\$5.00	31,200
2007	221	\$1,079.00	1,506	\$7,368.43	209	\$1,045.00	254	\$1,270.00	539	\$2,695.00	712	\$3,560.00	3	\$15.00	34,192
2008	234	\$1,142.80	1,574	\$7,711.45	239	\$1,195.00	307	\$1,532.70	606	\$3,030.00	817	\$4,085.00	1	\$5.00	34,454
2009	261	\$1,241.00	1,611	\$7,809.00	258	\$1,290.00	261	\$1,305.00	651	\$3,255.00	889	\$4,445.00	1	\$7.00	35,271
2010	299	\$1,420.00	1,681	\$8,115.00	222	\$1,110.00	279	\$1,409.00	695	\$3,475.00	841	\$4,205.00	1	\$2.00	34,811
2011	307	\$1,452.00	1,753	\$8,523.00	225	\$1,125.00	211	\$1,055.00	532	\$2,660.00	896	\$4,480.00	0	\$0.00	35,366
2012	313	\$1,469.00	1,703	\$8,307.00	254	\$1,270.00	269	\$1,343.00	535	\$2,675.00	815	\$4,075.00	3	\$6.00	35,345
Total	3,262	\$15,810.40	17,478	\$85,339.29	2,621	\$13,105.00	2,629	\$13,154.70	6,598	\$32,990.00	6,454	\$32,270.00	11	\$44.50	384,894

Year	Tires # Coupons	Tires \$ Coupons	Asbestos # Coupons	Asbestos \$ Coupons	Scrap Metal Coupons	Brush \$ Coupons	Scale Coupons	Propane Tank Coupons	\$ Coupons	Total # Coupons	Total \$ Coupons
2001	88	415	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	0	0	\$0.00	1,583	\$7,835.77
2002	188	875	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	0	0	\$0.00	2,290	\$11,295.66
2003	216	965	0	\$0.00	43	\$182.00	0	0	\$0.00	2,936	\$14,425.48
2004	188	899	1	\$2.56	57	\$243.00	0	0	\$0.00	3,597	\$17,729.97
2005	121	576	0	\$0.00	53	\$235.00	4	0	\$0.00	3,124	\$15,358.15
2006	185	864	1	\$2.56	75	\$321.00	2	0	\$0.00	3,757	\$18,491.60
2007	164	780	0	\$0.00	85	\$371.00	1	4	\$4.00	3,699	\$18,213.93
2008	161	690	0	\$0.00	63	\$280.00	7	0	\$0.00	4,009	\$19,792.95
2009	153	700	3	\$15.00	89	\$387.00	3	0	\$4.00	4,181	\$20,487.00
2010	140	653	1	\$2.20	99	\$440.00	2	0	\$0.00	4,260	\$20,868.70
2011	130	585	3	\$14.40	89	\$330.00	5	0	\$4.00	4,152	\$20,286.90
2012	130	608	1	\$5.00	95	\$340.00	5	0	\$0.00	4,123	\$20,120.00
Total	1,864	8,610	10	\$41.72	748	\$3,129.00	29	3	\$12.00	41,711	\$204,906.11

	TOTAL	%
Demolition	\$15,810.40	8%
MMSW	\$98,498.01	48%
SCORE	\$90,597.70	44%
TOTAL	\$204,906.11	100%

# send out 384,894  
Return Rate 10.8%

\* Electronics were taken in as appliance, following year electronics listed separate. Estimated electronics for this year.

The following gives an idea of the amount of items brought in:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Coupons Sent out</u>	<u>Coupons Returned</u>	<u>Used for Appliances</u>	<u>Used for Mattress</u>	<u>Used for Furniture</u>	<u>Used for Tires</u>
2001	28,977	1,583	329	87	97	88 for 415 Tires
2002	27,675	2,290	486	128	195	188 for 875
2003	27,351	2,936	548	195	257	216 for 965
2004	29,909	3,597	1,061*	206	218	188 for 899
2005	30,343	3,124	534	181	192	121 for 576
2006	31,200	3,757	603	251	255	185 for 864
2007	34,192	3,699	539	254	209	164 for 780
2008	34,454	4,009	606	307	239	161 for 690
2009	35,271	4,181	651	261	258	153 for 700
2010	34,811	4,260	695	279	222	140 for 653
2011	35,366	4,152	532	211	225	130 for 585
2012	35,345	4,123	535	269	254	130 for 608

\* includes electronics. Following year, electronics was listed separately.

#### **4.8 Litter/Illegal Dumping**

The County discourages and prevents illegal and onsite disposal of MSW through promotion of proper alternatives, waste education, and enforcement of the solid waste ordinance and MPCA rules. The methodology generally used is:

- Receive notification of a potential ordinance violation;
- Conduct initial on-site inspection;
- Meet with property owners or responsible individual (s);
- Discuss rule and ordinance violation;
- Issue a Cease and Desist Order or Citation, if necessary;
- Send a letter to responsible party with copy to the County Attorney, MPCA, and District Commissioner, if appropriate;
- DNR staff is notified for burn barrel violations;
- Identify time line for cleanup;
- Require receipts for proof of proper disposal;
- Cleanup complete - close the file

The County also has a policy that outlines the procedures under which solid waste collected in a cleanup project may be disposed of at the County Landfill Facilities at no cost to the organization doing the cleanup. The County Board addresses requests on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, there are programs within the County funding their own cleanups. The following are recent and previous cleanup projects held within the County:

- City of Pequot Lakes Cleanup by the Pequot Lakes Lions (May 5, 2012)
- City of Crosby Cleanup day (May 19, 2012)
- Garrison Lions Cleanup (June 2, 2012)
- City of Emily-Fifty Lakes Cleanup (September 15, 2012)
- City of Brainerd residential curbside pick-up of unwanted items (May 9 – 13, 2011)
- Annual KIWANIS Cleanup Blitz (May 7, 2011)
- Mission Township Cleanup (April 2009)
- Nisswa Lions Cleanup (May 2009)
- Annual Mineland/Cuyuna Country Recreation Area Cleanup Program (May 2009); starting in 2001 Project Green Touch (cooperative sponsorship between Touchstone Energy, Crow Wing Power and Mille Lacs Electric) took over organizing this effort from CREDI (Cuyuna Range Economic Development, Inc.)
- NE and North Brainerd Cleanup (May 30, 2009)
- CINOSAM Cleanup (August 2008)
- Crow Wing Township Cleanup (May 19, 2007)
- Roosevelt Township Cleanup (June 2005)
- Bay Lake Township Cleanup (August 2005)
- Manhattan Beach, roadside Cleanup (April 20, 2002)
- Deerwood Township, roadside Cleanup (April, 27, 2002)
- First Annual North Brainerd Cleanup (May 18, 2002)
- Merrifield Marathons Snowmobile Club, picked up 500 miles of snowmobile trails in Center and Mission Township (June 10, 2002)
- City of Breezy Point Spring Cleanup Days
- Borrows Junk Car Cleanup Program (October 12, 2002)
- First Annual Northeast Brainerd Cleanup (May 4, 2002)

These community “cleanup” days are becoming increasingly more important. According to Parkinson’s Law on Garbage “when people have small garbage cans, larger discards (e.g., appliances, broken furniture, mattresses, etc.) typically do not get thrown away.” They often sit in basements and garages. When homeowners are provided with these cleanup days, they now have a new option. This seems to be more of an issue for communities as the distance from the Landfill increases.

Other programs include: the MN Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Adopt-a-River Program and; and the MN Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), Adopt-a-Highway Program. These are approaches which encourage a volunteer’s response to the public rubbish problem.

An example of the Adopt-a-River Program is the Brainerd Kiwanis Club’s cleaning of Boone Park. The Club has, for the past 11 years, been cleaning the banks of the Mississippi River. The spring 2000 cleanup event included about 100 - 4th grade students. For approximately 10 years, each of Brainerd’s ten parks has been adopted by a different classroom of 4th graders.



Besides the Mn/DOT program, the County Highway Department also addresses litter along County roads. The County Highway Department encourages public participation in the cleanup of roadsides by area groups, conservation clubs, service organizations and other who desire to perform a public service by litter pickup and general cleanup along public roads. The County Highway Department will provide plastic bags, reflective vests, pick up the bags, and haul the trash to the landfill at no charge. The County Highway Department pays for the tipping fee at the Landfill.

Mn/DOT is required by Minnesota Statute 161.242 to regulate the operation of junkyards on lands adjacent to Minnesota's Truck Highway System. Illegal or non-conforming junkyards must be removed, relocated on-site or screened to become compliant with this statute. Furthermore, MPCA has a publication and education program for operators of junk/salvage facilities.

The County intends to continue the educational program on the hazards of onsite and illegal disposal. The program will attempt to bring more rural residents into the solid waste system. With continuing education targeting the environmental hazards of onsite and illegal disposal, and the increasing availability of rural collection service and enforcement activities, the County intends to reduce on-site disposal of solid waste. These actions will assist in the mitigation of impacts to air, surface water, groundwater, public health and will help to avoid nuisance conditions.

Civil citations can be and are issued by the MPCA to individuals for disposing of solid waste on someone else's property. The DNR can also issue citations for burning solid waste, i.e., burn barrels. Several property owners have voluntarily cleaned up their properties. The Land Services Department will continue to pursue enforcement against the property owner as needed.

During 1998, in conjunction with Land Services (then Planning and Zoning), a dedicated position was created for enforcement. Starting in 1999, the enforcement officer has had the authority to issue civil citations regarding violations.

Effective September 2, 2008, Crow Wing County initiated a site based model to help landowners comply with county zoning requirements. The model provides a high level of customer service by verifying permits and potential violations in the field which in turn protects our natural resources. The county is divided up into three zones geographically with each zone covered by a Land Service Specialist who is responsible for building permit approval, septic system inspection during installation and enforcement of the Land Use Ordinance. Land Service Specialists meet individual landowners and contractors on-site to discuss land use issues. Another improvement with the site based model is enforcement. In the past there was one Enforcement Office, and now the County has three Land Service Specialists to handle enforcement. Landowners are made aware of land use violations and given solutions and options to bring the property into compliance. It is always the goal of Environmental Services to obtain voluntary compliance with a landowner. When voluntary compliance cannot be obtained, a citation may be issued requiring an appearance in court. As of January 1, 2008 there were approximately 1,100 open violation cases. As of January 1, 2012 there are 25 remaining. In 2011 there were 113 cases with 88 being closed for a closure rate of 75%.

The Land Services staff reviews annually the enforcement activities with the intent to develop recommendations that will improve this critical tool for waste management.

- Some sites may not be cleaned-up without some assistance or administrative action by the County. Assistance may be in the form of a reduced tipping fee or a guaranteed loan. Flexibility may be warranted on a case-by-case basis. Notwithstanding, this action would not qualify under our current cleanup project tipping fee policy, if the party responsible for the solid waste is the property owner. A potential idea is to set up a revolving fund similar as discussed to upgrading sewers within the County.
- Continue to help townships/municipalities/county with cleanup of sites on government property. Utilize Sentence to Serve crews to cleanup abandoned dumpsites. Each government entity is responsible for paying the tipping fee incurred.

Previously, there was conflicting information in the county ordinances. The County junk/salvage yards ordinance is an example of an ordinance needing to be updated in such a manner that provides methodology addressing the numerous complaints received each year. In 2006, the Zoning Ordinance revision for junk/salvage was approved and became effective on August 1, 2006.

The County plans to continue its educational program on the hazards of onsite and illegal disposal for rural residents and will attempt to bring more rural residents into the solid waste system. With education on the environmental hazards of onsite and illegal disposal, increasing availability of rural collection service and enforcement activities, the County intends to reduce the amount of waste disposed onsite.

The following is the number of complaints handled by the Solid Waste Office since 1993:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount (ea.)</u>	
1993	69	2004	40	
1994	75	2005	29	
1995	52	2006	16	
1996	68	2007	18	
1997	63	2008	22	
1998	60	2009	15	
1999	31	2010	48	
2000*	13	2011	42	<u>Open</u>
2001	44	<u>2012</u>	<u>27**</u>	<u>8</u>
2002	31	TOTAL	781	70% Closed
2003	18			

\* The Enforcement Officer position was vacant for approximately 5 months, which may account for the few complaints reported during 2000.

\*\* Any cases not closed from previous year are listed in following year. Closed out 95% of all enforcement cases since 2008

#### 4.9 Demolition

Demolition debris is managed at six demolition debris land disposal facilities as outlined below. Note, the County facility only handles approximately 20 percent of the demolition being generated within the County.

The Phase I aspect of the County demolition Landfill was constructed and began to accept waste in 1993. The County obtained permit SW-440 to utilize a site of approximately 4.59 acres of land for the demolition Landfill on August 19, 1993. Also, incorporated into it is an old permit-by-rule demolition landfill. This permit-by-rule landfill was permitted for disposal of 15,000 cubic yards of demolition debris through July 31, 1992. The total disposal capacity for Phase I is 85,900 cubic yards, not including final cover.

The permit was reissued September 11, 2002 utilized the remaining disposal capacity at the permitted area (Phase I) and incorporated Phase II. The Phase II expansion is the area located just west of the existing facility. The design was developed to provide an in-place capacity of 203,000 cubic yards for compacted demolition debris and intermediate cover. The Phase II area is 4.71 acres. Construction of the demolition expansion was tied into the Potlatch Phase I upgrade, and was completed in 2000. The Phase I aspect accepted its last waste in July 2003. The Phase II aspect began to accept waste in August 2003. Based on the annual survey waste rates, Phase II is projected to reach capacity in 2020. The last permit reissuance was on March 31, 2008.

County residents also utilize privately owned demolition facilities: Crosslake (SW-412) located within Crow Wing; Hengel (SW-291), Jim Adrian Demolition Debris (SW-556), and Hengel's Westside Demolition Landfill (SW-539) located in Cass County; and Voyageurs/Oak Ridge (SW-428) located in Aitkin County.

The Lakes Area Habitat for Humanity ReStore is a retail store that accepts and sells donated building material supplies. They accept materials such as cabinets, appliances, furniture, flooring, doors, windows and more. For more information visit their website at [www.lakesareahabitat.org](http://www.lakesareahabitat.org). Since 2004, the ReStore has diverted over 4,300 tons of materials from the landfill. All donated items are tax deductible and help build Habitat homes in partnership with families in need in Cass, Crow Wing and Hubbard Counties.

This year Anderson Brothers, a local contractor, recycled 7,500 tons of asphalt and 2,800 tons of concrete. The Hengel Demolition landfill, located just west of Brainerd and their Westside Demolition landfill recycles the concrete and asphalt taken in at the site. Hengel also recycles scrap metal (steel, copper and aluminum) at both sites. This year 3,000 cu yds of concrete and 840 cubic yards of scrap metal was recycled. A Permit-by-Rule was given to Knife River to recycle concrete at their operation located in Crow Wing starting in 2000. In 2012, 3,710 tons of concrete and 1,740 tons of asphalt were crushed. Oak Ridge/Voyagers demolition landfill is also recycling metals.

Per conversations with Crosslake Demolition landfill and Jim Adrian, the volume of asphalt and concrete is not large enough to incorporate a concrete crusher into their operations, but both do recycle metal.

Table 4.4

## Crow Wing County Demolition Waste Management System

## ACTUAL VOLUME AND TONNAGE TABLE

	YEAR											(2001-2010) 10 YEAR TOTALS
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
Population	55,099	56,281	57,132	58,391	59,395	60,194	61,038	61,390	61,739	62,370	62,500	
Annual pop. change % = 1.3%												
Overall pop. change % = 11.0%												
Annual cubic yards change 3.5%												
DEMOLITION DEBRIS DISPOSAL - cubic yards												
Crow Wing County Landfill (SW-440)	19,435	26,266	22,095	30,455	25,361	21,480	20,386	13,959	16,950	14,055	13,124	204,131
Cross Lake Demolition Landfill (SW-412)*	10,600	14,500	13,117	11,665	39,423	38,375	38,938	30,865	20,287	17,987	15,540	241,697
Hengel Demolition Landfill (SW-291) (Cass County)	28,029	31,559	18,007	20,513	28,830	45,113	37,808	43,099	32,633	26,551	33,882	317,995
Oak Ridge/Voyagers (SW-428) (Atkin County)	12,473	8,320	19,067	7,181	14,898	7,933	16,032	12,055	14,548	2,448	2,417	104,898
Hengel's Westside Demolition Landfill (SW-539) (Cass County)	7,889	8,537	9,809	5,445	10,289	12,672	10,292	10,067	5,988	4,727	1,722	79,547
Jim Adrian Demolition Debris Disposal (SW-556) (Cass County)	5,815	7,518	6,279	8,184	7,145	8,881	8,243	7,005	8,409	6,008	6,335	74,007
Permit-by-Rule sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Demolition Disposal Need - cu yds	84,241	96,700	88,374	83,442	125,946	134,454	131,699	117,050	98,815	71,776	74,020	1,022,275
* Starting in 2004, went from reporting compacted to gate yardage												
Overall						2005 - 2009						
County Demo						2005 - 2010						
Overall						(annual)	-2.0%	-11.1%	-15.6%	-45.5%	-38.9%	
County Demo						(annual)	-5.1%	-31.5%	21.4%	-27.4%	-6.6%	

TOTAL Demolition Disposal Need - cu yds

\* Starting in 2004, went from reporting compacted to gate yardage

Table 4.4

Crow Wing County Demolition Waste Management System  
PROJECTED VOLUME AND TONNAGE TABLE

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	(2011-2020) 10 YEAR TOTALS
YEAR												
Population	62,500	62,745	63,902	65,080	66,280	67,503	68,747	70,015	71,306	72,621	73,960	
Annual pop. change % = 1.3%												
Overall pop. change % = 17.9%												
DEMOLITION DEBRIS DISPOSAL - cubic yards												
Crow Wing County Landfill (SW-440)	13,124	13,880	32,769	14,400	14,666	14,936	15,211	15,492	15,778	16,068	16,365	169,565
Cross Lake Demolition Landfill (SW-412)*	16,540	17,998	25,741	26,216	26,699	27,191	27,693	28,203	28,724	29,253	29,793	267,511
Hengel Demolition Landfill (SW-291) (Cass County)	33,862	28,235	28,057	28,574	29,101	29,637	30,184	30,741	31,307	31,885	32,473	300,193
Oak Ridge/Voyagers (SW-428) (Aitkin County)	2,417	1,016	702	714	728	741	755	769	783	797	812	7,816
Hengel's Westside Demolition Landfill (SW-539) (Cass County)	1,722	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jim Adrian Demolition Debris Disposal (SW-556) (Cass County)	6,335	8,114	9,372	9,545	9,721	9,900	10,083	10,269	10,458	10,651	10,847	98,969
Permit-by-Rule sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Demolition Disposal Need - cu yds	74,020	69,243	96,640	79,449	80,914	82,406	83,926	85,473	87,049	88,654	90,289	844,043
Overall	(annual)	-6.5%	39.6%		Overall		2005 - 2012	-28.1%				
County Demo	(annual)	5.8%	136.1%		County Demo			52.6%				

20.1%  
31.7%  
35.6%  
0.9%  
0.0%  
11.7%  
100.0%

In 2005, the new runway at the Brainerd Lakes Regional Airport showcased area recycling efforts. The project's second phase used 109,000 tons of 100 percent recycled concrete from area redevelopment projects as base material beneath the new paved surfaces. In phase three, the base material was created by combining about 56,000 tons of "bed rock," or unwanted mine tailing from a closed mine pit in Trommald, with another 24,000 tons of recycled concrete. Asphalt used in the project contained 20 percent recycled bituminous (ground up from old roads and parking lots).

#### **4.9.1 Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA) Treated Wood**

In approximately 15 years, the amount of CCA-treated wood headed for disposal is expected to peak. It is expected there will be a seven-to-tenfold increase in the amount of CCA-treated wood appearing at the site in the next 10 to 20 years as decks and outdoor structures are replaced. Other common wood preservatives include creosote and pentachlorophenol, but the predominant preservative used was CCA. CCA-treated wood was not widely used until the early 1970s. Previously CCA-treated wood represents nearly 80 percent of the market, with more than 450 million cubic feet being sold in the United States. This is a concern for research indicates arsenic is leaching from CCA-treated wood at levels above the national safe drinking water standard. Environmental Protection Agency officials and representatives of the wood-preserved industry reached a deal in 2002 to end the manufacturing of lumber permeated with CCA. They will cut production under graduated caps, allowing time to move to alternative treatments. Relative to waste disposal, any CCA-waste from new construction will decrease in the future. However, future demolition of CCA-treated wood projects will provide a source of this waste for decades.

The copper act as a fungicide and the arsenic is an insecticide. Chromium adheres those materials to the wood and creates lumber that can withstand decades of outdoor use. Burning this material concentrates the metal content and creates a toxic ash. Currently, the only viable option is disposing of this material into a landfill.

Minnesota is unique in that it did not adopt federal hazardous waste exemption for CCA-treated wood. Treated wood is classified as an industrial solid waste in Minnesota and must go into a MMSW landfill versus a demolition landfill. The current policy being administered at the County landfill is that treated wood is disposed in the MMSW landfill and not the demolition landfill.

The problem is that CCA-treated wood is difficult to separate out at the disposal site. New CAA-treated wood is easy to identify due to its greenish color, but when this material is exposed to sun and rain, the treated surface often turns a similar color as weathered, untreated wood. Once this happens, treated and untreated wood is commingled, they can be very difficult to distinguish from one another. To have sorting at the site would require an additional setup and labor costs. Also, with this entering into our MMSW landfill, we are seeing elevated arsenic in our leachate quality.

The key is to source separate it prior to disposal. Contractors and the haulers must separate this material from their demolition load and ensure it is brought in as a solid waste versus a demolition waste. To assist in this, the existing Haulers Manual and Demolition Manual was upgraded in 2002 to address this issue. These are provided annually to all the license haulers in the County and major haulers of demolition.



**APPENDIX 4-A**  
**2012 ANNUAL RECYCLING REPORT**





[illegible]



## SECTION 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The County has a well-developed residential recycling program, and many of the larger businesses also have a well-developed recycling/waste reduction program in place. Recycling offers a vital environmental benefit, and in conjunction with the County state-of-the-art Landfill provides a safe, reliable, and essential disposal option for our residents. The County is lucky to have both options - recycling and landfill at its disposal.

Considerable quantities of MSW will continue to be generated long into the foreseeable future, and it is imperative that the County continues to invest in its facilities and systems to manage the solid waste generated within the County in an economically and environmentally sound manner.

The amount of recovered materials met the overall State recycling goal of 35 percent. If, in the future, the County fails to reach the State mandated goal for recycling, the Board can consider making participation in the recycling programs mandatory. In addition, statute requires the County to:

- a. notify county residents of failure to achieve the goal and why the goal was not met, and
- b. provide county residents with information on recycling programs offered by the County.

An annual report such as this on the status of the County's solid waste programs will be prepared for the County Board and program managers. This will allow the progress or lack thereof, to be tracked.

A key issue: maintain the states mandated 35 percent recycling goal. For this to happen markets must exist and expand greatly for recyclable materials if County programs are to expand further and to be economical. One major flaw in the existing integrated management system established by the State is it has continued to promote a supply side approach to recycling (i.e., collect and the markets will follow). This approach has not significantly strengthened markets for recyclable commodities and has even led to backsliding in market development for commodities such as plastics. Bottom line is: Mandated recycling will not be self-sufficient, and needs to be considered a service - like water, sewer, police and fire protection. Funding a program from revenues raised by selling recyclables is not possible, and a service fee through local property tax and State grants will be required to pay for recycling programs into the foreseeable future. Overall, the relevant question is: "How much recycling is good policy?". This is further highlighted as a Major Finding in the January 2002, *Office of the Legislative Auditors Program Evaluation Report, Recycling and Waste Reduction*:

"Before deciding if and how to pursue options to divert more waste, however, state and county officials need to assess priorities, agree on funding, and better understand the cost and benefits of various alternatives."

Curbside collection programs will be continued and consideration given the following:

- Much depends on expanding markets for recyclable materials to make the programs cost effective.
- Efforts can be made to increase participation in the curbside collection programs. A more active public information program would likely promote participation in the programs.

The Drop-off Programs will be continued with consideration given the following:

- Much depends on expanding markets for recyclable materials to make the programs cost effective.
- Efforts can be made to increase the participation in the drop-off collection programs. A more active public information program would likely promote participation in the programs.
- The County has moved toward providing permanently located bins at the drop-off locations. These bins provide a more convenient opportunity to recycle and collect much more materials than the once-a-month drop-off programs.

Follow-ups to the annual business survey have reduced many barriers in this sector. This will provide additional opportunity in meeting our recycling/reuse/reduce goals. In addition, the material exchange will provide additional avenues for local businesses to reduce and recycle their waste. One key issue remains, the low return rate to the annual questionnaire. There is still recycling that is occurring that the County is not getting credit for.

The County should continue radio and newspaper advertising. Additional ads may be developed if required. The ads are structured to promote proper yard waste disposal, waste reduction, and proper problem materials disposal.

Even though area retailers are handling used materials (i.e., used tires, used oil, lead-acid batteries, and white goods), continue to see a quantity of these items being deposited at the drop-off areas located at the Site complex. It appears to adequately address problem materials, the County needs to have a program in conjunction with the private retailers.

Key issues the State needs to work, and the County needs too follow-up on are:

1. Funding a recycling program from revenues raised by selling recyclables is not possible, and a service fee through local property tax and State grants will be required to pay for recycling programs into the foreseeable future. State funding for SCORE comes from a portion of sales tax on solid waste management. The tax rate for municipal solid waste collection is 9.75 percent for residential customers and 17 percent for commercial customers. This tax has remained untouched; the State is just diverting more of these funds to General Revenue. Counties have seen no increase in

their state SCORE grants and at the same time declining State support. This will lead to additional recycling reassessments at the local level. The reality is recycling competes for taxpayers dollars;

2. Market development for recyclables collected (promote the demand side). Initially, recycling programs were sold to the counties on the basis that markets would be developed (by the State) for recyclable material and that this would eventually pay for the programs. Markets have not developed enough to fully support these programs fiscally. The largest factor remains the lack of expanding recycling markets, and a stabilized price paid for the materials collected. The demand for recovered commodities continues to fluctuate;
3. Insure state agencies and other government departments are following existing state laws regarding solid waste management, recycling, and waste reduction/reuse;
4. Historically, SCORE funding was never adjusted for inflation, and most counties already contribute more than the required 25 percent match;
5. Address "problem" components of the waste stream having high environmental costs and that have not become strong components of the recycling marketplace (i.e., plastic). Plastic products and packaging exhibit an ever-increasing share of the market, however, the ability to recycle this material has been shrinking. Historically there was only two types of plastic that were commonly recycled - No. 1 for PETE and No. 2 for HDPE. We are beginning to see 1 - 6 being recycled. Even then, the economics is marginal;
6. In February 2008, the preliminary climate change action plan was submitted to the House and Senate. The final report of the Minnesota Climate Change Advisory Group (MCCAG) is forth-coming. The state's goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to a level at least 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2015, to a level at least 30 percent below 2005 levels by 2026, and to a level at least 80 percent below 2005 levels by 2050 (MN Stat. sec 219H.02, Subd. 1). Under Waste Management, the MCCAG goal is to have 0% increase in waste generation per capital by 2020 (3% reduction by 2025); a 50% recycling rate by 2011 (60% by 2025); a 10% composting rate by 2012 (15% by 2020), and recycling and composting achieve a total of 75% diversion of waste from land disposal or waste to energy by 2025. This is a very aggressive goal, currently under SCORE legislation passed in 1989 directs Greater Minnesota counties to achieve a recycling rate of 25 percent of MSW by December 31, 1993. Subsequent amendments set a supplementary recycling goal of 35 percent for Greater Minnesota by December 31, 1996. If implemented, the impacts of this program will greatly affect our existing County's solid waste program both fiscally and operationally since the County operates a landfill system.

The primary goals for the Solid Waste Office in 2013 concerning the Solid Waste programs are:

1. Continue to manage the increase participation in the existing problem material management programs;
2. Continue to work with outlying cities/townships within the County to host spring/fall cleanup days to address problem and bulky items;
3. The County is still meeting the recycling goals within the County, but in recent years seen a decrease in the amount being recycled by businesses due to the amount area businesses that have closed. Continue to investigate and develop programs to increase commercial recycling efforts and reporting within the County;
4. Continue to work with the Department of Agriculture for their annual collection and disposal of waste pesticides. When the Department of Agriculture picks up the disposal cost, it has a \$1,000 annual saving to Crow Wing County;
5. Potential bio-mass markets. Once a long term demand is established, develop a contract for utilizing the brush that comes into the landfill.