

## Summary of Recycling Revenue Share Questionnaires

### I believe the potential benefits of this concept would be:

- *Encourage recycling*
- *Higher recycling rates w/new financial incentives to come*
- *Better/higher utilization of ecomaine recycling facility*
- *Incentive for non-participating members to use ecomaine*
- *Increase potential revenue to ecomaine budget*
- *Single sort option to more communities*
- *Minimal to the average recycler, but of some incentive to municipal leaders*
- *Increase revenue*
- *Incentivize to send municipal material to ecomaine*
- *Increase recycling totals and percent of volume*
- *Program will reward communities for maximizing the delivery of all a municipalities recyclables to ecomaine*
- *Assist with maximizing the investment in the single stream equipment to achieve top efficiency and productivity with the Recycling Facility*
- *Allows shared revenues, communities realize a direct cash incentive, works toward lowering a communities overall solid waste/recycling costs*
- *Helps to grow ecomaine's recycling volumes.*
- *I believe incentivizing is an excellent approach. I think this will be a great opportunity to increase recycling rates, reduce disposal, and generate a revenue stream as the reward. The higher the "share" the better.*
- *Long overdue!*
- *Potentially a way to return money to member towns for recyclable material.*
- *This concept would promise a level playing field between all ecomaine communities as some communities have not joined as recycle members and have the opportunity to sell the material on the recycle market. Members who participate in the single stream program do not have this opportunity.*
- *Increase incentives for communities to recycle.*
- *Reward to communities that recycle.*
- *Incentive for towns to send all recycling to ecomaine.*
- *Carrot to be used for the public to recycle more- good for marketing.*

### I believe the potential negative aspects of this concept would be:

- *Unfairness to some communities and a reduction in the overall assessment plan*
- *The refund is market driven and not a firm figure.*
- *Even the above scenario benefits some communities that sell their goods to ecomaine vs. those who send all their goods at no cost.*
- *Risk when prices are low to ecomaine*
- *Job loss in communities that process/sell recycled materials*
- *Involves "change" for some communities & "change" can be difficult!*
- *The ecomaine finances should be looked at more comprehensively. Recycling is a small part of the overall financial status at ecomaine. What is the true net revenue of recycling?*

- *Not all member communities want to break current relationships with markets where they are sending some or all of their recyclables.*
- *Board reps from communities that select to not take all recyclables to ecomaine may feel left out or it may contribute toward conflicts among the Board...those that receive revenue share and those that do not...due to Town /City policies or practices. May contribute to unintended consequences with Board relations*
- *Member communities no longer have flexibility to "play" the market for their recyclables...reliant only on ecomaine's efforts.*
- *I suppose the only negative aspect is that ecomaine will not be the recipient of the revenue which will simply net out to a cost back to the municipalities but the increase in recycling will be worth the effort.*
- *Will this raise assessment with break down?*
- *A lot depends on how the matrix is set up. What determines the dollar range? What would be the correlation between the market price and the \$ amount returned to the member? What happens when the market price of material falls below 0?*
- *Those who are currently selling their recycling won't like it.*
- *Budgeting on an annual basis.*
- *Communities won't like it if they don't recycle now (of course this would give them ammunition with their towns to start recycling or sending to ecomaine.)*

#### Additional comments:

- *Program should be municipal recycling only. Tracing commercial to a town/city is too problematic. I support.*
- *I think this is not the time to install a variable reimbursement plan in view of need to reduce assessments. I question the impact it would have on rates of recycling also. Look forward to discussion "in detail as that is where the devil is".*
- *I think the Finance Committee should take the lead looking at financial issues. This survey request should have come from them instead of the Recycling Committee.*
- *The potential negative aspects may not outweigh the advantages to implement the revenue share and appears to be an affordable method of rewarding and recognizing member communities for sending all of their material to ecomaine. We certainly need to be mindful of the larger picture here and impacts on Board relations and consensus building. I would suggest that outcomes from this survey be shared with the entire Board and then communicated to the Finance Committee for further review and recommendation as to go or not go with the Revenue share proposal to the Board.*
- *Great job ecomaine.*
- *Apply money to minimize tipping fees!*
- *Is there any way that ecomaine can get us a "group discount" on hauling fees to the facility? It seems that as large a community as we are and the fact that everything is going to a central location, the haulers may be open (with help from ecomaine resources) to something that would lessen the impact of losing some money from recycled goods in a matrix system. Especially true for small towns further removed from Portland.*

- *The current proposal has three major problems: 1.) It has already created ill will between ownership communities. Communities with commercial businesses will always recycle at a higher rate than bedroom communities. 2.) Management has pledged when meeting with town selectmen that the assessment would remain at equal rate for all ownership communities. This is a major guarantee because Portland has much greater voting power at Board meetings. 3.) The current \$10 per ton recyclable proposal will not generate any extra recyclables. At the present time we and I assume our competitors are offering about \$35 per ton to customer communities. The \$10 versus \$0 will not entice any ownership community that is skimming to stop skimming because we will be far below the going rates (\$35 per ton.) In fact, the mere presentation of this proposal encourages greater skimming and is thus counterproductive. It will not create a greater effort by the communities. A bold proposal that would work. This would require ecomaine to become far more entrepreneurial. We should offer the ownership communities the same variable rate recyclable program as the customer communities (\$35 per ton currently). This would reduce skimming and encourage major new local efforts. For this to work the assessment rate would have to remain unchanged.*
- *As important as recycling is to our region and our institutions, using it as a basis for revenue sharing seems to me to be a poor way to enhance recycling rates: 1. Revenue sharing as described to date will keep assessments unnecessarily high in order to pay for itself, but only half of ecomaine members will benefit. Costs will shift toward communities having lower than average recycling rates from those with higher than average. Freeport will subsidize Falmouth, and South Portland, Pownal. And unlike now, when each town decides its own balance of cost, ethics, and recycling, communities would have no choice. Regardless of total recycling, half our members would always have below average recycling rates, and money would always flow from that half to the other. Transfer payments between towns: I can think of no process more likely to rupture the comity our member communities presently enjoy. 2. This topic could only be raised when prices for recyclables are high. As I recall from an analysis a couple years ago, our real cost of managing recyclables is \$70-\$75/ton. It wasn't so long ago that virtually every recyclable processed at ecomaine was sold at a loss. We all know that unpredictability of materials prices. I can't fathom a long-term, inherently divisive financial practice that ignores the volatility of markets for recyclables and electricity (and who knows, perhaps for compostables as well.) 3. What is your goal: to increase recycling or to increase recycling at ecomaine? There is a big difference. Among member communities that operate local recycling programs permitted by their waste handling agreements, it is my understanding total recycling rates are above the average for member communities, although that success is obscured by the manner in which ecomaine records recycling. I still hear the occasional work like "resent" or "punish", so I hope the focus of this discussion remains on recycling, and not on some unstated subtext. There are many good ways to encourage and enhance recycling in our region, however, I am not persuaded that subsidies between member communities is one of them.*
- *I hope ecomaine considers this proposal. It is a good one and be another tool to show communities that ecomaine is giving back.*

- *I have heard from town officials that the revenue share must be large enough to be a true incentive. I don't know what that dollar figure is. I strongly support revenue sharing for recycling. I think it is a fairer way to treat one of ecomaine's primary goals. Now towns that don't recycle are rewarded anyway by sharing in reduced assessments made possible, in part, by historic revenues from recycling. That isn't fair to towns that do recycle. If our goal is to recycle as much as possible, why should we reward those that don't instead of those that do?*