

### **3. A Report Containing the Results and Interpretations of the Pilot Projects Survey**

In the following pages, I have provided a comprehensive overview of the survey results for the 'food scraps pilot project'. The survey data is shown, an interpretation of the outcomes is provided, and recommendations are given for providing the community with the best permanent locations. All participants of the pilot project were asked to contribute their opinions in this survey voluntarily. The turnout was 236 people out of 645 people. This is a low response rate of 36.6 % for such a focused pilot project. It would have been assumed that people would have been more willing to participate in the survey, as they knew that their participation would be pivotal in determining the trajectory of a permeant organics project. The people who filled out the survey were already invested in the pilot project in some capacity. Therefore, there is likely to be some bias to some of this data, as it was not given to the general public.

Question 1 was regarding the participants' residential location. 35.21% (75 people) were from Ferguson Township, 19.72% (42 people) were from Patton Township, 18.78% (40 people) were from College Township, 14.55% (31 people) were from Harris Township, 7.98% (17 people) were from Benner Township, 2.35% (5 people) were from State College Borough, 0.94% (2 people) were from Halfmoon Township and 0.47% (1 person) was unsure of which borough or township they were a part of. Thus, we can see that most people came from four main communities (Ferguson Township, Patton Township College Township, and Harris Township). It would therefore be ideal to find permanent locations in at least these four areas.

Question 2 was asked to gauge the popularity of the locations. The drop-off site that was used by the most people (30.21%, 71 people) was the Municipal building in Ferguson Township. Next was the Hawbaker recycling facility in Patton Township with 25.11%, 59 people, Spring Creek Park in College Township with 20.00%, 47 people, Nittany View Park in Harris Township with 14.47%, 34 people, and lastly the Municipal building in Benner Township with 10.21%, 24 people. Therefore, as stated in question one, it would be wise to choose a few different locations in the most popular townships/boroughs. That way many people can access these locations. Accessing the location by biking and with public transportation is important, as it creates more opportunities for everyone in the community to access the drop-off location. In addition, this encourages people to reduce their carbon footprint and is in alignment with the local emission reduction goals.

Question 3 was regarding how convenient each person perceived the drop-off location to be. This was answered based on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the least convenient and 5 being very convenient). More than half (53.62%, 126 people) of participants found their location to be very convenient (ranking it a 5). The order decreased in a unformed fashion. 22.98%, 54 people ranked it a 4, 14.04%, 33 people ranked it a 3, 5.53%, 13 people ranked it a 2 and 3.83%, 9 people ranked it a 1. It can be assumed that those who gave this question a low ranking (1, 2, or 3) could not easily get to the location because of not having access to a personal vehicle and therefore having to walk, bike, or use public transportation. It was stated by numerous people in in a later question that their location was far away from public transportation making it a hassle for them to get there. Additionally, the answer may have also been influenced by things like familiarity with the area and frequency of visiting/running errands in that part of town.

Question 4 asked participants if they combined drop-off with any other errands. 28.94% (68 people) said no, while 73.19% (172 people) responded with yes. The most common errands were grocery shopping, recycling (grass drop off, paper, MISC plastics) as well as combining it with appointments such as meetings, shopping, and other stores (like Walmart, Lowes, Home Depot, Wegman's, Target), church, dog walking, post office, the YMCA, on school route, going to work and the gas station. People who rated question 3 highly most likely also engaged in this tactic of combining drop off with another errand, as this is most convenient. When answering this question (as well as question 17) many people mentioned that they very much appreciate the opportunities to participate in such a program. However, a few people ask themselves if all of their efforts were even paying off. Those individuals felt that many in the community did not care for the environment, leaving them to feel that their efforts were unfairly distributed. We must provide participants with motivational updates to combat these feelings in the future and to make them feel like they are doing important work.

Question 5 asked participants if they had used other locations during the duration of the pilot. The overwhelming response, with 86.38% (203 people), was no. The response for yes was 13.62% (32 people). Their answers varied, with Ferguson and Patton Township being the most popular. The reason for this variation remains unclear, as participants were not specifically asked why they used other locations. It can be assumed that they likely knew that they would be in the area of the other drop-off location anyways, therefore they decided to combine drop-off with some other errand. (This can be assumed as one usually does not randomly store food scraps in the car, but rather this is an action that must be deliberately planned.)

Question 6 was regarding the frequency of the usage of the drop-off sites per week. The majority, with 80.26% (187 people) responded with once per week and 19.31% (45 people) were in the two to three time per week bracket. There was an outlier (1 person) who stated that they dropped off their scraps more than 5 times. (There was no verification if this was an error (like a typo) or in fact correct.) In a later question (question 12), a handful of people stated that they did not partake in the drop-off at all or irregularly and that they stored their scraps in the freezer, therefore they only dropped off a few times over the duration of the pilot project.

Question 7 asked the participants to rank how user-friendly they found the whole process to be. There were numeric options on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest) that could be given. There were a variety of answers, the highest result was a rating of 4 with 85 people (36.17%) finding it to be a good experience in its entirety. 31.91%, (75 people) gave it the highest rating of 5, while 20.00% (47 people) responded with a 3. Lastly, the ratings of 2 and 1 both were equal with (5.96%, 14 people).

This negative response is mostly likely to do with the fact that users had a hard time with locks, and opening the heavy dumpsters due to lack of strength or injury, there were participants who observed others putting non-organic waste into the dumpster. Another problem was that people had a lot of trouble with the collection process at home stating that it was messy, smelly, and there were bugs. Despite many complaints throughout the whole survey, most were quite forgiving, as the purpose and intention of this project were more meaningful to them than whether or not it was user-friendly. This can be deduced by the many appreciative responses in question 17. As for the minority of negative ratings, this is quite congruent with the results seen

in the later question (question 10) where 5 people (2.14%) responded that they would not recommend the project further.

Question 8 asked participants to tell us how they heard about the pilot project. There was a close tie between the municipal newsletter (26.38%, 62 people) and other news articles and reports (25.96%, 61 people). Close behind was the COG newsletter (22.13%, 52 people) and word of mouth (20.43%, 48 people). 14.89% (35 people) responded with 'other'. These answers ranged from people specifically doing research (calling the township office and doing Google searches for composting programs in the area), to seeing the collection site while dropping off grass clippings or doing other errands. 7 out of these 35 people did not recall, while radio ads were the least common answer with 2.13% (5 people).

The conclusion can be made based on the results from question 8, that going forward radio ads are not a good investment to make as it was the least popular answer with 2.13% (5 people). An aesthetic text/post can be produced for participants to post to their social media. This way we are making the most of the word-of-mouth, which does not cost anything, allowing us to reap the benefits. It could be a simple yet effective method. Posting flyers at local stores, street poles...etc. could also be an option, but it may not be worth the effort and labor involved. As we live in such an online-focused society the focus is automatically directed more towards this. However, the power of a physical sign should not be underestimated, as it is far harder to overlook, as opposed to a deleted e-mail or a forgotten-about message.

Question 9 asked participants to share why they were interested in participating in such a program. There were six set questions and "other" to choose as many as they liked. By far the two most popular responses, with over 200 votes each, were "I know it is important for our community to better manage our food waste" and "I want to support our community's sustainability efforts". 121 people believe that it is an important practice to partake in but cannot compost in their homes. 47 people said that they compost at home but need somewhere for other materials such as meat, dairy, and garden scraps. 8 people responded that they only drop off garden scraps/debris, weeds, etc. The combination of these people will likely be more inclined to use the drop-off site during certain seasons and holidays. 13 people said that they drop off what they are not able to put through the garbage disposal. 31 responded to the "other", elaborating with answers noting the importance of diverting food scraps from landfills because of the emissions and general waste reduction. Others said that they compost at home, but do not have the capacity at certain times of the year (garden waste) or on the other hand, do not produce enough organic waste themselves for it to be effective.

Question 10 asked participants to tell us if they would recommend the project to others in the community. 26.50% (62 people) said that they would in theory, while the majority (71.37%, 167 people) responded that they already had. 2.14% (5 people) responded that they would not endorse the project further. This overwhelming majority of participants who had already recommended it further shows the power of community action and the motivation of the citizens to continue. We can and should involve them as much as possible as they are a powerful group.

Question 11 asked participants to tell us how likely they would be to continue with the drop-off program if a site(s) would be made permanent. The majority, 75.11%, 175 people, said that they

would definitely continue (rating it a 5 out of 5). 14.16%, 33 people rated it a 4, 6.44%, 15 people were unsure if they would continue rating it a 3, 1.72%, 4 people rated it a 2 and 2.58%, and 6 people rated it a 1. However, these results are inconclusive without knowing the reasonings behind the ratings.

Question 12 built off the prior question (question 11) asking participants to share their thoughts on what might deter them from continuing to participate in a long-term program. 222 people answered this question, while 15 decided to skip it. There were over 50 people who said they could not think of anything that would keep them from continuing. Many expressed their disappointment with the pilot project ending. These people most probably gave a higher rating for question 11 (stating that they would be very likely to continue). However, it seems that the rest of the people, even those who answered question 11 with a high rating, stated that their answers were contingent upon things like continued convenience of the location, easier access (better/no locks and user-friendly dumpsters), and cleanliness.

The most frequent answer to this question had to do with the location of the drop-off site. Travel distance greater than 5-10 miles was frowned upon, as well as a less convenient location overall. Costs were another reason. Some said if they had to pay anything or too the amount would be high, and they would not be likely to participate. A big concern was drop-off being limited to a specific day and time (i.e., not having 24/7 access to the dumpster).

The physical aspects like locks were a common frustration (specifically it was mentioned as being bad at Ferguson township). A further concern for some was that as the weather changes, they would have more trouble gaining access to the location due to snow and/or ice. In addition, the strength that was needed for participants to access the heavy dumpsters was also mentioned numerous times. People mentioned that they were able-bodied and still had a hard time with the dumpsters. Others said that they had additional challenges as they had limited strength due to factors such as age or injury. Therefore, another type of container (front load, chute-type access, sliding door) should be investigated. It was explicitly mentioned to look into "...using compost bins that circulate and aerate the soil, rather than just dumpsters" and that Foxdale apparently has smaller and more user-friendly composting bins.

Many people found the drop-off program to be time-intensive, and an unpleasant experience (odors, insects, collection problems...etc.) People also mentioned a lack of general cleanliness at the site. The storage of food waste in people's homes was often talked about as causing them trouble. Therefore, we must provide participants with more information and propose better/different solutions for storing the waste at home and transporting it in their cars. This combination caused a few to give up after only a couple of attempts. One person's experience highlights these problems, "My first drop-off was a positive experience. My second drop-off was an extremely poor experience; I think the dumpster had just been emptied and was covered in maggots and juice. It smelled foul about four+ feet around the dumpster. I have a fairly strong stomach, and the smell had me dry heaving and so nauseated."

Question 13 asked participants for their input and recommendations for a permanent site location. The general consensus was that the current locations are good as they are. The Ferguson township building seems to be very popular and Spring Creek Park. The general

consensus was locations such as township municipal offices/ buildings, recycling centers, on the Penn State campus and near grocery stores would be most convenient. It was frequently suggested that we introduce smaller-scale dumpsters but offer more locations.

A detailed compilation list can be found below:

- Centre County Recycling & Refuse Authority, 253 Transfer Rd, Bellefonte, PA 16823
- At recycling centers near: Alpha Fire Company- Patton station, near Pleasant Gap, grass drop off (Ferguson Township Municipal Building, Spring Creek Park or Glenn O'Hawbaker Recycling Center), Centre County Transfer Station & Recycling Facility and the miscellaneous plastics centers.
- Near stores such as Walmart, Home Depot, Wegmans, Giant or Trader Joe's, South Atherton Shopping Centers, MCA/South Hills College parking lot
- A location for park forest (as there is said to be a big eco-friendly community) Wegmans, Target, Walmart or Trader Joe's near North Atherton Street. Clearwater Conservancy.
- Drop-off locations in large apartment complexes
- Behind the American Ale House and Grill
- Centre Peace building that way Amberleigh neighborhood, Logan Greene, Burnham Farms, and downtown Bellefonte households could easily participate
- In Lemont, somewhere near the main square, South Atherton Shopping Centers or College Township Municipal Offices
- Halfmoon township

Question 14 asked participants how much they would be willing to pay for such a drop-off program. The majority, 26.38% (62 people) said that they would not pay anything. 21.70% (51 people) said that they would be willing to pay \$10 per year, 20.00% (47 people) said that they would be willing to pay \$20 per year, 17.87% (42 people) said that they would be willing to pay \$30 per year and 14.04% (33 people) said that they would be willing to pay more than \$30 per year. Putting a price tag on such a drop-off program, where people have to invest so much of their time, does not seem to sit well with most. The majority would be happy to pay for curbside pickup, however as this is not an option, we want to encourage as many citizens as possible to participate in a permanent project. Thus, barriers such as associated fees, would likely scare off more people from participating, especially if they have to deal with unsanitary and troublesome protocols (like the locks and heavy dumpsters). Additionally, other community members who did not participate in the pilot project might not even be willing to test a permanent program due to the associated costs. This would especially be the case if they themselves do not see the purpose behind diverting food scraps. Mr. Hicks should be asked if he has any specific information regarding available funding. In his interview response, he said "... (maybe) we could find a way to cover the expenses of the program without accessing any fees to the participants. There are various "pots of money" that could be utilized to make sure there were no fees to the participants" (Hicks, 2023).

Question 15 asked participants if they had encountered problems. Over half (68.67%, 160 people) said no. The rest (31.33%, 73 people) said that they encountered problems. The majority of the people sighted problems pertaining to the locks. People had much trouble with getting the locks off and on, while others could not get the lock combinations to work. A common issue was

that locks were reattached wrongly (locked upside down, making it harder to put in the code to unlock) and others were damaged. As was already pointed out in the above sections, participants again pointed out that many people (especially senior citizens, shorter people, and people with disabilities) had trouble handling the dumpsters, as they were heavy and hard to open.

Members were further inconvenienced by people locking the locks with dirty hands, causing there to be a buildup of sticky residue on the locks. They also expressed frustrations with seeing people who were not following instructions for closing dumpsters and throwing away inorganic/ not allowed materials. In some cases, there was apparently some confusion regarding the term "garden waste". Furthermore, participants were disgusted at the site of maggots and other insects, coupled with the foul odor from the dumpsters. These unpleasantries must be combated with a new solution at a permanent location(s).

Question 16 asked the participants to choose as many options as they wanted for their preference of location for a drop-off site. Parking lots for grocery or other stores were the most popular with (58.80%) 137 votes. Close behind were Township buildings (such as the current Benner and Ferguson Townships sites) with (57.08%) 133 votes. Local parks (such as the current College and Harris Townships sites) had (54.94%) 128 votes and the Compost facility at Hawbaker recycling site (the current Patton Township site) had (31.76%) 74 votes. The rest of the (12.88%) 30 votes were in the other category, where they were asked to respond.

(Similar responses were given here as to question 13.) On or near Penn State's campus, by/in recycling centers, and at transfer stations. It was also suggested to look into housing complexes/communities that already have garbage/recycling drop-offs. When looking for a suitable site, the factors of bothersome insects and smell need to be considered. Keeping this in mind store parking lots and parks are also not ideal. If it has not already been done, we need to investigate if Penn State's Organic Materials Processing Center (OMPEC) has the capacity to partner with the community on this issue. During the survey, Penn State's campus was mentioned as a convenient location for some.

Question 17 asked participants to share any other thoughts and opinions that they might have. There was an overwhelming amount of thanks expressed for this pilot program and hopes of continuing with a permanent project. There was also a general sense of curiosity, participants would like to be in the loop about where the compost gets made, how much the program is contributing, what the compost gets used for / who profits from it/ if they can access the compost once it is available and if it saves the borough any money investing in such a program. These questions should be answered on a frequently asked questions (FAQ) tab on the Centre County Recycling and Refuse Authority website.

Many people expressed their frustrations about not having curbside pickup like their neighbors and friends in State College borough. Thus, we will need to provide the citizens with a comprehensive overview of the situation and explain this situation. A few people were inspired to buy their own, at-home composting unit, because they encountered problems with the pilot project, but still wanted to participate in composting. There was a plea for expanding the list of allowed items, as well as clarifying what items are allowed, and which are not, and an explanation for why not. For example, one person stated that they would like more specific

information regarding garden waste, as houseplants were allowed, however, the instructions said, "no leaves". Going forward, we will have to be specific and provide clear examples. A lot of people also offered their help with volunteering or getting involved in some way.

The final question, 18, was optional and participants could state their name.

*In the following section, I cover various topics based on the feedback given from the survey. To this, I add my own interpretations and recommendations in a summary style for each topic.*

### **Location:**

The ideal locations would be open 24/7, protected from the elements, close to population-dense areas, and conveniently situated at or near a recycling center, grocery store, or township building. These places are the most probable for combining errands, saving on emissions and time. Locations should be walkable, bikeable, and accessible by public transportation to provide accessibility to as many citizens, as well as to encourage further reductions in emissions. Factors like being able to access the drop-off sites safely with the changing seasons (limited daylight) were also concerns. Therefore, locations have to be found with access to electricity (to install a light for the site or ideal an already lit-up place).

### **Cleaner environment at the drop-off sites:**

Participants were under the impression that the dumpsters were not being cleaned out, causing foul odors and insects (flies, maggots...etc.) to be attracted. Members stated getting messy during the process of dumping their food scraps. The juices that had accumulated at the bottom of the container that they were dumping, as well as juices that were dripping on them from handling the dumpster. This caused there to be a buildup of sticky residue on the locks, causing people to feel uncomfortable. It would be ideal to have access to a wash station nearby. Alternatively, these problems could be eased by providing wet wipes, gloves (garden / waterproof gloves that are attached to the dumpster, to deter someone from taking them), or something of this nature. We must do our best to accommodate the needs of our constituents, as many complained about the messiness and some even opted out altogether.

### **Pickup of scraps:**

The suggestion was made for smaller more user-friendly dumpsters that are changed more regularly. If the current large dumpsters are to be kept, then the possibility of adapting the frequency of pick up to the seasonality of food waste should be considered. For example: increasing the level of pick up during the summer months (during school holidays...etc.). This could help reduce the scraps sitting in the hot sun creating odors and attracting more insects. There were additional worries about the container filling up too fast. If not already under consideration, we should be catering to the higher demand that is likely to come with holidays (Halloween, Thanksgiving, and Christmas) where people are cooking and dealing with more food.

### **Infrastructure:**

If the current dumpsters are our only option moving forward, they must be adapted/pimped to have integrated steps (welded on) so that people can better access them because the current dumpsters are very displeasing to our users. A ladder or an external stepping stool can easily be



stolen. If composting should continue, we must explore compromising with the municipality to allow 100% biodegradable compost bags (made of natural plant starch). People are unhappy with the current method of collection requires improvement. If biodegradable bags are still not an option, then we have to provide participants with a garbage can next to the dumpster to throw away the plastic bag, they transported their food scraps in. This will also reduce the chance of participants throwing their plastic bags in with the compost and carrying a sticky, smelly bag home is not appealing. In addition, having a regular trash can next to the dumpster would likely mitigate the need for locks, as people would be much less inclined to throw non-organic materials into the organic dumpster if there was a trash can nearby.

Otherwise, a different type of container must be found. A costly, high-tech, and user-friendly (excluding a minority of the nontech-savvy population) option would be to introduce [smart composting bins](#) that open with QR codes. New York City currently has around [250 bins](#) spread around the city. [These types of bins](#), even without the QR code would be much more user-friendly. These [bigger bins](#) do not expose citizens to as many odors, as the bins are much lower to the ground and have a smaller opening than a dumpster. Participants consistently expressed their annoyance over the locks. If locations must be locked, a better and more user-friendly solution must be found than the locking system currently being used. However, depending on the location of the dumpsters, it may not be necessary to use locks.

#### **Biogas, instead of compost:**

Instead of collecting food scraps for compost, it might make more sense to turn it into biogas. Then compostable bags could be used for collection, as the process is less sensitive. Many participants of the pilot project had a huge problem with collecting, transporting, and dumping their food scraps. It would be more user-friendly if participants could collect and dump the compost bag into the dumpster. This would create more engagement, as many said that they were hindered in long-term involvement in this pilot due to these collection and storage problems. Additionally, citizens noted that they were disappointed that the items allowed were limited and did not include cooking oil and other items. This would not be an issue if the organic materials would be used in biogas plants/digesters.

#### **Emissions savings:**

A staggering 73.19% (172 people) said that they combined drop-off with any other errands in question 4. This is a huge amount of saving on emissions. With regards to the organic waste that was able to be diverted from the landfill to be used towards creating compost at the State College Brough Compost Facility, the pilot project had collected 66,528 pounds of food scraps as of October 23rd. This translates to 33 tons of compostable material from five locations. Thus, around 45,372 net pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> are saved by turning food waste into compost instead of going to the landfill. This calculation was made [Using this calculator](#).

#### **Information for participants:**

Participants generally have the desire to be kept in the loop. The members wanted more information surrounding what is being done with the compost, how much they have been able to produce, and where the final product gets used. It was perceived that the list of compostable items allowed was more restrictive than in 2022, this caused people much aggravation as they were not able to follow the logic behind restricting certain organic materials. Therefore, we can



combat this by being providing participants with more information. For example: we could interview an expert at the compost site, who explains that certain items cannot decompose as fast as others. Also, it was requested that a list of permitted items either be posted directly on bins or somewhere at the site, as individuals were seen putting inappropriate objects in the dumpsters. Along these same lines, instructional videos may also help to go over things like using the infrastructure at the sites (showing how to lock correctly...etc.). Requests were made regarding recommendations for at-home storage/collection bins for their scraps.

Numerous people wrote about a curbside pickup option being their preferred way of participating in composting. A lot of people kept asking if we could provide them with this service, while others were under the impression that this was a new idea and had not been considered or investigated. Consequently, we need to inform people that a curbside pickup has been looked at, but has not been approved and therefore, is not an option. Given the citizens this clarification should help them in understanding why we are moving forward with this drop-off option and hopefully help them get fully on board with the program. All of these answered should be in the FAQ tab section on the Centre County Recycling and Refuse Authority website (this can be found in the Deliverables section titled '6. Website Content').

#### **Future correspondence with participants:**

Looking at the data from the survey trends timestamp, on the days (October 10th and October 23rd) were Shelly sent out the e-mails (initial email and reminder e-mail) there was a correlation between the e-mails and the level of engagement. Participation was high the following day, however, it dropped back down in the days after. This is important to note in the planning of future projects. Maybe we should have sent out one more reminder e-mail to attract more participants. Also, we may want to think about setting up an SMS service. For such situations, people may have found it more convenient and may have been more likely to fill out the survey as most people have a smartphone and could have filled it out immediately.

Many of the participants are knowledgeable about the effects of global warming (landfills produce GHGs) and are very willing to engage in such a permanent project. Some participants felt that there was a lack of advertisement for this pilot project. Thus, in the future, we will have to focus more efforts on advertising. It was seen that word-of-mouth advertisement was one of the most effective methods. Therefore, we should think about involving our members. An aesthetic text/post can be produced for participants to post to their social media. This way we are making the most of the word-of-mouth, which does not cost us anything, allowing us to reap the benefits. Additionally, creating a social media campaign or a hashtag could be a simple yet effective method of spreading the news. Therefore, social media platforms such as Instagram must be set up.

We may want to ask for volunteers, as some said would be willing to volunteer in some capacity. A few people also took the initiative by seeing a problem and then fixing it themselves. One person specifically put WD-40 on a lock because it was hard to get on and off. We may want to think about taking advantage of such volunteers (acting like a neighborhood watch). They might send a text message or an e-mail on the status of the dumpster (fullness) ...etc. This could help reduce costs and emissions associated with staff that has to come down to the drop-off site, especially for the monitoring as participants will be at the drop-off site anyways to drop off their

food scraps. Lastly, an interactive map showing exactly where the locations are, and ideally how to get there should be created. ([Here](#) is an example of such a map (Boulder County, n.d).)

### **To do/ lo look into:**

- Are the dumpsters cleaned out regularly? If not, is there a way to adopt this practice, as it seems to really bother people.
- Look up grant opportunities, external funding (contact Mr. Hicks and look up Bipartisan Infrastructure Law: article [here](#) (Collins, 2023))
- Get approval for compostable bags to collect in and discard in.
- Investigate other options for locks (not bike locks) and dumpster types (not with the heavy lids)
- Look into the option of a neighborhood composting bin/program, apartment complexes that have composting and non-permanent locations such as farmers markets
- Create an aesthetic text that participants can post to their social media
- Set up social media accounts (post updates, interesting facts and useful information)
- Inform participants about where the compost gets made, how much the program is contributing, what the compost gets used for, if they can have access to it, and if it saves the borough any money
- [Here](#) is some inspiration on how to effectively present information on the website
- The EPA has “[Toolkit- Model Recycling Program](#)” ([more information](#))

### **Additional information:**

It was also pointed out that the wider community must be informed about this program. Law enforcement personnel and others need to be aware of the locations, to avoid unpleasant experiences with police thinking that the participants are doing something illegal. One participant specifically shared their unfriendly encounter with the Ferguson Police.

### **Conclusion:**

The sites and equipment must be very user friendly making the experience as comfortable for the participants as possible. This means providing 24/7 access at a convenient location, with easy access by public transportation, in a safe area with lights after the sun goes down. Evaluating the equipment (locks and dumpster type) based on the needs of the community will also be vital in providing a good and speedy experience for our participants. Making sure that waste is collected regularly, in accordance with the trends in seasonality, and that the cleanliness of the sites is up to good standards will minimize odors, insects, and other unpleasant things. Furthermore, the current time intensity of going to drop-off sites limits the number of participants therefore it is especially important that we support the public as much as possible to ensure the long-term and wide-spread involvement.

## Reference:

Bachmann, H. (2016, March 7). *Voices: For Swiss, recycling is very serious business*. USA Today. <https://eu.usatoday.com/story/opinion/voices/2016/03/06/voices-swiss-recycling-very-serious-business/81333110/>

Budds, D. (2023, April 10). *The Smart Bin is designed to make you think*. Curbed. <https://www.curbed.com/2023/04/new-york-city-smart-composting-bin-app-design.html>

*Drop-Off Composting Sites*. DSNY - the city of New York Department of Sanitation. (n.d.). <https://www.nyc.gov/assets/dsny/site/services/food-scraps-and-yard-waste-page/nyc-food-scrap-drop-off-locations>

Collins, A. (2023, September 27). *Grants Help Communities Build Food Waste Recycling Infrastructure*. Be a Force for the Future. <https://www.nrdc.org/bio/andrea-collins/grants-help-communities-build-food-waste-recycling-infrastructure>

*New smart solar bin trial in the City of Ryde*. City of Ryde. (n.d.). <https://www.ryde.nsw.gov.au/Council/Media-Centre/News-and-Public-Notices/New-Smart-Solar-Bin-Trial-in-the-City-of-Ryde>

*Recycling drop-off centers*. Boulder County. (n.d.). <https://bouldercounty.gov/environment/recycle/drop-off-centers/>