



# *Statewide Materials Management Advisory Committee*

**Meeting Agenda  
May 25, 2021 1:00 pm  
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency  
By Teleconference: (312) 535-8110  
Access Code: 289 611 329**

1. Introductions (5 minutes)
2. Approval of Past Minutes (5 minutes)
3. Motion to Adopt Recommendations to the General Assembly (90 minutes)
  - a. Infrastructure Recommendations
  - b. Local Government Support Recommendations
  - c. Statewide Diversion Goals
  - d. Materials to Target for Diversion
4. Old Business (5 minutes)
5. New Business (15 minutes)
  - a. Report to the General Assembly Review process, *James Jennings and Shantanu Pai*
6. Adjournment

## Materials Management Advisory Committee

Meeting April 27, 2021

1. Introductions: quorum met at 1:00 PM, James Jennings called the meeting to order.

Committee members present: McKeen, Mummel, Griffith, Jarland, Pausma, Willis, Kaar, Monte, Cowhey, Holcomb, Disbrow, Sauve, Stone, Connell, Dyer, Keane, Pai

IEPA employees present: Jennings, Buis, Metz, Fry, Foxworth, Suthar Miller, Ferree

Public: Scott Cassel, Sydney Harris, Dave van Vooren, Liz Kunkle, Rose Naseef, Megan Walton Conway, Benjamin Krumstok, Jenny Hinton

Absent: Gale, Tazelaar, Laird, Westerfield, Rivas

2. Approval of Past Minutes: The minutes were amended to change the date to 2021. Walter motions, Jarland seconds.
3. Discussion of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for Packaging, *Scott Cassel and Sydney Harris, Product Stewardship Institute*. PSI has over one hundred different partners, and many state governmental agencies and local governments are members. Cassell and Harris discussed numerous diversion policies, but stated their belief that EPR is the centerpiece because it brings together stakeholders. According to Cassel, packaging is 40% of the waste stream and 11 states currently have bills on EPR packaging. There have been extreme disruptions to these bills and the waste stream due to the pandemic. Fundamental pillars for EPR programs include: legislation, financing, and regulatory oversight. Case study on New York's EPR bill. Brief discussion of concerns over businesses being able to cover costs; a transition period is needed and producers must work with existing haulers and MRF operators. Concern over apartment accessibility; depends on the language of the bill. PPP (packaging and paper products) is focused on just the packaging, not the products. Discussion of timeline- several months working with the state's product stewardship council, takes a few years to get up and running after passing the bill into law.
4. Landfill Diversion Strategies
  - a. Landfill bans, *IEPA team*. Estimated 55-70% recovery rate for materials primarily targeted for landfill bans. Landfill bans result in an increase in fly dumping. Willis believes bans encourages creation of infrastructure development; need a two-year transition for infrastructure to develop before banning a material completely. Discussions on HHW ban and AD projects. If all aluminum cans were banned and instead recycled, this would reduce greenhouse gases the most. However, this would be difficult to enforce. Kaar acknowledges that some items should or should not be banned because of impacts on water quality, etc.
  - b. Numerical Diversion Goals, *James Jennings*. Group discussion of numerical targets for the state's objectives: 40% by 2025, 45% by 2030, and 50% by 2035.
  - c. Materials to Target for Diversion, *Shantanu Pai*. The 40% goal (~3million tons of materials) relies on CDM Smith data saying we are currently at 30%. Send Shantanu feedback.
5. Subcommittee Updates
  - a. Measurement Subcommittee Update, *Suzanne Boring and Shantanu Pai*. Still waiting on some data from City of Chicago. Thank you to those who have been sending feedback. Next meeting is May 14<sup>th</sup>.

## Materials Management Advisory Committee

Meeting April 27, 2021

- b. Local Government Subcommittee Update, *Jennifer Jarland and Jessica Miller*. County Plan Update template:  
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eZWzvno80Y\\_ii7YsxpnbCk1zUDea6hdd/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eZWzvno80Y_ii7YsxpnbCk1zUDea6hdd/edit)  
Local Gov subcommittee Findings and Recommendations:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/13BRngovTKQHxt-I5VCM0oLXzkXA9T4G/edit>  
Please wait to make comments until next week.
  - c. Infrastructure Subcommittee Update, *Walter Willis and Sunil Suthar*. Still have some revisions to make. The next meeting is May 6<sup>th</sup>.
6. Old Business
    - a. State training requirement: for ethics and sexual harassment. If you can't get on, email James. He will send the link.
  7. New Business: Want to bring all the recommendations to the committee for next month. Most of the work for the report to the General Assembly should be done by Memorial Day.
  8. Adjournment: Willis motions to adjourn, Disbrow seconds. The meeting adjourned at 2:49 PM.

## **Motion to Adopt Recommendations to the General Assembly**

**Proposed Motion Language:** The Committee include in its report to the General Assembly the findings and recommendations adopted by the Infrastructure Subcommittee.

**Summary of the Issue:** Materials collection and recovery infrastructure is an imperative element to a successful statewide materials management strategy. The Infrastructure Subcommittee recommends the General Assembly address the statewide need for additional materials management infrastructure by appropriating sufficient funds to provide awards for recycling and compost facility construction and enhancement. The Subcommittee also recommends that numerous state agencies collaborate to develop and maintain asset maps reflecting available materials recovery opportunities across the state. Additional details on the Infrastructure Subcommittee's findings and recommendations are attached.

**General Assembly Plan Element(s) Addressed:** 415 ILCS 15/4.5(j)(6); 415 ILCS 15/4.5(j)(9); 415 ILCS 15/4.5(k)(5).

---

### **Recordkeeping**

**Date of Consideration:**

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Resolution:**

**Votes in Favor:**

**Votes in Dissent:**

**Abstentions:**

## ILLINOIS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

### FINDINGS

The following are the findings of the MMAC related to the current infrastructure in the State of Illinois for managing municipal waste:

1. The IEPA 2020 Illinois Landfill Disposal Capacity Report documented there are 24.5 years of landfill disposal capacity statewide, with capacity ranging from 12.4 years in IEPA Region 2 to 48.22 years in Region 7. **Figure 1** shows the distribution of permitted landfills in the State.
2. The existing distribution of waste transfer stations shown on **Figure 2** indicates there are more waste transfer stations in the IEPA Region 2 than the other regions of the State and the other regions of the State rely on more long hauling of municipal waste in packer trucks direct to the landfill than Region 2. Waste transfer stations can serve multiple infrastructure purposes to enhance the efficiency of transporting municipal waste, recyclables, and landscape waste, and may include additional recovery of recyclables at the transfer station.
3. The existing distribution of landscape waste transfer stations shown on **Figure 3** indicates there are more landscape waste transfer stations in IEPA Region 2 than other regions of the State. As with waste transfer stations, this indicates that other Regions of the State rely on long hauling of landscape waste in collection vehicles direct to composting facilities than in Region 2.
4. The existing distribution of construction and demolition (C&D) recycling facilities is shown on **Figure 4**. The Figure illustrates that the majority of C&D recycling facilities are located in IEPA Region 2. Prior to 2009, C&D recycling facilities were only exempt from local siting requirements set forth in Section 39.2 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, in counties with more than 700,000 residents which limited development of this type of infrastructure outside of Region 2.
5. The distribution of permitted compost facilities shown on **Figure 5** indicates there is greater geographic coverage and distribution of these facilities across the State than with either material recovery facilities or construction and demolition recycling facilities. The infrastructure for landscape waste developed since the landscape waste ban went into effect in 1990. It should be noted that while the State diverts approximately 500,000 tons per year of landscape waste, the amount of other organic material in the waste stream (e.g. food scraps and food-soiled paper) if captured would represent nearly 10 times that amount. Further, of the State's 48 permitted compost sites only 6 reported accepting food scraps in their 2019 annual reports required pursuant to Section 39(m) of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

6. The distribution of existing material recovery facilities and consolidation/transload facilities shown on **Figure 6** (including both in-state and out-of-state facilities currently receiving materials generated in Illinois) indicates there is likely a need for additional consolidation/transload facilities in rural areas to aggregate recyclables for more efficient transfer to primary MRFs, which are predominantly located in more densely populated areas of the State.
7. The distribution of drop-off recycling locations (including sites that collect recyclables, electronics and/or food scraps) sites shown on **Figure 7** indicates there is likely a need for more drop-off recycling facilities in rural areas to serve residents who typically are not offered curbside recycling service.
8. The distribution of scrap metal recycling facilities shown on **Figure 8** indicates there is likely adequate coverage for the State.
9. The distribution of household hazardous waste (HHW) collection facilities shown on **Figure 9** indicates that all four existing HHW collection facilities are located in northern Illinois. At the far southwest portion of the state, Madison County is close to opening one additional HHW collection facility supported by IEPA funding. In west central Illinois (Peoria County), a privately operated HHW collection facility is planned to open in the next few years.

Based on available appropriations, IEPA-sponsored one-day HHW collection events have been inconsistently available to residents who live more than a 40-mile distance from the four HHW collection facilities in northern Illinois. Typically, the General Assembly appropriates the IEPA funding to annually provides a limited number of one-day collection events for HHW throughout the State. There have been a few years when insufficient funds were appropriated to allow for any IEPA-sponsored one-day HHW collection events. In 2020, IEPA entered into long-term collection agreements with six “hub” collection locations across the State that provide for annual IEPA sponsored one-day collection events. This IEPA commitment significantly improves the consistency of larger annual one-day HHW collection events.

The 2015 Illinois Task Force on the Advancement of Materials Recycling unanimously agreed that a convenient statewide HHW collection infrastructure is needed. Illinois residents who are located more than 40 miles from a HHW collection facility continue to lack a convenient option for HHW disposal.

10. . Currently the IEPA’s funding for waste diversion programs is totally reliant on the landfill surcharges authorized by Section 22.15 of the Act. The MMAC during its research of other State programs found other examples of funding mechanisms currently being utilized or evaluated including taxes on other services (for example Michigan uses tax proceeds from an internet tax to fund environmental programs), using unredeemed bottle bill revenue and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for packaging.

## **CHALLENGES**

The following are challenges that have been identified with enhancing the infrastructure for managing municipal waste in Illinois:

1. As most the infrastructure figures show, there is more intense development of infrastructure in the more populated areas of the State because of the greater municipal waste generation. Absent additional or alternative infrastructure investment, this situation poses a challenge to the less populated areas of the State that do not have the same access to recycling and composting infrastructure compared to more populated areas resulting in fewer waste diversion programs in less populated areas. The key question regarding infrastructure development is how can the infrastructure be developed if there is less waste or material to be managed which typically results in higher unit costs, and in turn leads to project developers deciding not to invest in the infrastructure due to a lack of business case and affordability?
2. In order to achieve higher waste division goals there will be a need to increase the number of residents and businesses who recycle and compost. A key challenge will be not only getting more participation in programs but making sure there are proper guidelines for recycling and composting in order to reduce contamination which leads to higher program costs and can impact markets negatively as well.
3. A corollary to Item 2 above is if Illinois is successful in diverting more material from landfills and developing the infrastructure to manage this additional material, there must be markets for the recyclables and end use compost. Market development should lead to more secure business models which should lead to continued investment in infrastructure.
4. Increasing the number of HHW collection facilities is challenged by the need for local units of government to find, fund and maintain a HHW collection facility site, and pay for the initial permitting costs. This has been a significant barrier to the development of more HHW collection facilities.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following are recommendations based on the above findings, noted challenges and research conducted by the MMAC:

1. The General Assembly should appropriate from the Solid Waste Management Fund the following amounts to the IEPA:
  - a. A minimum of \$1 million in total for the express purpose of issuing two rounds of infrastructure grants to recycling facilities within the next 5 years. The first appropriation should be for at least \$400,000 for grants to counties with less than 100,000 residents. The scope of this grant round should include new and existing material recovery facilities (MRFs), new and existing consolidation facilities for recyclables, general construction and demolition debris recycling facilities, and drop-off recycling facilities. The second

appropriation should be for at least \$600,000 for grants to counties with more than 100,000 residents. The scope of this grant round should be new and existing MRFs.

- b. A minimum of \$1 million in total for the express purpose of issuing two rounds of infrastructure grants to compost facilities within the next 5 years. The grant should be open to both new and existing compost facilities, landscape waste transfer stations and include all types of composting technology. The first appropriation should be for at least \$400,000 for grants to counties with less than 100,000 residents and the second appropriation should be for at least \$600,000 for grants to counties with more than 100,000 residents.
    - c. Annual appropriations of an additional \$275,000 per new HHW facility (for up to five additional HHW collection facilities to be established in areas of the state sufficiently remote from the network of existing HHW collection facilities) from the Solid Waste Fund to the IEPA to provide funding for HHW transportation and disposal expenses. This funding is in addition to the current appropriation of funds for the four existing HHW facilities, which have an approximate cost of \$275,000 per facility per year.
2. Units of local government should explore implementing curbside pick-up programs for HHW in areas of the state where a franchise agreement with a municipal waste hauler can be established and the waste hauler providing service has capabilities to collect and transport HHW.
3. The General Assembly should explore other funding mechanisms in addition to the landfill surcharges authorized by Section 22.15 of the Act.
4. Based on the information reported to the Subcommittee from various vendors and technologies (e.g., Brightmark - pyrolysis of plastics, WM – anaerobic digestion of organics, INEOS -chemical recycling of polystyrene back into styrene, Bioenergy Development – anaerobic digestion of organics, and Titus MRF Services – secondary MRF) there are opportunities for development of new infrastructure and Illinois should continue to encourage the development of new infrastructure in the State that can accept recyclables or organic material as a feedstock and reduce reliance on landfilling.
5. The State and other units of local government should explore public-private collaboration on funding for needed infrastructure, including additional grants for MRFs, secondary MRFs (a secondary MRF processes the residue and/or mixed plastics from MRFs to further recover materials of value), C&D recycling facilities, drop-off facilities and residential recycling carts to divert material from the landfill into needed feedstocks for recycling or composting. As part of this collaboration, State and local governments and the private sector should explore how to support the end-use of recycled content products and finished compost material. With the recent commitments being made by the private sector in organizations such as The Recycling Partnership and Closed Loop Partners, the advantages of working together have become obvious and needed.



6. The IEPA and Department of Agriculture should work together, in conjunction with the Illinois Farm Bureau, Feeding Illinois, and the University of Illinois, to develop an asset map and database for food recovery. As much wasted food as possible should be rescued for human consumption and if recovered would significantly reduce greenhouse gases. The asset map and database should attempt to connect all known food pantries and food rescue or recovery network partners in the State with all known donators of food. The map and database should also include all known specialty farmers who recover and donate food from their own specialty crops. The map and database should be developed by January 1, 2023 and updated annually.
7. The IEPA should clarify its position regarding the siting of new or existing aerobic and anaerobic digestors that accept food scraps pursuant to Public Act 96-0418, more specifically to clarify and under what circumstances these facilities may be exempt from the local siting law.
8. The IEPA should update the infrastructure maps for landfills, waste transfer stations, landscape waste transfer stations, construction and demolition debris recycling facilities, MRFs and consolidation/transload facilities, compost facilities, drop-off recycling sites, scrap metal recycling facilities and HHW collection facilities/one-day collection hub locations on an annual basis and include the maps and associated data in the annual landfill capacity report.

## **Motion to Adopt Recommendations to the General Assembly**

**Proposed Motion Language:** The Committee includes in its report to the General Assembly the findings and recommendations document, along with the Plan Update Template document adopted by the Local Government Support Subcommittee.

**Summary of the Issue:** Illinois law places a heavy emphasis on local government leadership in the administration of solid waste, recycling, composting and materials management programs. The Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act establishes the minimum guidelines for county solid waste management plans. However, that guidance has not been revisited in nearly three decades. The Local Government Support Subcommittee recommends the State of Illinois address this by utilizing the modernized template used for local solid waste management plans to reflect the significant intellectual and programmatic enhancements that have occurred in the past thirty years. Additional details on the Local Government Support Subcommittee's findings and recommendations are attached, along with the Plan Update Template to be used by County program coordinators to Update their Plans.

**General Assembly Plan Element(s) Addressed:** 415 ILCS 15/4.5(k).

---

### **Recordkeeping**

**Date of Consideration:**

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Resolution:**

**Votes in Favor:**

**Votes in Dissent:**

**Abstentions:**

# Local Government Subcommittee Findings and Recommendations

## Local Government Subcommittee Findings

- 1. Data collection and tracking are critical elements to evaluate county materials management program success that requires additional statewide support.** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, in their 2020 National Recycling Strategy draft document, has identified information tracking and measurement as core components of successful progress of the nation's recycling programs. In Illinois, solid waste, recycling, and other materials management initiatives are primarily coordinated at the county or municipal level, rather than statewide. Some counties have effective data collection and tracking mechanisms that enable them to examine historic trends and implement targeted, data-driven enhancements. However, not all counties have the resources or the reporting structure in place for data collection and tracking. The absence of a consistent statewide data gathering system adversely impacts the quality of available statewide materials management data, impairs individual county's efforts to monitor materials management program performance and update their Solid Waste Plans. This information deficit results in a lack of statewide data to examine materials management metrics and program effectiveness.
- 2. The existing Solid Waste Plan reporting structure does not provide sufficient flexibility for all counties or guarantee that information is consistently reported at the state level.** The Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act establishes the minimum criteria for Solid Waste Plan contents and county government reports. Existing law requires each county to review its Solid Waste Plan every five years and submit any necessary and appropriate changes to the Illinois EPA for review and approval. Not all counties have sufficient resources to designate limited staff time to such revisions, or to contract with a consultant to complete an update every five years, which puts those counties in the difficult position of weighing satisfaction of the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act requirements against other core local government functions. This could result in some counties going several cycles without updating their Solid Waste Plan and therefore impair the advancement of the materials management infrastructure in those communities. For the five year period from 2015 to 2020, counties with a population greater than 100,000 were over four times as likely to complete a Plan Update than counties with populations under 100,000. In addition, not all Solid Waste Plans are submitted to the Illinois EPA; only plans with necessary and appropriate changes are submitted. Limited reporting of Plan Updates impedes the Illinois EPA's ability to render evaluations that accurately reflect existing materials management practices across the state.
- 3. Development of initial County Solid Waste Plans in the 1990's were funded in part with grants issued by IEPA, in recognition of the financial burden that the planning requirement would have on counties statewide.** Counties were encouraged to jointly develop their Solid Waste Plans to ensure a regional, cohesive strategy for long-term waste management. Implementation of a revised standard format for Plan Updates is expected to have a similar financial burden, which may impede implementation if funding is not available in every county.

## Local Government Subcommittee Recommendations

- 1. The General Assembly should appropriate the Illinois EPA sufficient funding to obtain statewide data tracking services.** Currently, numerous private entities offer multijurisdictional data tracking services that enable various federal and state agencies to aggregate comparable reported datasets in a manner that is easily digestible for regulatory agencies, the regulated community, local government, and the general public. Indeed, USEPA has procured such services as part of its State Measurement Program,

which identifies national trends in various solid waste, recycling, and materials management arenas. For nearly a decade, the Illinois EPA has participated in USEPA's Program by providing USEPA the requested information via the procured data tracking services. Other states have obtained comparable software to compile a wide range of materials management data and employed those data to render sound policy and program decisions. In most cases, this software costs less than \$5,000 per year. The General Assembly should provide the Illinois EPA funding to procure these services. Once funding is made available, the Illinois EPA will identify counties to test it prior to statewide implementation.

2. **The content required for county Solid Waste Plan updates should be revised to include a standard format.** More specifically, the amended Plan form should include the following standard elements: an Executive Summary; Current Plan Implementation; data on the volume (generation) and types (characterization) of materials currently being managed; a detail of existing infrastructure; a waste generation assessment; description of existing diversion programs and recommendations for expanding recycling programs; discussion of public education campaigns; and a summary of recommendations. There may also be an optional section on Partnerships, Policy, and Funding. To assist counties with less than 100,000 population, less reporting will be required for the description of current and proposed material management programs. Whenever possible, the standard form should be available as a fillable PDF that can be submitted electronically. Additional information on each reporting element is detailed in the County Solid Waste Plan Update Template section below.
3. **The General Assembly should appropriate \$1 million from the Solid Waste Fund to the IEPA to provide grant funding support for all counties to develop their first Plan Update incorporating the revised standard content.** Fund appropriation may be distributed over one or multiple budget years to reflect varying due dates for county Plan Updates. Appropriated funds should be allocated equally to all counties (\$10,000 per county), with funds applied for through and administered by the IEPA. Funds may be used for third party expenditures or for in-kind costs incurred in the development of a Plan Update.

The schedule for completion of Plan Updates utilizing the new format is recommended as follows:

1. Counties with a Plan Update completed within the 5-year period preceding implementation of the new format: Prepare and submit a Plan Update conforming with the new format on their next 5-year Plan Update renewal date (provided, however, that counties with a Plan Update in progress or due within 6 months of the date the new format is implemented are granted a 1-year extension to complete their update utilizing the new format)
  2. Counties with a Plan Update completed more than 5 years before the implementation of the new format: Prepare and submit a Plan Update conforming with the new format within 18 months of the date the new format is implemented.
  3. For any county that fails to request funds and/or to complete a Plan Update within 18 months of the date that such funds and the new format are available, the IEPA shall have the option to reallocate grant funds on behalf of the County. Such funds shall be used to assign staff or retain a third-party consultant to develop a Plan Update on the county's behalf, which task shall include consultation with the subject county.
4. **Flexibility should be granted to Counties in the submission of subsequent Plan Updates.** For all counties, subsequent Plan Updates (those submitted after the first Plan Update on the new format), the Plan Update requirement may be may be satisfied by: 1) submission of a new Plan Update following the revised format; or 2) a written statement by the County that there are no significant changes in the waste characterization, infrastructure or materials management programs in the County.

## County Solid Waste Plan Update Template

A thorough template of the contents of Illinois County Solid Waste Plans with potential recommendations for materials management advancement are included in this report as Section XXX. Below is a synopsis of the content of that template solid waste plan, which will be reflected in the revised version of the IEPA Reporting Form.

### A. Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should be a brief summary of the Plan. The summary should include a short overview of the status of materials management and diversion efforts within the County and a summary of recommended goals to enhance programs during the next planning period.

### B. Current Plan Implementation Status

This section should include at least two items: 1) a review of current programs, including the progress on recommendations from the most recent Plan; and 2) a discussion of any barriers to achieving the recommendations set forth in the most recent Plan and a proposal to overcome those barriers.

### C. Existing Infrastructure Report

This section should identify the location and life expectancy of any landfills that service county residents, which can be derived from the Illinois EPA's Landfill Capacity Report. This section should also include the location of facilities in the county that divert materials from landfills. Identified facilities should include, at a minimum, materials recovery facilities, transfer stations, construction and demolition debris facilities, composting facilities, recycling drop-off facilities, household hazardous waste facilities, and scrap metal yards. This information may be derived in part from IEPA infrastructure mapping resources.

### D. Waste Generation Assessment

The Waste Generation section should identify the County's current waste generation rate and current diversion rate, using locally compiled data where available. If locally-derived rates are not available, the County should use statewide figures contained in Section xxx of this document, or as updated by the IEPA in the future.

### E. Current and Proposed Programs

This Section should include each of the subsections below and should discuss the current status of existing diversion programs, identify opportunities to enhance programs, discuss the strategies that will be implemented during the reporting cycle, and propose a schedule for the implementation of recommendations. An illustrative list of program possibilities for each category is included below. More detail is provided in the Template Plan, Section XXX.

#### 1. List of diverted items and materials to target for diversion

This Section should include an itemized list of the materials (traditional, organic, non-traditional, and other) for which there are locally-available collection opportunities. Illustrative examples of these opportunities include curbside collections of recyclables, food scrap drop off locations, electronics recycling collection events, and one-day collection events for household hazardous waste. This section should also include a list of items that the reporting county intends to specifically target for increased diversion during its next reporting period. The selected materials

may vary from county-to-county based on unique local factors. Reporting counties should consult the best available diversion data sources at the time, including the matrix of divertible materials crafted by the Measurement Subcommittee, when rendering these decisions.

## 2. Traditional Recycling Efforts

This section of the Plan Update should discuss efforts focused on traditional recycling items. A description of current programs and recommendation for expansion into new materials and/or programs should be included. A menu of possible recommendations is included in the template Plan Update.

## 3. Organics Recycling Efforts

This section of the Plan Update should discuss efforts focused on organics recycling. A description of current programs and recommendation for expansion into new materials and/or programs should be included. A menu of possible recommendations is included in the template Plan Update.

## 4. Non-Traditional Recycling Efforts

This section of the Plan Update should discuss efforts focused on non-traditional, and in most cases, non- curbside recycling, such as electronics, household hazardous waste, construction and demolition debris, and other materials. A description of current programs and recommendation for expansion into new materials and/or programs should be included. A menu of possible recommendations is included in the template Plan Update.

## 5. Other Recycling Efforts

This section of the Plan Update should evaluating and considering support of emerging technologies that transform waste into useful products

## 6. Disposal

### F. Public Education and Outreach

This section of the Plan Update should describe current and proposed efforts to educate the public and to promote recycling efforts in the County. Key provisions of public education and outreach programs are included in the Plan Update template.

### G. Partnerships, Policy, and Funding

This section of the Plan Update is an optional discussion of partnership formation, recommended policy measures and potential funding sources for the programs described elsewhere in the Plan Update. Suggestions topics to be included in this section are included in the Plan Update template.

### H. Summary of Recommendations

This Section should include a brief summary of the recommended program enhancements and the timeline for implementing those decisions.

**Materials Management Advisory Committee**  
**Subcommittee on Local Government Support**  
**County Solid Waste Plan Update Template**

**Introduction**

This outline serves as a guide to Illinois counties to write Plan Updates, as required by the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. The table of contents for county Plan Updates shall be as follows:

- A. Executive Summary**
- B. Current Plan Implementation Status**
- C. Existing Infrastructure Report**
- D. Waste Generation Assessment**
- E. Proposed Material Managements Programs**
  - 1. List of diverted items**
  - 2. Traditional Recycling Efforts**
  - 3. Organics Recycling Efforts**
  - 4. Non-Traditional Recycling Efforts**
  - 5. Other Recycling Efforts**
- F. Public Education and Outreach**
- G. Partnerships, Policy, and Funding (Optional Section)**
- H. Summary of Recommendations**

All Plan Updates should be put in this order, or if an alternative format is utilized a checklist should accompany the Plan Update noting on what pages the outlined materials are presented.

Two additional sections are included in the detailed outline below that are not sections of the Plan Update. These include special provisions for counties with a population of less than 100,000 (**Section I, Special Provisions for Counties with Populations less than 100,000**), and requirements for submission of future Plan Updates (**Section J, Submission of Plan Updates**).

The Exhibits to this outline are numbered to correspond with the outline section to which they relate.

- Exhibit E-1:** List of Recyclable Materials
- Exhibit E-2:** Recommendations for Traditional Recycling Efforts
- Exhibit E-3:** Recommendations for Organics Recycling Efforts
- Exhibit E-4:** Recommendations for Non-Traditional Recycling Efforts
- Exhibit F:** Education and Outreach
- Exhibit G:** Partnerships, Policy and Funding (Optional)

**Detailed Outline of Plan Sections**

- A. Executive Summary**
  - 1. One to two page summary of status of recycling in the County, goals for next planning period, and summary of critical recommendations.
- B. Current Plan Implementation Status**

1. Review of progress on recommendations from current plan noting barriers to progress where appropriate
2. Summary of current programs and diversion activities, if not represented in the above review
3. Use standardized reporting metrics (such as waste diversion and generation rates) to be designated and provided by the Agency

**C. Existing Infrastructure Report**

1. This information can be sourced from the recycling infrastructure maps available from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.
2. Existing Landfills utilized by county
  - a. Location and expected life
  - b. Plans for expansion, if any
3. Summary of other facilities utilized by county
  - a. MRFs
  - b. Transfer Stations
  - c. C&D facilities
  - d. Household Hazardous Waste collection facilities
  - e. Composting facilities
  - f. Recycling Drop-Off facilities
  - g. Scrap Metal facilities

**D. Waste Generation Assessment**

1. Waste generation
  - a. Use locally compiled data, where available
  - b. Alternative: use state reports and data sourced by the IEPA

**E. Proposed Material Management Plans**

1. List of Materials to target for Diversion
  - a. See **Exhibit E-1: Materials to Target for Diversion** for a matrix of materials and diversion ratings from the Measurement Subcommittee
  - b. Use of EPA “Managing and Transforming Waste Tool” provides assistance in the area of the Plan.
2. Traditional Material Diversion Efforts
  - a. Current items recycled
  - b. Additional Items to be diverted
  - c. Recycling goals/recommendations for traditional recycling items
  - d. Encourage identification of 7 or more recommended strategies from the suggestions in **Exhibit E-2: Recommendations for Traditional Recycling**, or similar or related strategies.
  - e. Implementation schedule
3. Organics Material Diversion Efforts
  - a. Current items recycled
  - b. Additional items to be diverted
  - c. Recycling goals/recommendations for organics recycling items.
  - d. Encourage identification 5 or more recommended strategies from the suggestions in **Exhibit E-3: Recommendations for Organics Recycling** or similar or related strategies.



- e. Implementation schedule
- 4. Non-traditional Material Diversion Efforts
  - a. Current items recycled
  - b. Additional items such as HHW, electronics, hard-to-recycle materials
  - c. Recycling goals/Recommendations for non-traditional items
  - d. Encourage identification of at least 1 recommended strategy from the suggestions in **Exhibit E-4: Recommendations for Non-Traditional Recycling**, or similar or related strategy.
  - e. Implementation schedule
- 5. Other programs/technologies such as waste-to-energy, anaerobic digesters, etc.
- 6. Disposal Efforts
  - a. Facilities to be relied upon for disposal located in-county and out-of-county
  - b. Regional pollution control facility siting ordinance provisions
  - c. Identify recommendations that determine which kinds of pollution control facilities are allowed in your county

#### **F. Public Education and Outreach**

Plans should describe efforts to promote the recycling measures discussed in Section E above. Elements of the Education and Outreach sections of the Plan should follow the recommendations given in **Exhibit F: Education and Outreach**.

#### **G. Partnerships, Policy, and Funding (Optional)**

This section is optional. This Section can be used to explore additional methods to increase and improve recycling efforts described in the Plan. A suggested list of topics is included in **Exhibit G: Partnerships, Policy and Funding**.

#### **H. Summary of Recommendations**

Use enough space as necessary to provide a concise summary of the goals and recommendations set forth in Sections E (Diversion Programs), F (Public Education and Outreach) and G (Partnerships, Policy & Funding) of the Plan.

#### **I. Special Provisions for Counties with Populations Less than 100,000**

1. Required plan sections shall be completed, however Section E and F shall have modified requirements.
  - a. Required Sections: Section A (Executive Summary),
  - b. Section B (Current Plan Implementation Status)
  - c. Section C (Current Infrastructure Report)
  - d. Section D (Waste Generation Assessment)
  - e. Section H (Summary of Recommendations)
  - f. Sections A-D should be prepared on on-line, fillable forms whenever possible
2. Modified Section E: Current and Proposed Diversion Plans
  - a. Identify at least 3 recyclable commodities to be targeted within the county for recycling from Exhibit E-1: List of Recyclable Materials
  - b. Traditional Recycling Efforts
    - i. Drop off and curbside collection infrastructure (for municipalities, townships, or county-wide) availability should be reviewed, and described in detail.

- ii. Encourage identification of a minimum of 3 recommended strategies for traditional recycling from **Exhibit E-2: Recommendations for Traditional Recycling**, or similar/related strategies.
  - c. Organics Recycling Efforts
    - i. Some local government composting or mulching should occur
    - ii. Encourage a leaf and limb drop-off pile in municipalities
    - iii. Local government website should provide information on backyard composting, and other available programs for organics diversion, including food scraps (may be accomplished by linking directly to state or national resources)
    - iv. Encourage identification of recommended strategies for organics recycling from Exhibit E-3: Recommendations for Organics Recycling, or similar/related strategies.
  - d. Non-traditional Recycling Efforts
    - i. Maintain/secure public or private sites to collect/manage batteries, tires, oil, other automotive fluids
    - ii. Implement a program to manage electronics or partner with other counties to hold 1-day events
    - iii. Encourage to opt-in to CERA law for reduced costs of 1-day electronics collection events (must opt-in by March 1st of preceding year with IEPA and Clearinghouse)
    - iv. Consider participation in the IEPA medication and sharps collection programs and /or DEA take back programs to conduct at least one event per fiscal year for sharps and/or medicines
- 3. Modified Section F: Public Education and Outreach
  - a. Ensure at a minimum:
    - i. Provide adequate signage at drop off locations sponsored by county
    - ii. K-12 education/promotion on core message
    - iii. Provide information on recycling options (curbside guidelines, drop-offs, events), reduce, reuse, and compost resources on local government websites
    - iv. Utilize local or state-specific educational material (customizable) to keep a consistent message in all formats (digital, print, etc.) and all parts of county
- 4. Optional Section G. Partnerships, Policy, and Funding.

## J. Plan Updates

- 1. Filing of initial Plan Updates after implementation of the new format
  - a. For counties that have completed a Plan Update in or after 2016, the Plan Update conforming to the new format outlined herein is due upon the next 5-year Plan Update deadline.
    - i. However, if the 5-year Plan Update renewal date falls within 6 months of the date when the new format is available, an automatic 1-year extension is granted.

- b. For counties with a plan updated completed prior to 2016, a plan update conforming to the new format outlined herein is due within 18 months of the date that the new format is implemented.
- 2. Future Plan Updates (those submitted after the initial new format Plan Update is adopted) shall be due every five years, beginning five years after the date of the last Plan Update.
  - a. For any county, a written statement by the county's designated Recycling Coordinator affirming that the prior Plan Update has been reviewed and no significant changes have occurred to necessitate revisions to the Plan shall satisfy the requirement to complete the Future Plan Update.

**Exhibit E-1**  
**Materials to Target for Diversion**

The composition and quantity of materials reaching the end of life continue to change. As technological and social innovations create new consumer patterns or disrupt existing or respond to consumer demands the nature of the material stream changes. This dynamic landscape has challenged the recycling industry for decades. Local planners, often challenged with limited resources, are forced to choose between focusing on increasing the recovery of materials present in the waste stream that currently have markets and search for markets for materials that may be growing in volume in the waste stream. However, this creates a program that is forever playing catch up to a changing material stream.

The committee presents a diversion matrix that provides four distinct diversion quadrants based on the current collection program and market conditions of the material. Collection programs may and are different depending on geography, volume, material, and investments. Drop off, curbside, and take backs are only some of the examples of collection programs. New programs are continuously being developed both in the private and public sector.

Any material of the waste stream can be placed in one of four of the diversion quadrants and can subsequently be moved to a different quadrant over time to reflect the current conditions.

**Established program:** These are materials with established collection programs. Residents and businesses across the states have reasonable and consistent access to the program and commodity markets for the material. Significant infrastructure investments for these programs have already been made and new investments tend to be supported by the commodity markets for the materials.

**Limited program:** These are materials with established collection programs in specific regions. In some regions of the state residents and or businesses may have reasonable and consistent access to the program or commodity markets for the material. Limited infrastructure investments for these programs have been made and are growing to support commercial volumes.

**Pilot programs:** These are materials with collection programs currently being piloted. Specific residents and or businesses may have temporary access to the program or commodity markets for the material. Commodity markets for the material may not be mature or scaled to process current volumes. Current infrastructure and infrastructure investments for these programs is limited and not networked to existing materials management infrastructure.

**No programs:** These are materials with no known collection programs. Residents and or businesses do not have access to the program or commodity markets for the material. Commodity markets for the material do not exist. Infrastructure investments for these programs is limited and not networked to existing materials management infrastructure.

Based on the current conditions in Illinois Table XX delineates the current make of materials in each diversion quadrant.

	Established program	42.4%	Limited programs	32.6%	Pilot Programs	14.2%	No programs	10.7%
Fiber	Uncoated OCC/Kraft	8.8%			Compostable Paper	3.7%		
	Mixed Paper	9.8%						
	Milk & Juice Cartons/Boxes - Coated	0.3%						
Organic	Yard Waste	3.1%	Food Scraps	17.5%	Other Organic	2.2%		
Plastic	#1 Other PET Containers	0.3%	Other Film	3.1%	Other Plastic	1.9%	Trash Bags	1.8%
	#2 HDPE Bottles/Glass - Clear	0.4%	#6 Exp. Polystyrene Packaging	1.0%				
	#2 HDPE Bottles/Glass - Color	0.4%	#3-#7 Other - All	0.7%				
	#1 PET Bottles/Glass	1.1%	Commercial & Industrial Film	1.8%				
	Other Rigid Plastic Products	2.5%						
	Grocery & Merchandise Bags	0.7%						
	#2 Other HDPE Containers	0.0%						
Construction and Demolition	Clean Engineered Wood	1.7%	Painted Wood	3.0%	Plastic C&D Materials	1.0%	Other Roofing	0.3%
	Compostible Shingles	1.5%	Wood Pallets	2.4%			Other C&D	2.0%
	Clean Dimensional Lumber	1.5%	Gypsum Board	0.8%				
	Concrete	1.0%	Treated Wood	0.1%				
	Rock & Other Aggregates	0.6%						
	Bricks	0.3%						
	Asphalt Paving	0.2%						
	Reinforced Concrete	0.0%						
Metal	Other Ferrous	1.3%						
	Ferrous Containers (Tin Cans)	0.9%						
	Other Metal + mixed C&D metals	0.7%						
	Aluminum Beverage Containers	0.5%						
	Other Non-Ferrous	0.4%						
	Other Aluminum	0.3%						
	HVAC Ducting	0.0%						
Glass	Recyclable Glass Bottles & Jars	2.6%					Flat Glass	0.5%
							Other Glass	0.3%
Inorganics	Electronic Equipment	0.5%						
	White Goods - Not refrigerated	0.3%						
	Telephones	0.2%						
	Computer Equipment/Peripherals	0.2%						
	Computer Monitors	0.1%						
	White Goods - Refrigerated	0.1%						
Other Organics			Clothing	1.8%	Other Textiles	1.6%	Bottom Flies & Dirt	3.0%
					Carpet	2.0%	Diapers	2.0%
Other Inorganics	Tiles	0.2%	Other Household Batteries	0.2%	Household Bulky Items	2.3%	Ceramics/Porcelain	0.6%
	Used Oil/Filters	0.1%	Latex Paint	0.1%			All other materials	3.0%
	Other Automobile Fluids	0.0%	Oil Paint	0.0%				
	Lead-acid Batteries	0.0%	Fluorescent Lights/Ballasts	0.0%				

**Exhibit E-2**

**Recommendations For Traditional Recycling**

These recommendations do not appear in order of preference. Each county can select recommendations for its Plan based upon its specific needs, opportunities, and existing infrastructure.

**Suggested Minimum Number of Recommendations to be Included in Plan**

	If County Population is	
	< 100,000	> 100,000
Traditional Recycling Materials	3	7

**Recommendation 1: Waste Minimization campaigns**

Use the slogan “Rethink, Reduce, Reuse, Recycle”

Promote Repair and Share programs

**Recommendation 2: Promote Education for Proper Recycling**

Use State of Illinois recycling guidelines

Educate to reduce the “Dirty Dozen” contaminants

Expand educational efforts to new audiences -property owners, industrial commercial sector, etc.

**Recommendation 3: Promote Circular Economy**

Develop Circular Economy partnerships with business community, including waste haulers, institutions, and service/professional organizations for focused educational efforts

**Recommendation 4: Promote Product Stewardship**

Monitor and consider participation in state and national manufacturer and retailer take-back initiatives

Encourage design for environment practices amongst local industry and manufacturing businesses

**Recommendation 5: Promote sustainable procurement practices**

Require minimum post-consumer recycled content procurement for local governments

Sponsor green procurement workshops

Reward green buying practices in schools, businesses with financial incentives

Encourage selection of vendors with sustainability practices in supply chain management

Promote healthy alternatives to cleaning products within local government contracts

**Recommendation 6: Recognize businesses with Green Business designation**

Develop a green business program or join existing program (Smart Energy Design Assistance Center certification, Illinois Green Business Certification)

Recognize waste reduction efforts

Recognize new recycling efforts

Recognize food scraps and organics reduction programs

Recognize schools, businesses, etc. that perform IEPA waste audits.

**Recommendation 7: Consider Ordinances to increase commercial/industrial/multifamily recycling**

Consider ordinances supporting recycling  
Promote educational efforts directed to property owners and tenants

Recommendation 8: Consider franchising agreements

Evaluate organized collection for residential service for waste, recyclable, and compostable collection to aid with efficiency and/or expanded services  
Evaluate commercial franchises for waste, recyclable, and compostable collection to increase diversion  
Review applicable state statutes concerning franchising.

Recommendation 9: Promote pilot programs/demonstration projects potentially utilizing local government to provide mentoring

Consider possible reduction of number of accepted materials or simplification of guidelines  
Investigate possible multi-stream recycling for low-population communities  
Promote glass collection from bars and restaurants

Recommendation 10: Plan for waste and recycling surges

Plan for end of year student move-out surges  
Plan for natural disaster debris management coordination with state/regional efforts  
Require event planning (or event permit requirements) to include diversion plan for public events (concerts, festivals)  
Plan for holiday waste uptick (trees and pumpkins)

Recommendation 11: Promote Industrial Sector Recycling

Provide link to a toolkit sharing information on waste audits (generation and characterization studies), waste reduction analysis, materials marketplace  
Investigate if haulers may provide many such services

Recommendation 12: Promote Recycling of White Goods

Promote and educate on takeback with purchase  
Disseminate information on available service options  
Consider inclusion for provision in hauler contracts (usually an additional fee, especially for freon-containing)  
Support materials reuse centers

**Exhibit E-3**

**Recommendations for Organics Recycling**

These recommendations do not appear in order of preference. Each county can select recommendations for its Plan based upon its specific needs, opportunities, and existing infrastructure.

**Suggested Minimum Number of Recommendations to be Included in Plan**

	If County Population is	
	< 100,000	> 100,000
Organic Materials	optional	5

**Recommendation 1: Promote greenscaping and home management of yard waste**

Promote backyard composting programs with subsidized compost bin sales/workshops

**Recommendation 2: Evaluate anti-burning ordinances, bans, or regulations for yard waste**

Ensure compatibility with existing state regulations

**Recommendation 3: Promote development of adequate infrastructure and end market**

Attract food scrap composting facility to county

Develop wood chip recycling facilities

Encourage anaerobic digestion facilities

Create and/or further develop public drop-off locations for food scraps

**Recommendation 4: Evaluate voluntary vs. mandated food scrap composting programs**

Evaluate availability of collection infrastructure

Evaluate availability of processing infrastructure

**Recommendation 5: Encourage “Compost Ride-Along” programs**

Consider including collection of food waste along with landscape waste for curbside collection in hauler contracts

Consider if infrastructure is in place to support this service, for example, consider if yard waste sites can also accept food waste and seasonality of collections

**Recommendation 6: Consider clean-for-used food scrap container swap program**

Consider if possible for residential, commercial and industrial properties

**Recommendation 7: Develop opportunities for pre/post-consumer food recovery**

Work with restaurants, institutions, schools, groceries

Connect local food banks with large scale generators

**Recommendation 8: Promote use of certified end-market compost in landscaping projects**

Encourage adoption of specifications requiring compost use in land development and large-scale landscaping projects

Encourage incorporation of compost use as part of building and site plan review process for new development

Consider ordinances requiring local government projects to use certified end-market compost

**Recommendation 9: Sponsor seasonal composting events such as pumpkin collection and Christmas tree composting**



**Exhibit E-4**

**Recommendations for Non-Traditional Recycling**

Non-traditional recyclable materials are those special materials that are hard-to-recycle materials that are not collected curbside. These recommendations do not appear in order of preference. Each county can select recommendations for its Plan based upon its specific needs, opportunities, and existing infrastructure.

**Suggested Minimum Number of Recommendations to be Included in Plan**

	If County Population is	
	< 100,000	> 100,000
Non-Traditional Materials	optional	1

**Recommendation 1: Evaluate opportunities for collection sites**

Consider public or private sites to properly collect and manage tires, oil, other automotive fluids, textiles, scrap metal, polystyrene, carpet, and other difficult to recycle items.

Promote opportunities for the collection of single use and rechargeable batteries.

**Recommendation 2: Promote Construction and Demolition Recycling**

Promote LEED certified facilities, if available

Provide to public a list of C&D processing facilities updated yearly

Promote C&D recycling for local government facility projects

Promote ordinances to require C&D recycling - tied to building or demolition permits

**Recommendation 3: Sponsor One Day Events and/or Drop Off locations**

Promote one day events for Hard to Recycle materials

**Recommendation 4: Promote Electronic recycling**

Consider opting into the CERA program

Secure permanent drop off locations

Organize one-day events

**Recommendation 5: Promote reduction of and proper disposal of Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)**

Direct to an IEPA toolkit that would include prepared outreach materials on such things as: healthy alternative products, promoting reuse, promoting purchasing practice to find alternatives/reduce HHW

Access IEPA HHW event program information and apply for an event

Research feasibility for siting a partnership-based HHW facility

Secure permanent drop off locations

Sponsor one-day events/ Apply for IEPA HHW events

Evaluate options for home collection programs for HHW

**Recommendation 6: Promote Reuse/resale**

Consider entities like Goodwill or AmVets, both for-profit and nonprofit entities

Host or partner in conducting a repair workshop

**Recommendation 7: Promote Sharps and Medicine Take-Back Programs**

Encourage participation in the IEPA collection programs and /or DEA take-back programs to conduct at least one event per fiscal year

Secure take-back sites for sharps and/or medicine.

**Recommendation 8: Monitor legislative actions for advancement in special recycling efforts.**

## Exhibit F

### Education and Outreach

1. County Plans should include the following:
  - a. Links to IEPA Website containing education materials developed on a statewide level
  - b. List of resources
  - c. Local contact information
  - d. Comprehensive resource guide
  - e. Inventory of available infrastructure
  - f. Designated spokesperson/presenter to provide local, direct outreach, and public response
  
2. Counties may benefit from partnership with existing state and local organizations to ensure an understanding of existing waste minimization options. The following list is not exhaustive and does not endorse any particular organization; it is meant to be illustrative of groups with additional resources on waste, recycling, and composting activities in the State of Illinois:

[Illinois Food Scrap Coalition](#) (IFSC)

[Illinois Recycling Foundation](#) (IRF)

[Illinois Product Stewardship Council](#) (ILPSC)

[Illinois Counties Solid Waste Management Association](#) (ILCSWMA)

[Illinois Chapter of the Solid Waste Association of North America](#) (SWANA-IL)

[Seven Generation Ahead](#) (SGA)

[SCARCE](#) (School & Community Assistance for Recycling and Composting Education)

[Wasted Food Action Alliance](#) (WFAA)

3. Target Audiences should include the general public, business community, institutions, government entities and officials, and teachers and students.
  
4. Counties are encouraged to establish measurable outcomes for educational programs, such as
  - a. Website hits
  - b. Newsletter reach
  - c. Recovered Material quality
  - d. Questions received from constituents
  - e. Number of social media followers
  - f. Surveys to gauge engagement and awareness
  - g. Cart tagging/cart observations.
  
4. Counties should identify tools and methods to support outreach, such as
  - a. Videos
  - b. IEPA toolkit (to be developed as result of Education Committee recommendations)
  - c. School education programs
  - d. One-on-one educational outreach programs direct to communities with below-average diversion rates, low participation rates, and/or high contamination rates.

## Exhibit G

### Partnerships, Policy and Funding

#### (Inclusion in Plan is Optional)

1. Partnerships can be valuable tools to aid in the implementation of Plans. The following are suggestions for partnerships:

Suggestion 1: Explore working with municipalities and neighboring counties to develop municipal joint action agencies as allowed under Illinois law to jointly manage solid waste and recycling

Share research and data

Conduct joint planning

Joint contracting

Suggestion 2: Consider working with other communities to develop joint contracting such as

Collection agreements by intergovernmental agreement

Cross-jurisdictional recycling

Commercial/municipal franchise agreement

Suggestion 3: Develop partnerships for services and events

Regional drop-off locations

Community collection event

Expansion of commercial recycling

Educational programs

Suggestion 4: Pursue Green Business Program (not-for-profit) partnerships to assist businesses with waste diversion

Suggestion 5: Establish relationships and communication with municipal program coordinators to aid in strategy implementation

Suggestion 6: Consider creation of Citizens Advisory Committees to advise in drafting Plan Updates and strategy implementation

2. Policy initiatives can be valuable tools to aid in the implementation of Plans. The following are suggestions for policy initiatives.

Suggestion 1: Local Ordinances for data collection.

For example, the Kane County Recycling and Hauler Licensing Ordinance (95-157), requires licensed haulers to provide collection of recyclables from all residential and commercial accounts to which they provide waste service. The Ordinance also stipulates that Kane County annually license all waste and recycling haulers within the County, and specifies that annual hauler tonnage reports be completed. These hauler tonnage reports have historically provided the County with an understanding of waste and recycling tonnages by sector to ensure proper planning for collection and infrastructure needs. Hauler licensing also provides the County with insight into collection patterns and market conditions, as well as an opportunity to advance diversion efforts through direct hauler outreach. Follow link: [Kane County Hauler Licensing and Reporting Ordinance](#)

Suggestion 2: Local Ordinances to Support Recycling through access and/or requirement

Residential (single family and multi-family) recycling

Commercial, institutional, and industrial recycling  
Food scrap and organics recycling  
Set diversion goals that are stricter than the State's

Suggestion 3: Consider Waste Exports

Examine feasibility for waste exports  
Review reliance on out-of-county landfills, and explore options

Suggestion 4: Consider Emerging Technologies

Evaluate and consider alternative technologies for materials management

3. Funding mechanisms can be identified to aid in the implementation of Plans. The following are suggestions for funding sources.

Suggestion 1: Compile a list of potential financial resources, including but not limited to,

Fee-for-service programs - where residents pay for the recycling service offered (such as pay-per-pound battery recycling)

Bulk Collection fees - for one-day clean-ups of bulk items and white goods

Community recycling event fees - paid by sponsors, participating communities, stakeholders, or by residents (for example pay-per-car for confidential document shredding events)

Hauler contract license fees - as permitted by state-statute

Franchise contract fees - terms may be written into hauler contracts that require haulers to cover the costs of contract administration in accordance with the limitations established in state statute

Host community benefit/host fee - for siting of pollution control facilities

Suggestion 2: Grant opportunities to support Plan implementation

Grants offered periodically available from: Closed Loop Fund, USEPA, Dept. of Agriculture, Recycling Partnership, etc.

Suggestion 3: Work with existing economic development groups

Seek outside funding to expand Solid Waste and Recycling functions

Seek funding in whole or in part for cost of developing Plans

## **Motion to Adopt Recommendations to the General Assembly**

**Proposed Motion Language:** The Committee include in its report to the General Assembly the following diversion goals: 40 percent by 2025; 45 percent by 2030; and 50 percent by 2035.

**Summary of the Issue:** Illinois does not presently have established statewide diversion goals. Currently, the annualized statewide landfill diversion rate is 37 percent. During several Materials Management Advisory Committee meetings, there were discussions underscoring the need for numeric diversion goals. Based on the potential cumulative impact of other previously approved recommendations, the proposed goals are both ambitious and achievable.

**General Assembly Plan Element(s) Addressed:** 415 ILCS 15/4.5(j)(8)

---

### **Recordkeeping**

**Date of Consideration:**

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Resolution:**

**Votes in Favor:**

**Votes in Dissent:**

**Abstentions:**

## **Motion to Adopt Recommendations to the General Assembly**

**Proposed Motion Language:** The Committee include in its report to the General Assembly the stratified approach to materials to target for diversion that categorizes materials based on common infrastructure and end market characteristics.

**Summary of the Issue:** Numerous public and private entities have identified specific materials that should be targeted for diversion as part of their jurisdictional or organizational long-term planning. This type of planning has been employed to target plastics, food waste, and other significant volumetric contributors to the municipal solid waste stream. Such an approach can be effective, but does not necessarily accommodate changes in waste generation over time. To combat this, the Committee categorized each of the categories of municipal solid waste based on common impediments to diversion and identified strategies that have been successful to overcome those hurdles. The Committee proposes using this framework to holistically target the municipal solid waste stream in a manner that maximizes landfill diversion. Additional information related to this proposal is attached.

**General Assembly Plan Element(s) Addressed:** 415 ILCS 15/4.5(j)(5)

---

### **Recordkeeping**

**Date of Consideration:**

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Resolution:**

**Votes in Favor:**

**Votes in Dissent:**

**Abstentions:**

# Diversion strategies & Materials to target

# Working definitions

## Recycling markets:

Recycling markets are referred to customers that accept recyclables that are collected from the MSW stream.

For the purposes of this document, we only consider positive markets, i.e. where the buyer will pay for the materials.

## Collection programs:

Collection programs can and are different depending on geography, volume, material, and investments. Drop-off, curbside, and take backs are only some of the examples of collection programs. New programs are continuously being developed both in the private and public sector.

## Emerging materials:

Materials that have not had collection or recovery technologies as well as materials that are *growing*, *new* or *emerging* to the waste stream.

## Access:

Opt-in or opt-out curbside collection programs are considered access in densely populated regions. Access looks different based on the collection program that is appropriate for the region.

One day events that happen periodically and predictably they serve as reasonable access.

Drop-off sites that are widely promoted and accessible to the general public also serve as reasonable access.

## Material recovery facility (MRF)

A facility that sorts, processes, and bales different types of aggregated recyclables for sale to processors.

## Processing facilities:

Processing facilities can be seen as accepting directly from consumers/ generators (MRFs) but also intermediate facility that sends to further processing or *direct manufacturing*.

## Accepting facilities:

Mills, convertors, manufactures accepting post consumer/industrial materials AND actively converting these materials into new consumable products.



# Diversion Matrix

The matrix calculation uncovered four quadrants of materials to prioritize. Each with its own set of challenges, opportunities and set of strategies.

## Established programs Or Global Markets

Established collection programs  
Established infrastructure  
Markets and economics support infrastructure investment.  
Access to markets across the State

## Limited programs Regional Markets

Collection programs exist in some regions  
Infrastructure is growing to support commercial volumes  
Regional Markets do exist  
Limited statewide access

## Pilot programs Emerging Markets

Collection programs are being/have been piloted  
Processing infrastructure are not effectively accessed  
Markets are not mature (established)

## No programs presently exist Future Markets

Recovery technologies are not developed  
Infrastructure needs to be developed  
Market development required to be Economically Sustainable.

## **Established programs**

### **Global Markets**

Established collection programs

Established infrastructure

Established regional markets

Reasonable access across the State

### **Strategies:**

- Increased education on supporting recycling by buying recycled content
- Increased efficiency through contamination reduction
- Increased programing through local planning assistance

## Limited programs

## Regional Markets

Collection programs exist in some regions

Infrastructure is growing to support commercial volumes

Regional Markets do exist

Limited statewide access

## Strategies:

- Increase access through additional infrastructure and collection programs
- Support development of markets through purchasing recycled content.
- Innovate collection programs

## **Pilot programs**

## **Emerging Markets**

Collection programs are being/have been piloted

Processing infrastructure are not effectively accessed

Markets are not mature (established)

## **Strategies:**

- Engage and recruit technologies and programs to the state
- Market development
- Pilot and implement supplemental or alternative strategies for recovery

**No programs presently exist**

### **Future Markets**

Recovery technologies are not developed

Infrastructure needs to be developed

Market development required to be Economically Sustainable.

### **Strategies:**

- Engage and recruit researchers and innovators to identify recovery solutions
- Engage and recruit researchers, innovators, and manufacturers to identify alternative materials