


Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #1:

All CAP governments ban single use plastics, including water bottles, straws, lids and utensils.

### Description:

Plastics production continues to grow largely due to our reliance on single use plastics. Single use plastics, used just once and then discarded, are estimated to account for about half of all plastics produced. Plastics are made from fossil fuels and the energy used to manufacture them is mostly fossil fuels. For that reason, single-use plastics are a primary contributor of greenhouse gas. Plastics are also known to contain chemicals that are harmful to human health and the environment. The most recent waste audit performed in Routt County in 2017 reported that approximately 14% of municipal solid waste going to the Routt County landfill is plastic. Banning the distribution of single-use plastics in our communities will help reduce consumption of these materials. Several of our peer mountain communities are leading the way, which provides the benefit of learning from their experiences.

### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.





## Partners:

Yampa Valley Sustainability Council, Restaurant Association, Yampa Valley Medical Center, Colorado Mountain College, event coordinators and producers, durable vendors, processing facilities, Steamboat Ski Resort (SSRC), schools, and lodging accommodations.

## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Determine list of stakeholders (both internal and external).
- 2) Review similar ordinances from other locations and existing ordinances that may conflict.
- 3) Create a draft of the proposed ordinance (revised or new).
- 4) Consider a phased implementation.
- 5) Convene stakeholders to discuss and refine draft ordinance.
- 6) Perform public outreach for feedback.
- 7) Create the final proposed ordinance.
- 8) Present to elected officials for vote and adoption.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to two (2) years.

## Cost Estimate:

\$50K to \$200K (staff time and materials to develop and implement).

## Potential Funding Sources:

N/A

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: M

Notes/Assumptions: High fossil fuel use in plastic production.

Co-benefits: M




Notes/Assumptions: Energy savings, wildlife, oceans and landfills benefit.
Implementation Cost: L
Notes/Assumptions: Business savings.
Political Barriers: M
Notes/Assumptions: Some businesses may oppose.
Ease of Implementation: M
Notes/Assumptions: Telluride, Breckenridge and other ordinances as examples.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS1 A4. Adopt specific programs, policies, and codes to limit or eliminate the availability of certain products that will significantly advance progress towards waste reduction goals.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #2:

Require contracted residential hauling for trash and recycling in all CAP government jurisdictions.

### Description:

Contracted residential hauling for trash and recycling is commonplace in communities throughout the US and Colorado, including Routt County’s Hayden and Oak Creek. This strategy is proven to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by taking trucks off the road, reducing vehicle miles traveled. It reduces wear and tear on local roads, making them last longer, which reduces fossil fuel use. Residents in neighborhoods with contracted residential hauling report visual benefits from trash being curbside only one day a week and reduced truck traffic through neighborhoods. The bidding process provides an opportunity for communities to create contracts with competitive rates and terms and conditions that incentivize waste reduction and diversion. Hauler contracts provide a concise pathway for consistent recycling and compost education and outreach.

### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.





## Partners:

Waste haulers, Yampa Valley Sustainability Council, HOAs, and management companies.

## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Look at other curbside residential models like Hayden, Oak Creek, and Carbondale.
- 2) Determine the best framework for our region.
- 3) Require hauler licensing.
- 4) Consider districting.
- 5) Convene stakeholders.
- 6) Determine the bidding process.
- 7) Publish requests for proposals (RFP) with clear terms.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to three (3) years.

## Cost Estimate:

Zero to \$200K for (initial development and implementation).

## Potential Funding Sources:

CAP governments, Recycling Resources Economic Opportunity (RREO) program, EPA Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction (SSM) funding.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H

Notes/Assumptions: Significant reductions due to reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increased waste reduction and diversion.

Co-benefits: H

Notes/Assumptions: Reduced wear and tear on roads, less traffic. Better rates for consumers.




Efficient route for haulers. Visual benefits to having consistent days for pickup. Enables consistent education and outreach.
Implementation Cost: L  Notes/Assumptions: Staff time to develop and implement ordinance. Cost savings for haulers, consumers and Road and Bridge.
Political Barriers: H  Notes/Assumptions: Haulers and some consumers may oppose.
Ease of Implementation: H  Notes/Assumptions: Hayden and Oak Creek already have this. Look to similar ordinances elsewhere, like Carbondale.

**CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS1 A5. Develop a county-wide approach to waste management, data collection, and reporting.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

### Waste Working Group Recommended Action #3:

All CAP governments require residential volume based pricing for trash services in their jurisdictions.

#### Description:

Residential volume based pricing, also known as pay-as-you-throw (PAYT), is the most common strategy used by communities to increase residential recycling and composting rates. Volume based pricing is common in Colorado, so there are many successful programs to follow as examples. This strategy involves variable pricing based on the amount of trash residents generate. Those who generate the least amount of waste pay less, providing a direct financial incentive to reduce trash and to recycle and compost more. Volume based pricing is a top recommendation of the 2022 City of Steamboat Springs Recycling Study to boost recycling rates. This system is known to create equity in comparison to single rate systems because in single rate systems those who generate less trash subsidize rates for those who generate more.

#### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.



## Partners:

Waste, recycling and compost haulers, and processing facilities.

## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Determine list of stakeholders (both internal and external).
- 2) Review similar ordinances from other locations and existing ordinances that may conflict.
- 3) Create a draft of proposed ordinance.
- 4) Convene stakeholders to discuss and refine draft ordinance.
- 5) Perform public outreach for feedback.
- 6) Create final proposed ordinance.
- 7) Present to elected officials for vote and adoption.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to two (2) years.

## Cost Estimate:

\$1.4K to \$1.5K cost to haulers, and 0.2 to 0.3 FTE depending on the size of the implementing entity.

## Potential Funding Sources:

RREO, EPA SSM funding.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H

Notes/Assumptions: The most effective strategy to significantly increase residential diversion rates. Must include strategies to prevent contamination.

Co-benefits: H





Notes/Assumptions: Financial incentive to recycle more. More equitable. Potential cost savings for those who generate less trash.

Implementation Cost: M

Notes/Assumptions: Costs for variable sized trash bins with costs increasing as bin size increases. (Other less common systems are colored bags and reduced trash pickup frequencies.)

Political Barriers: M

Notes/Assumptions: Haulers and those who don't recycle may oppose.


Ease of Implementation: M

Notes/Assumptions: Lots of examples of programs throughout Colorado and the US.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A3 T2. Identify recycling opportunities, needs, and gaps and create a comprehensive recycling plan.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #4:

Require that all takeout materials in municipalities be zero waste.

### Description:

Food and packaging containers are estimated to be about 45% of materials landfilled in the US. Given our tourist economy and large number of events, it is reasonable to estimate that Routt County's rate is at least as high, and possibly higher, than the national average. Therefore, ensuring that takeout materials are zero waste (recyclable, compostable, reusable) is an effective strategy to reduce the amount of material disposed of in the landfill.

### Lead Implementer(s):

Municipalities.

### Partners:

Restaurant association and restaurants, durables vendors, processing facilities, YVSC.

### Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Determine list of stakeholders (both internal and external).



- 2) Review similar ordinances from other locations and existing ordinances that may conflict.
- 3) Create a draft of the proposed ordinance.
- 4) Consider a phased approach.
- 5) Convene stakeholders to discuss and refine draft ordinance.
- 6) Perform public outreach for feedback.
- 7) Create the final proposed ordinance.
- 8) Present to elected officials for vote and adoption.

### **Timeframe to Begin Implementation:**

Immediately (0) to two (2) years.

### **Cost Estimate:**

\$30 to \$200K for staff time and \$30K for materials (to start).

### **Potential Funding Sources:**

RREO, EPA SMM, landfill tip fees, bag fees.

### **Assessment:**

<p>Greenhouse Gas Potential: M</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Assumes significant amount of material from takeout. Assumes alternatives have a lower total carbon footprint.</p>
<p>Co-benefits: L</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Innovations and education. Would need to address PFAS in compostables.</p>
<p>Implementation Cost: L</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Potential for added cost to business and consumer.</p>
<p>Political Barriers: L</p>



Notes/Assumptions: Restaurant and/or public resistance.


Ease of Implementation: H

Notes/Assumptions: Ordinance.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A1. Adopt zero waste policies and incentivize zero-waste for events and facilities.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #5:

Revise municipal codes/design standards to include hydration stations in commercial buildings and public spaces.

### Description:

Revise municipal codes to include hydration stations in high traffic public buildings and public spaces so that residents and visitors have access to water for refillable water bottles. It's estimated that approximately 85% of water bottles end up in landfills, so using refillables instead will help to reduce overall waste, thereby reducing GHG emissions.

### Lead Implementer(s):

Building departments and municipalities.

### Partners:

Yampa Valley Sustainability Council, private businesses, public works, builders/commercial developers.

### Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Convene stakeholders.



- 2) Revise code.
- 3) Base criteria on the number of people using the building.
- 4) Include lodging, high traffic commercial, public building.
- 5) Incentivize other private industries.

### Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0).

### Cost Estimate:

\$1K to \$1.5K for stations, code revisions already happening.

### Potential Funding Sources:

N/A (assumes water fountains are already required).

### Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: L Notes/Assumptions: Reduces need for single use plastic water bottles.
Co-benefits: M Notes/Assumptions: Could significantly reduce trash volumes in public locations.
Implementation Cost: M Notes/Assumptions: Cost of hydration stations are likely to exceed those for water fountains.
Political Barriers: L Notes/Assumptions: None anticipated.
Ease of Implementation: M Notes/Assumptions: Code revision.






## **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A2 T4. Create model code.

WS2 A2 T5. Develop necessary infrastructure to support selected recycling program.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #6:

Establish a Community Recycling Center for collection of:

- traditional recyclables
- hard to recycle materials
- household hazardous waste
- C&D materials (bricks, dimensional lumber, windows, fixtures, doors, etc.)
- organics (food and yard waste).

Include satellite drop sites for recyclables.

### Description:

There is currently no public infrastructure for waste or recycling in Routt County. Since waste management is a utility, a need similar to water and electricity, most counties and/or municipalities throughout Colorado and the US support waste diversion and recycling through public infrastructure. Because Routt County relies solely on private infrastructure, the community is vulnerable to disruptions and lacks consistent outlets for material diversion. A recycling facility is needed to properly divert materials, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect human health and the environment. Drop-off collection of traditional recyclables is recommended in the 2022 City of Steamboat Springs Recycling Study. It was also identified as a preferred pathway for rural CO recycling in EcoCycle’s Baseline Waste Diversion Assessment. Without outlets for proper diversion and recycling these materials end up in landfills, or worse, being dumped in the natural environment. One benefit of drop-off recycling is that







contamination is managed through source separation and site supervision. Source separated materials are cleaner and are more likely to go towards their highest and best use, resulting in greater GHG emission reductions.

### **Lead Implementer(s):**

CAP governments, YVSC (?).

### **Partners:**

Businesses, community, destination facilities, haulers and processors.

### **Implementation Needs & Next Steps:**

- 1) Identify stakeholders.
- 2) Review feasibility study.
- 3) Determine who manages or operates.
- 4) Locate and secure a site(s).
- 5) Consider adding staffed satellite drop sites.
- 6) Identify funding.

### **Timeframe to Begin Implementation:**

Immediately (0).

### **Cost Estimate:**

TBD - feasibility study pending.

### **Potential Funding Sources:**

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), SWIFR, RREO, EPA SSM, landfill tip fees, bag fees.



## Assessment:

<p>Greenhouse Gas Potential: H</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Would allow for reuse and recycling, thereby decreasing GHG emissions. Cleaner materials from source separation leads to greater GHG emission reductions. Outlet for proper treatment of hazardous materials.</p>
<p>Co-benefits: H</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Community resource. Human health and environmental benefits.</p>
<p>Implementation Cost: M</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Site and operation costs.</p>
<p>Political Barriers: L</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Needed.</p>
<p>Ease of Implementation: M</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Pilot already exists.</p>

## CAP Strategy and Action:

WS1 A1 T4. Implement identified strategies for waste diversion (e.g., curbside recycling, organics recovery, business waste diversion, C&D, transfer station, education & events).


WS1 A2. Develop or expand community-wide organics recycling programs, infrastructure and facilities. Work towards making composting equally accessible throughout the community.

WS1 A7. Develop a construction and demolition diversion program.

WS2 A2 T6. Increase opportunities to recycle & properly dispose of hard-to-recycle and household hazardous waste items in the County.

WS2 A3 T2. Identify recycling opportunities, needs, and gaps and create a comprehensive recycling plan.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #7:

Support compost programs, including yard waste, and ensure composting is accessible to all CAP government jurisdictions.

### Description:

Composting organic materials is a necessary action to reach Routt County’s waste diversion targets, as recycling alone will not be enough. It is estimated that with the addition of composting, Routt County’s waste diversion rate could double. The most recent waste audit performed in Routt County in 2017 found that organics make up about 25% of MSW going to the landfill with as much as 40% organics reported in neighboring communities. There are currently two compost operations serving Routt County and participation is limited, due in part to cost. According to the Routt County Organics Recovery Study, composting will require government support to make it successful. A 2022 life cycle assessment performed by EREF found that curbside collection of organics negates the GHG benefits of composting, so drop-off collection of organics is preferred to gain the greatest GHG emission reductions. Composting is most effective as a GHG reduction strategy when materials are processed close to their source and when finished compost is used locally to enhance soils.

### Lead Implementer(s):

Compost haulers and processors, CAP governments.



## Partners:

Businesses and residents, end market users.

## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Perform stakeholder outreach.
- 2) Consider existing facilities.
- 3) Consider distributed composting.
- 4) Incentivize participation.
- 5) Consider a landfill ban on food and yard waste or mandatory organics collection.
- 6) Government to provide drop off locations (per organics study).
- 7) Ensure all compost operations are properly permitted with oversight.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediate (started but needs more work to make it accessible to all).

## Cost Estimate:

\$5 to \$75K for staff time and materials.

## Potential Funding Sources:

RREO, SWIFR, EPA SSM, landfill tip fees, bag fees.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H

Notes/Assumptions: Significant methane emission reductions. Drop off preferred to gain the greatest GHG benefits.

Co-benefits: H

Notes/Assumptions: Soil health.




Implementation Cost: M Notes/Assumptions: Facility and drop-off infrastructure.
Political Barriers: L Notes/Assumptions: General support.
Ease of Implementation: H Notes/Assumptions: Comparably simple programs and infrastructure.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS1 A2. Develop or expand community-wide organics recycling programs, infrastructure and facilities. Work towards making composting equally accessible throughout the community.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #8:

Require that all permitted events in CAP government jurisdictions be zero waste.

### Description:

As a tourist destination, Routt County and Steamboat Springs in particular, permit many events. Events tend to produce significant amounts of waste, most of which is landfilled. Requiring events to be zero waste is a GHG reduction strategy and a good way to educate the community and visitors about waste reduction. Currently the City of Steamboat Springs provides a monetary reimbursement for event zero waste costs as an incentive. A small portion of events choose to go this route. The next step is to require that all permitted events be zero waste.

### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.

### Partners:

Event producers, processors and haulers, durable vendors.



## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Permit events (explore which events).
- 2) Look to other programs.
- 3) Develop program criteria with minimum standards and verification.
- 4) Consider whether variances are appropriate.
- 5) Incentivize/ enforce.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to one (1) year depending on the municipality.

## Cost Estimate:

\$5K to \$20K.

## Potential Funding Sources:

Bag fees are currently used (should explore whether this is the best use of those fees by looking at impacts per dollar spent).

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: M
Notes/Assumptions: Decent waste generation at events - tourists economy.
Co-benefits: H
Notes/Assumptions: Education.
Implementation Cost: L
Notes/Assumptions: Eventual reduced costs for vendor materials.
Political Barriers: L



Notes/Assumptions: Events producers generally like this.

Ease of Implementation: M


Notes/Assumptions: Need ZW vendors or program plans.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A1. Adopt zero waste policies and incentivize zero-waste for events and facilities.





Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #9:

All CAP governments require commercial and multi-family unit recycling in their jurisdictions.

### Description:

In order to reach Routt County’s CAP waste targets, all entities will need to recycle and compost, including businesses and multi-family unit (MFU) properties. Currently many of these entities do not recycle because of costs, inadequate enclosures, and space constraints. The City of Steamboat Springs passed an ordinance in 2023 requiring that businesses and MFUs recycle. However, the 2022 City of Steamboat Springs Recycling Study projects that even with required business and MFU recycling, the City will only reach 25% waste diverted, well below the target of 48% by 2030 and 85% by 2050. Routt County will need all entities countywide to participate to have any chance of meeting these targets.

### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.

### Partners:

Haulers, MFUs and businesses, HOAs, processing facilities, resort management, Chamber, Main Street.



## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Determine list of stakeholders (both internal and external).
- 2) Review similar ordinances from other locations and existing ordinances that may conflict (including current City of Steamboat Springs ordinance).
- 3) Create a draft of the proposed ordinance (revised or new).
- 4) Consider hiring a consultant to help prepare ordinance.
- 5) Convene stakeholders to discuss and refine draft ordinance.
- 6) Perform public outreach for feedback.
- 7) Create the final proposed ordinance.
- 8) Present to elected officials for vote and adoption.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to three (3) years.

## Cost Estimate:

.2 to 1 FTE for governments, or \$20K to \$50K for consultant.

## Potential Funding Sources:

Bag fees, landfill tip fees.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H Notes/Assumptions: Business waste significant.
Co-benefits: H Notes/Assumptions: Education.
Implementation Cost: M Notes/Assumptions: Programs already exist locally.



Political Barriers: M

Notes/Assumptions: Some MFU and business resistance.


Ease of Implementation: H

Notes/Assumptions: Already exists in City of Steamboat Springs.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A2 A3. Create partnerships.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #10:

Require Construction & Demolition (C&D) diversion at all construction sites in Routt County.

### Description:

It is estimated that construction and demolition (C&D) waste comprises 25% to as much as 50% of all material disposed in the landfill. These materials have some of the highest embodied carbon of all materials being landfilled. Therefore reuse of construction materials, in lieu of using new materials, is a highly effective way to reduce GHG emissions. Material recovery through deconstruction is a relatively new method being used in some areas of Colorado, such as Pitkin and Boulder counties. Deconstruction and construction material reuse creates valuable jobs as it decreases GHG emissions.

### Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments, planning and building departments.

### Partners:

Event contractors, end-users, material haulers, end markets for materials, deconstruction companies.



## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Convene stakeholders.
- 2) Require C&D data reporting from haulers.
- 3) Review available data (Recycle CO toolkit).
- 4) Ensure markets exist to divert C&D.
- 5) Revise code to require C&D diversion at construction sites (see Pitkin and Boulder counties).
- 6) Consider a phased implementation with discounted fee structure for sites with diversion and incentives for using reclaimed materials in construction.
- 7) Incentivize C&D diversion through landfill disposal fee structure (see Pitkin and Eagle Counties).

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to develop end markets and one (1) to three (3) years to fully develop program.

## Cost Estimate:

\$25K to \$2M depending on the infrastructure.

## Potential Funding Sources:

RREO, EPA SMM, SWIFR, landfill tip fees.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H
Notes/Assumptions: Large amount of waste going to landfill. Assumes that outlets for materials exist or will exist.
Co-benefits: H
Notes/Assumptions: Reuse.
Implementation Cost: M



Notes/Assumptions: Expand facilities and end markets.

Political Barriers: L

Notes/Assumptions: Good practices.


Ease of Implementation: M

Notes/Assumptions: Additional infrastructure needed to support the program.

### **CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS1 A7. Develop a construction and demolition diversion program.



Sector	CAP Strategies
 <b>Waste</b>	WS1. Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfill.
	WS2. Increase diversion.
	WS3. Support waste reduction initiatives at the state level.

Highlighted boxes show which CAP Strategies are implemented by CAP recommended Action.

## Waste Working Group Recommended Action #11:

Establish a regional materials recovery facility (MRF) or transfer station for commingled recyclables that is accessible to all in Routt County.

### Description:

Recyclables collected residentially in Routt County are commingled and thus require separation at a materials recovery facility (MRF). There is one MRF located in Routt County and one transfer station that loads materials for transfer to a Denver-based MRF. Both the MRF and transfer station are privately owned and usually do not accept materials from other haulers. This creates vulnerabilities for the region since all curbside collection is commingled and no publicly accessible MRF or transfer facility exists. Sorting materials locally reduces GHG emissions from transportation and creates local jobs. A publicly owned regional facility could potentially serve Moffat, Grand and Rio Blanco counties, which lack MRF infrastructure. Alternatively, a publicly owned transfer station could facilitate transportation of materials to Eagle County’s publicly owned MRF, which is free to users and dual-stream. A benefit of a transfer station is that it could accommodate transfer of all sorts of materials, including source separated, hard to recycle, and trash. This could help alleviate the vulnerabilities of having no publicly owned waste management infrastructure in Routt County. There are currently significant sources of funding available for publicly owned MRF and transfer station infrastructure.



## Lead Implementer(s):

CAP governments.

## Partners:

Haulers, YVSC, end markets, D&D, Axis Steel.

## Implementation Needs & Next Steps:

- 1) Identify stakeholders.
- 2) Review feasibility study.
- 3) Determine who manages or operates.
- 4) Locate and secure a site(s).
- 5) Consider public purchase of existing infrastructure.
- 6) Identify funding.
- 7) Apply for any grants.
- 8) Permit and buildout facility.

## Timeframe to Begin Implementation:

Immediately (0) to five (5) years - start planning now for upcoming grant opportunities.

## Cost Estimate:

\$3M to \$15M.

## Potential Funding Sources:

EPR, SWIFR, RREO, Recycling Partnership.

## Assessment:

Greenhouse Gas Potential: H

Notes/Assumptions: Reduced hauling to front range for processing. More local control.





<p>Co-benefits: H</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Local control over contamination. Serve the region. Create jobs. Help spur local end market development.</p>
<p>Implementation Cost: H</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Expensive facility.</p>
<p>Political Barriers: M</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Private haulers/processors may oppose.</p>
<p>Ease of Implementation: M</p> <p>Notes/Assumptions: Many other models to look to. EPR could help.</p>

**CAP Strategy and Action:**

WS2 A2. Ensure that residents, businesses, and organizations have access to affordable recycling in order to reduce their waste footprint.