

Residential Food Scrap Drop-Offs



Processing options:

- Permit exempt facilities
- Permitted sites
 - Farms
 - Community
 - Commercial

- Drop-Off Points:
- Transfer stations
- Fast trash
- Permitted compost sites
 Alternatives:
- Insignificant waste management event
- Draft rules (proposed drop-off sites

URBAN PARMA

On-Farm Composters:

- Permit exempt facilities (<100 yards per year total)
 - ~500 lbs/week or less food @ 1:5 ratio
- Small compost facility registration up to

Program Type	Measurable Metric	Capture Factor to Get to Tons per Week	Notes
Municipal curbside collection—voluntary ^a	# of households	(# of Households) × (6.6 Lbs. per Household per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Actual generation in the study was measured at 7.4 Lbs. per Household per Week, but there was a slightly lower capture rate. This was a voluntary pilot. There may have been some weight loss due to evaporation prior to collection.
Curbside collection— nationwide averages ^b	# of households	(# of Households) × (7–9 Lbs. per Household per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Reported from a national survey of collection services, including a mix of private and contracted commercial haulers, as well as some municipal haulers.
Curbside collection— well established ^b	# of households	(# of Households) × (Up to 12 Lbs. per Household per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Reported from well-established residential collection programs that continued to invest in significant outreach and education.
Bicycle collection ^c	# of households	(# of Households) × (8.5 Lbs. per Household per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Program in Austin, Texas, includes collection of all organics, but does not include meat or dairy (26% according to one study—Wrap, 2016).
Food scrap drop-off⁵	# of households	(# of Households) × (3–4 Lbs. per Household per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Note this is based on the number of households participating in the program, not the number of households in the community. Higher rates are likely possible over time.
Food scrap drop-off (low participation) ^d	Participating region population	(Population) × (0.01–0.05 Lbs. per Person per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Assuming generation of 8 Lbs. per Household, this corresponds to a \leq 1% capture rate. Representative of start-up period.
Food scrap drop-off (medium participation) ^d	Participating region population	(Population) × (0.050–0.099 PLbs. per Person per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Assuming generation of 8 Lbs. per Household, this corresponds to a 1–3% capture rate. Representative of start-up to first couple of years.
Food scrap drop-off (high participation) ^d	Participating region population	(Population) × (0.100–0.199 Lbs. per Person per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Assuming generation of 8 Lbs. per Household, this corresponds to a 3–6% capture rate. Representative of an established and successful program.
Food scrap drop-off (very high participation) ^d	Participating region population	(Population) × (0.20–0.28 Lbs. per Person per Week) ÷ (2,000 Lbs. per Ton)	Assuming generation of 8 Lbs. per Household, this corresponds to a 6–8% capture rate. Representative of an established and very successful program. Higher rates may be possible

Table 12.2. Residential Food Scrap Capture

Source: Adapted from James McSweeney and Brenda Platt, *Micro Composting: A Guide to Small Scale and On-Site Food Scrap Composting Systems* (Washington, DC: Institute for Local Self-Reliance, forthcoming), courtesy of the Institute for Local Self-Reliance.

with additional resources and/or policies.

^a Randy Mail and Everett Hoffman, "Curbside Organics Collection From Residents: Phase 2 Report," City of Cambridge: Department of Public Works, 2015, 21, https://www.cambridgema.gov/~/media/Files/publicworksdepartment /recyclingandrubbish/PDFs/2015%20Cambridge%20Curbside%20Organics%20Phase%202%20Report.ashx?la=en

^b Juri Freeman and Lisa Skumatz, "Best Management Practices in Food Scraps Programs," Econservation Institute for US EPA Region 5, 6, 25, http://www.foodscrapsrecovery.com/EPA_FoodWasteReport_EI_Region5_v11_Final.pdf

^c Dustin Fedako, email to author, 2016.

^d Compost Technical Services LLC., unpublished survey, 2017.

Population	Low	Medium	High	Very High
800	40	79.2	152	224
1200	60	118.8	228	336
1600	80	158.4	304	448
2000	100	198	380	560
3000	150	297	570	840

*Permit



Samuel Street, or

and the state of t

Functional Elements:

- Good containers
 - \checkmark Kitchen countertop
 - ✓ Larger vessel
- Education
 - ✓ Training
 - ✓ Monitors
 - ✓ Getting over ick factor
- Economic Incentives ✓ Who pays?

