## Appendix U PWCS Results Without Bulk Items

## PWCS Results Without Bulk Items

The protocol for the PWCS included the collection of any bulk waste that was part of a randomly collected sample of refuse and recycling materials. Bulk waste was defined as any item too large to fit into a 96 -gallon toter. When a bulk item was part of a sample, it was weighed and the weight and a description of the item was recorded by the Sample Manager on the Sample Management Form (see Appendix N).

In compiling the results of the PWCS, the Data Manager assigned the weight of the bulk item(s) recorded on the Sample Management Form to one of the existing material categories. For example, the weight of a mattress recorded as a bulk item in a refuse sample would be included in "Other Textiles." The weight of an air conditioner recorded as a bulk item in an MGP sample would be included in "Small Appliances and Other Electronics."

Of the 403 samples sorted for the PWCS, 93 included bulk items with a total weight of 2,158.60 pounds. Table AU-1 lists the bulk items included in the PWCS results, their weight, and the material category to which they were assigned.

Table AU-1
Bulk Items

| Bulk Item | Total Bulk <br> Weight | Category |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mattress | 76.00 | Non-Clothing Textiles |
| Fiberglass Insulation | 11.00 | Fiberglass Insulation |
| C\&D Wood | 3.50 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| Plywood | 43.00 | Other C\&D Debris |
| Tree Limb | 25.70 | Stumps/Limbs |
| Leather Suitcase | 13.70 | Other Leather Products |
| C\&D Wood - Treated | 18.00 | Treated/Contaminated Wood |
| Film Plastic - Tarp | 10.00 | Other Film |
| Baby Stroller | 19.00 | Mixed Metals |
| Vacuum Cleaner | 13.50 | Small Appliances |
| Baby Stroller - Metal | 11.10 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Chair - Ferrous | 6.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Mattress | 19.45 | Non-Clothing Textiles |
| Wood - C\&D | 17.50 | Other C\&D Debris |
| Plastic Fan | 3.70 | Other Plastics Materials |
| Plastic Broom Handle | 9.10 | Other Plastics Materials |
| Foam Pad (Egg Type) | 2.80 | Miscellaneous Inorganics |
| C\&D - Wood | 11.00 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| Prunings | 23.00 | Prunings |
| Contaminated Wood | 20.00 | Treated/Contaminated Wood |
| HDPE Colored Container | 7.40 | HDPE Colored Bottles |
|  |  |  |

Table AU-1
Bulk Items

| Bulk Item | Total Bulk Weight | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child Car Seat | 9.40 | Other Plastics Materials |
| Computer | 21.10 | Other Computer Equip. |
| Plastic Broom/Mop Handles | 7.00 | Other Plastics Materials |
| C\&D Wood | 12.60 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| Mattress | 42.40 | Non-Clothing Textiles |
| Vacuum Cleaner Part - Plastic | 3.60 | Other Plastics Materials |
| Spring Mattress (Cloth Covered) | 38.50 | Non-Clothing Textiles |
| Cloth Covered Sofa Seat Pads (Foam Core) | 8.90 | Non-clothing Textiles |
| Wood Paneling (Non C\&D) | 4.30 | Miscellaneous Organics |
| Wood C\&D | 4.00 | Other C\&D Debris |
| C\&D Wood | 9.80 | Treated/Contaminated Wood |
| C\&D Wood | 16.80 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| Treated Wood - C\&D | 33.40 | Treated/Contaminated Wood |
| Steel Hand-Cart | 11.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Lawn Mower | 10.10 | Mixed Metals |
| C\&D Wood | 5.40 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| HDPE Container | 22.60 | HDPE Colored Bottles |
| C\&D Wood | 19.20 | Other C\&D Debris |
| Tree Stumps | 13.70 | Stumps/Limbs |
| Tree Branches | 30.30 | Stumps/Limbs |
| Carpet | 16.40 | Carpet/Upholstery |
| Metal Bed Frame | 4.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 30.00 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| Carpet | 34.30 | Carpet/Upholstery |
| Tree Cuttings | 11.40 | Prunings |
| Carpet | 12.20 | Carpet/Upholstery |
| Radio Speaker | 18.30 | Mixed Metals |
| OCC | 15.60 | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |
| C\&D Wood | 8.80 | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 11.10 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| Radio | 13.65 | Audio/Visual Equipment |
| Foam Couch Cushion | 5.60 | Non-Clothing Textiles |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 11.60 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 12.60 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 38.40 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| VCR | 8.50 | Audio/Visual Equipment |
| Tubular Metal Chair | 12.00 | Mixed Metals |
| Wood, Non C\&D | 10.20 | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |
| Refuse Subtotal | 963.20 |  |

Table AU-1
Bulk Items

| Bulk Item | Total Bulk <br> Weight | Category |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Metal Range Hood | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Cart, Plastic Wheels | 9.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Microwave Oven | 16.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Folding Chair | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Electric Fan (15") | 8.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Bed Frame | 21.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Bicycle Wheels | 8.00 | Rubber |
| Metal Cabinet | 23.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal + Plastic Chair | 16.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Microwave | 26.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Office Chair | 20.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bar | 8.00 | Mixed Metal |
| Metal Pipes | 22.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Frame | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Frame | 44.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Heater | 14.00 | Small Appliances |
| Stove | 96.10 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Bars | 15.00 | Mixed Metal |
| Metal Frame | 9.00 | Mixed Metal |
| Air Conditioner | 25.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Chair Piece | 9.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bed Frame | 18.20 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Chair | 6.30 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Cabinet | 22.30 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Baby Stroller | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Cabinet | 5.50 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Baby Stroller | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Stove Top | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bed Frame | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Pipe | 6.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bed Frame | 19.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Air Conditioner | 35.00 | Small Appliances |
| 2 Metal Bed Frames | 20.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Plastic Vacuum Cleaner | 10.00 | Othall Appliances |
| Metal Curtain Rod | 8.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bed Frame | Other Ferrous |  |
| Metal Stove Top | Other Ferrous |  |
| Metal Stove Top |  |  |
| Refrigerator Door |  |  |

Table AU-1
Bulk Items

| Bulk Item | Total Bulk <br> Weight | Category |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Metal Chair | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Shelf | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Plastic Vacuum Cleaner Bottom | 8.00 | Small Appliances |
| Air Conditioner | 66.00 | Small Appliances |
| Washing Machine (Part) | 80.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Appliance Cover | 5.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Air Conditioner | 48.00 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Container | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Bed Frame | 7.50 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Pan | 5.50 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Chair | 7.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Ceiling Fan - Parts | 14.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Container | 12.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Dishwasher Or Similar Appliance | 71.00 | Small Appliances |
| Refrigerator Door | 10.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal Cabinet | 13.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Child's Bicycle | 28.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Canister Vacuum - Plastic + Metal | 12.00 | Small Appliances |
| Microwave Oven | 31.50 | Small Appliances |
| Metal Frame | 4.50 | Other Ferrous |
| Freezer Door (Part) | 17.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Freezer Door (Part) | 21.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Metal File Drawer | 15.00 | Other Ferrous |
| Steel Pipes | 22.00 | Other Ferrous |
| MGP Subtotal | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 5 . 4 0}$ |  |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 8 . 6 0}$ |  |
|  |  |  |

Bulk items accounted for 2.06 percent of the Refuse Sort and 10.77 percent of the MGP Sort. There were no bulk items in the Paper Samples.
The detailed results of the PWCS Refuse Sort without bulk items are shown in Table AU-2. The 59 bulk items in the Refuse Sort weighed a total of 983.2 pounds. The detailed results of the PWCS Refuse Sort including bulk items are presented in Table 6-2 of the PWCS Report.

Table AU-2
Detailed Results of the PWCS Refuse Sort without Bulk

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Refuse Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Refuse Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 3.77\% | 2,200.83 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 1.34\% | 782.81 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 0.69\% | 405.55 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 7.48\% | 4,366.02 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 0.23\% | 135.75 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 0.19\% | 110.56 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.61\% | 356.74 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 0.47\% | 277.37 | R | R Bev Cartons |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 7.63\% | 4,456.14 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.52\% | 304.71 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 0.66\% | 387.59 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 0.34\% | 198.50 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 0.66\% | 384.72 | R | $R$ Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 0.31\% | 182.59 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles Other Rigid | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 0.39\% | 226.54 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.03\% | 15.88 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.08\% | 47.94 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.01\% | 7.88 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.01\% | 8.39 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.23\% | 132.29 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.07\% | 40.86 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.07\% | 41.93 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.16\% | 95.01 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.71\% | 413.31 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 0.62\% | 361.88 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 2.85\% | 1,663.76 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film Other Rigid | Other Film <br> Plastic Crates and Soda Bottle |  | 5.29\% | 3,087.73 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Carriers |  | 0.06\% | 35.86 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single-Use Food Svc |  | 0.79\% | 462.44 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single Use Cameras |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Plastics |

Table AU-2
Detailed Results of the PWCS Refuse Sort without Bulk

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Refuse Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Refuse Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Disposable Razors |  | 0.01\% | 4.22 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Other Plastics Materials |  | 1.62\% | 948.00 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Deposit | 0.29\% | 168.20 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Non-Deposit | 1.02\% | 595.05 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Deposit | 0.15\% | 88.78 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.17\% | 96.41 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Deposit | 0.27\% | 156.69 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.06\% | 34.25 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Mixed Cullet | Mixed Cullet |  | 0.51\% | 298.50 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Other Glass | Other Glass |  | 0.20\% | 119.31 | PR | PR_Glass |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Deposit | 0.17\% | 102.10 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Non-Deposit | 0.03\% | 15.99 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Foil/Tins |  | 0.61\% | 356.46 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Other Aluminum |  | 0.05\% | 27.84 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Other Non-Ferrous |  | 0.06\% | 37.94 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Tin Food Cans |  | 0.93\% | 543.04 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Empty Aerosol Cans |  | 0.13\% | 73.23 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Other Ferrous |  | 0.98\% | 574.45 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Mixed Metals |  | 0.42\% | 247.96 | R | R Metal |
| Organic | Yard | Leaves and Grass |  | 6.39\% | 3,730.62 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Yard | Prunings |  | 3.03\% | 1,769.47 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Stumps/Limbs |  | 0.55\% | 320.35 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Food | Food |  | 16.28\% | 9,506.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |  | 0.14\% | 83.05 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Non-Clothing Textiles |  | 1.73\% | 1,008.48 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Clothing Textiles |  | 3.76\% | 2,196.80 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Carpet/Upholstery Disposable Diapers/Sanitary |  | 1.14\% | 665.22 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Diapers/Hygiene | Products |  | 3.89\% | 2,268.61 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Animal By-Products |  | 1.27\% | 740.54 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Rubber Products |  | 0.32\% | 187.18 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Leather | 0.39\% | 228.50 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Other | 0.10\% | 55.96 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.21\% | 119.74 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.02\% | 12.95 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 4.29\% | 2,503.93 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 4.03\% | 2,353.11 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 0.25\% | 147.06 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.20\% | 114.06 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 2.63 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.05\% | 28.44 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.10\% | 59.18 | NR | NR_Other |

Table AU-2
Detailed Results of the PWCS Refuse Sort without Bulk

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Refuse Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Refuse Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. Untreated Dimension Lumber, |  | 0.15\% | 89.75 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Pallets, Crates |  | 0.33\% | 193.60 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 2.88\% | 1,684.39 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 1.18\% | 688.69 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.04\% | 20.72 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.60\% | 351.44 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.02\% | 11.89 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 1.60\% | 935.69 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.24\% | 138.82 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.39\% | 229.44 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.07\% | 42.86 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.54 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.05\% | 28.85 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.06\% | 37.17 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.07\% | 38.88 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.81 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.07\% | 40.31 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 2.59 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  | 0.00\% | 0.07 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 1.41 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.04\% | 23.83 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | 0.09\% | 49.73 | NR | NR_Other |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 100.00\% | 58,393.32 |  |  |

NR = Nonrecyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
PR = Potentially Designated for Recycling Under future DSNY programs
R = Recyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
(1) Tonnage values are based on $59,618.80$ tons which is the average weekly tonnage of refuse that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY, less $2.06 \%$ of the refuse stream that was bulk. This equates to 58,393.32 tons.

The detailed results of the PWCS Paper Sort without bulk items are shown in Table AU-3. Because there were no bulk items in the Paper Sort, these results are identical to the results in Table 7-3A of the PWCS Report and are included here only to provide a complete picture of the results without bulk waste.

Table AU-3
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk- Paper

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Paper Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Paper Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 39.84\% | 2,908.87 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 20.64\% | 1,506.76 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 4.22\% | 307.98 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 25.04\% | 1,828.22 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 3.19\% | 232.74 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 1.33\% | 97.00 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.53\% | 38.53 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 0.27\% | 19.92 | R | R Bev Cartons |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 0.13\% | 9.58 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.01\% | 0.57 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 1.36\% | 99.33 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 0.01\% | 1.00 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 0.05\% | 3.42 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 0.02\% | 1.55 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles Other Rigid | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 0.03\% | 1.86 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.00\% | 0.00 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.00\% | 0.03 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.00\% | 0.00 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.00\% | 0.01 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.00\% | 0.32 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.01\% | 0.40 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.00\% | 0.01 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.00\% | 0.16 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.05\% | 3.38 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 0.01\% | 0.55 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 0.22\% | 16.35 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film Other Rigid | Other Film |  | 0.86\% | 62.93 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Plastic Crates and Soda Bottle Carriers |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single-Use Food Svc |  | 0.01\% | 0.79 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single Use Cameras |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Plastics |
|  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |

Table AU-3
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk- Paper

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Paper Stream | Weekly <br> Tonnage in Paper Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Disposable Razors |  | 0.00\% | 0.04 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Other Plastics Materials |  | 0.31\% | 22.49 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Deposit | 0.03\% | 1.95 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.06\% | 4.03 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Deposit | 0.00\% | 0.00 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.00\% | 0.00 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Deposit | 0.00\% | 0.00 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.00\% | 0.32 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Mixed Cullet | Mixed Cullet |  | 0.04\% | 3.24 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Other Glass | Other Glass |  | 0.00\% | 0.10 | PR | PR_Glass |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Deposit | 0.01\% | 0.47 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Non-Deposit | 0.00\% | 0.17 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Foil/Tins |  | 0.02\% | 1.56 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Other Aluminum |  | 0.01\% | 1.01 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Other Non-Ferrous |  | 0.00\% | 0.22 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Tin Food Cans |  | 0.04\% | 3.06 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Empty Aerosol Cans |  | 0.00\% | 0.06 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Other Ferrous |  | 0.04\% | 3.05 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Mixed Metals |  | 0.09\% | 6.79 | R | R Metal |
| Organic | Yard | Leaves and Grass |  | 0.00\% | 0.01 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Yard | Prunings |  | 0.00\% | 0.01 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Stumps/Limbs |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Food | Food |  | 0.40\% | 29.45 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |  | 0.00\% | 0.22 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Non-Clothing Textiles |  | 0.18\% | 13.19 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Clothing Textiles |  | 0.12\% | 8.53 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Carpet/Upholstery |  | 0.01\% | 0.82 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Diapers/Hygiene | Disposable Diapers/Sanitary Products |  | 0.07\% | 5.29 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Animal By-Products |  | 0.02\% | 1.79 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Rubber Products |  | 0.01\% | 0.98 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Leather | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Other | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.02\% | 1.36 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.00\% | 0.23 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 0.38\% | 27.47 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 0.01\% | 0.47 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 0.06\% | 4.28 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 0.21 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |

Table AU-3
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk- Paper

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Paper Stream | Weekly <br> Tonnage in Paper Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Const Debris | Wood | Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, Crates |  | 0.06\% | 4.02 | NR | NR Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 0.02\% | 1.23 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 0.01\% | 0.82 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 0.11\% | 8.17 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.01\% | 0.78 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.01\% | 0.76 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.07 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints <br> Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.00\% | 0.14 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.00\% | 0.28 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 7 | NR | NR_Other |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 100.00\% | 7,301.40 |  |  |

NR = Nonrecyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
PR = Potentially Designated for Recycling Under future DSNY programs
R = Recyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
(1) Tonnage values are based on $7,301.40$ tons which is the average weekly tonnage of paper recycling that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY.

The detailed results of the PWCS MGP Sort without bulk items are shown in Table AU-4. The 63 bulk items in the MGP Sort weighed a total of $1,195.40$ pounds. The detailed results are of the PWCS MGP Sort including bulk items are presented in Table 7-3B of the PWCS Report. In addition, a more detailed discussion of bulk items in the MGP Sort is presented in Appendix W.

Table AU-4
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk - MGP

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of MGP Stream | Weekly Tonnage in MGP Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 0.69\% | 30.00 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 0.28\% | 12.21 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 0.09\% | 4.06 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 1.15\% | 50.10 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 0.04\% | 1.64 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 0.01\% | 0.54 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.06\% | 2.43 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 1.81\% | 79.06 | R | R Bev Cartons |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 0.36\% | 15.82 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.02\% | 0.97 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 0.73\% | 31.69 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 1.33\% | 57.98 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 5.20\% | 226.62 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 2.92\% | 127.11 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles Other Rigid | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 2.94\% | 128.17 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.00\% | 0.09 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.13\% | 5.63 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.06\% | 2.77 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.01\% | 0.65 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.69\% | 30.15 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.18\% | 7.73 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.08\% | 3.64 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.45\% | 19.79 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.11\% | 4.91 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 1.72\% | 74.75 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 0.81\% | 35.50 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Other Film |  | 2.65\% | 115.44 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Plastic Crates and Soda Bottle Carriers |  | 0.17\% | 7.47 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single-Use Food Svc |  | 0.19\% | 8.11 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single Use Cameras |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Plastics |
|  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |

Table AU-4
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk - MGP

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of MGP Stream | Weekly Tonnage in MGP Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Disposable Razors |  | 0.10\% | 4.50 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Other Plastics Materials |  | 3.78\% | 164.82 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Deposit | 1.08\% | 46.97 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Non-Deposit | 6.80\% | 296.30 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Deposit | 1.16\% | 50.52 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Non-Deposit | 2.94\% | 128.01 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Deposit | 1.20\% | 52.38 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.32\% | 13.77 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Mixed Cullet | Mixed Cullet |  | 23.33\% | 1,016.24 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Other Glass | Other Glass |  | 0.68\% | 29.52 | PR | PR_Glass |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Deposit | 0.44\% | 19.36 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Non-Deposit | 0.42\% | 18.19 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Foil/Tins |  | 1.05\% | 45.74 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Other Aluminum |  | 0.25\% | 11.00 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Other Non-Ferrous |  | 0.30\% | 13.21 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Tin Food Cans |  | 7.66\% | 333.86 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Empty Aerosol Cans |  | 0.69\% | 30.01 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Other Ferrous |  | 14.39\% | 626.95 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Mixed Metals |  | 0.64\% | 27.69 | R | R Metal |
| Organic | Yard | Leaves and Grass |  | 0.03\% | 1.13 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Yard | Prunings |  | 0.03\% | 1.19 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Stumps/Limbs |  | 0.00\% | 0.01 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Food | Food |  | 1.29\% | 56.01 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |  | 0.08\% | 3.32 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Non-Clothing Textiles |  | 0.18\% | 7.93 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Clothing Textiles |  | 0.06\% | 2.65 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Carpet/Upholstery Disposable Diapers/Sanitary |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Diapers/Hygiene | Products |  | 0.09\% | 3.95 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Animal By-Products |  | 0.01\% | 0.61 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Rubber Products |  | 0.10\% | 4.24 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Leather | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Other | 0.00\% | 0.19 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.06\% | 2.70 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.02\% | 0.77 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 1.31\% | 56.91 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 0.22\% | 9.49 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 1.39\% | 60.42 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.80\% | 34.84 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 0.16 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |

Table AU-4
Detailed Results of the PWCS Recyclables Sort without Bulk - MGP

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of MGP Stream | Weekly Tonnage in MGP Stream ${ }^{(1)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. Untreated Dimension Lumber, |  | 0.87\% | 37.74 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Pallets, Crates |  | 0.14\% | 6.12 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 0.09\% | 3.73 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.00\% | 0.04 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.06\% | 2.66 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 0.01\% | 0.40 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.41\% | 18.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.48\% | 21.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.01\% | 0.44 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.07\% | 3.05 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.04\% | 1.87 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 0.07 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.01\% | 0.55 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 0.04 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HHW } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \% \\ 100.00 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ 4.356 .31 \end{gathered}$ | NR | NR_Other |

NR = Nonrecyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
PR = Potentially Designated for Recycling Under future DSNY programs
$R=$ Recyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program
(1) Tonnage values are based on $4,882.00$ tons which is the average weekly tonnage of MGP recycling that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY, less $10.77 \%$ of the MGP stream that was bulk. This equates to 4,356.31 tons.

The detailed results of the PWCS Waste Sort, which combines the results of the Refuse Sort and the Recycling Sort without bulk items are shown in Table AU-5. A total of 121 bulk items weighing $2,158.6$ pounds were part of the combined sorts. The results of the combined sorts including bulk items are shown in Table 8-2 of the PWCS Report.

Table AU-5
Detailed Results of the PWCS Waste Sort without Bulk ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Waste Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 7.34\% | 5,139.71 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 3.29\% | 2,301.78 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 1.02\% | 717.58 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 8.91\% | 6,244.33 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 0.53\% | 370.13 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 0.30\% | 208.11 | R | $R$ Paper |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.57\% | 397.70 | R | R Paper |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 0.54\% | 376.35 | R | R Bev Cartons |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 6.40\% | 4,481.54 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.44\% | 306.25 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 0.74\% | 518.60 | NR | NR_Paper |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 0.37\% | 257.48 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 0.88\% | 614.76 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 0.44\% | 311.24 | R | R Plastics |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 0.51\% | 356.58 | R | $R$ Plastics |
|  | Other Rigid |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.02\% | 15.97 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.08\% | 53.60 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.02\% | 10.64 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.01\% | 9.05 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.23\% | 162.76 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.07\% | 48.98 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.07\% | 45.57 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.16\% | 114.96 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.60\% | 421.59 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 0.62\% | 437.19 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 2.45\% | 1,715.60 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Film | Other Film |  | 4.66\% | 3,266.10 | PR | PR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Plastic Crates and Soda Bottle Carriers |  | 0.06\% | 43.33 | PR | PR_Plastics |

Table AU-5
Detailed Results of the PWCS Waste Sort without Bulk ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Waste Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single-Use Food Svc |  | 0.67\% | 471.34 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single Use Cameras |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Disposable Razors |  | 0.01\% | 8.77 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Other Plastics Materials |  | 1.62\% | 1,135.31 | NR | NR_Plastics |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Deposit | 0.31\% | 217.13 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Non-Deposit | 1.28\% | 895.37 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Deposit | 0.20\% | 139.30 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.32\% | 224.42 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Deposit | 0.30\% | 209.07 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.07\% | 48.34 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Mixed Cullet | Mixed Cullet |  | 1.88\% | 1,317.98 | R | R Glass |
| Glass | Other Glass | Other Glass |  | 0.21\% | 148.94 | PR | PR_Glass |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Deposit | 0.17\% | 121.93 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Non-Deposit | 0.05\% | 34.35 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Foil/Tins |  | 0.58\% | 403.76 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Aluminum | Other Aluminum |  | 0.06\% | 39.84 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Other Non-Ferrous |  | 0.07\% | 51.36 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Tin Food Cans |  | 1.26\% | 879.96 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Empty Aerosol Cans |  | 0.15\% | 103.30 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Ferrous | Other Ferrous |  | 1.72\% | 1,204.45 | R | R Metal |
| Metal | Other Metal | Mixed Metals |  | 0.40\% | 282.43 | R | R Metal |
| Organic | Yard | Leaves and Grass |  | 5.33\% | 3,731.76 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Yard | Prunings |  | 2.53\% | 1,770.67 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Stumps/Limbs |  | 0.46\% | 320.36 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Food | Food |  | 13.69\% | 9,591.47 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Wood | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |  | 0.12\% | 86.60 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Non-Clothing Textiles |  | 1.47\% | 1,029.59 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Clothing Textiles |  | 3.15\% | 2,207.98 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles |  |  | 0.95\% | 666.04 | NR | NR_Other |
|  |  | Disposable Diapers/Sanitary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organic | Diapers/Hygiene | Products |  | 3.25\% | 2,277.86 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Animal By-Products |  | 1.06\% | 742.94 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Rubber Products |  | 0.27\% | 192.40 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Leather | 0.33\% | 228.50 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Other | 0.08\% | 56.15 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.18\% | 123.79 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.02\% | 13.96 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 3.69\% | 2,588.31 | NR | NR_Other |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 3.37\% | 2,363.08 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 0.30\% | 211.76 | NR | NR_Other |

Table AU-5
Detailed Results of the PWCS Waste Sort without Bulk ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Waste Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.21\% | 148.90 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 2.99 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.04\% | 28.44 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.08\% | 59.18 | NR | NR_Other |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. Untreated Dimension Lumber, |  | 0.18\% | 127.49 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Pallets, Crates |  | 0.29\% | 203.75 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 2.41\% | 1,689.35 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 0.98\% | 689.51 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.03\% | 20.75 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.51\% | 354.09 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.02\% | 11.89 | NR | NR_Other |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 1.35\% | 944.27 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.22\% | 157.60 | NR | NR_Other |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.36\% | 251.20 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.07 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.06\% | 42.86 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.54 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints <br> Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.04\% | 28.85 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.05\% | 37.61 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.06\% | 41.93 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.81 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.06\% | 42.32 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 2.66 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  | 0.00\% | 0.07 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.00\% | 0.55 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 1.45 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.03\% | 24.11 | NR | NR_Other |
| HHW TOTAL | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \% \\ 100.00 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.73 \\ 70,051.03 \end{gathered}$ | NR | NR_Other |

Table AU-5
Detailed Results of the PWCS Waste Sort without Bulk ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | \% of Waste Stream | Weekly Tonnage in Waste Stream (2) | Recycling Indicator | Recycling Subindicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NR = Nonrecyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program PR = Potentially Designated for Recycling Under future DSNY programs R = Recyclable under DSNY's current Curbside Recycling Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) Results are the aggregate of the refuse stream and recycling stream results. "Small Appliances" were defined in the refuse stream as any small appliance. This definition was later revised for the recycling sort to include only those small appliances with less than $50 \%$ metal. All other small appliances in the recycling stream were included in the "Other Ferrous" category. |  |  |  |  |  |  | the recycling sort to eam that was bulk. |

As the results in Table AU-5 shows, bulk items made up 2.44 percent of the waste sampled during the PWCS.

## Appendix V <br> PWCS Results Adjusted for Moisture and Particulates

## PWCS Results Adjusted for Moisture and Particulates

A primary objective of assessing the composition of New York City's curbside waste stream is to provide defensible, accurate data to assist planners in formulating future program changes. The PWCS Report describes the detailed composition of the refuse, recycling, and aggregated waste streams. These data represent an excellent starting point. However, as discussed in the body of the PWCS Report, individual materials in the refuse and recycling streams absorb moisture and embedded particulate matter during the collection and compaction process. Unless the transfer of moisture and foreign particulate matter is adjusted for, the results of a composition study can be misleading.
For example, the results of the PWCS showed that 3.71 percent of the refuse stream was newspaper, a material designated for recycling by the DSNY. When this percentage is applied to the average weekly tonnage in May and June of 2004, this suggests that 2,210.19 tons of newspaper could theoretically been recycled. However, the results of the moisture and particulate testing indicate that a significant fraction of the newspaper in the refuse was actually moisture and particulate matter. To evaluate more precisely the amount of newspaper being disposed, an adjustment should be made for moisture and particulate matter. For this reason, Appendix V presents the adjusted results of the Refuse Sort and the Aggregated Waste Stream.

Moisture and particulate testing were conducted on 25 materials in the Refuse Stream and 27 materials in the Recycling Stream. These materials were selected because it was felt that these materials were most susceptible to the migration of moisture and foreign particulates. A total of 41 random samples from the Refuse and Recycling Sort were selected for moisture and particulate testing. Each of the materials occurring in the selected samples were tested. Some samples contained only some of the materials to be tested. In all 641 tests were conducted on the 41 samples. Table AV-1, AV-2, and AV-3 summarize the moisture and particulate tests that were conducted for the PWCS.

Table AV-1
Summary of Moisture and Particulate Testing for the Refuse Sort

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | atego |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample ID | Borough |  |  | Clothing Textiles |  |  | HDPE Colored Bottles |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{\underline{1}} \\ & \dot{\bar{U}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \ddot{\sim} \\ & \infty \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $$ |  | Total Categories Tested From Each Composition Sample |
| 20040515-M62-1-25CN-566 | Manhattan | , |  | - | - |  | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | $\bullet$ |  | - |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | - |  |  | - | $\bullet$ | - | 19 |
| 20040517-BK31-4-25CW-017 | Brooklyn |  |  | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - |  |  | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | - |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ |  | 14 |
| 20040517-BK72-2-25CN-686 | Brooklyn | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | 20 |
| 20040518-BX123-2-25CN-746 | Bronx | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | 20 |
| 20040518-BX21-1-25CN-636 | Bronx | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | 21 |
| 20040518-BX92-2-25CU-186 | Bronx | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ |  | - | 21 |
| 20040519-BK102-1-25CU-010 | Brooklyn |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | s |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 17 |
| 20040519-BK175-2-25CU-127 | Brooklyn | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | - | - | $\bullet$ |  | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | 20 |
| 20040519-M101-1-25CW-098 | Manhattan | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\times$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 19 |
| 20040519-M34-1-25CW-160 | Manhattan | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | - | $\bullet$ | - |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 18 |
| 20040520-BK185-1-25CW-096 | Brooklyn | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | - | - | - |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 14 |
| 20040520-BX61-6-25CW-006 | Bronx | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 22 |
| 20040521-BK113-1-25CN-763 | Brooklyn | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | - |  | - |  | - |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | 20 |
| 20040521-BX11-3-25CN-725 | Bronx | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | 22 |
| 20040522-Q136-2-25CW-517 | Queens | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 22 |
| 20040522-Q72-1-25CW-527 | Queens |  | $\bullet$ | $\times$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\times$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 17 |
| 20040522-SI38-2-25CW-142 | Staten Island | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | 21 |
| 20040525-Q13-25CW-547 | Queens |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | 18 |
| 20040525-Q13-25CW-552 | Queens | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | - |  | - |  | - |  | $\bullet$ | - | - |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ | 18 |
| 20040525-Q84-4-25CN-104 | Queens | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | - | - | - | - | $\bullet$ | 22 |
| Total Tested from Each Category |  | 16 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 16 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 20 | 17 | 19 | 385 |

- Composition sample categories tested by the lab.
× Composition sample categories not tested by the lab due to human waste contamination. Not counted in "Total" values.
s Composition samples categories not tested by the lab due to spillage of sample. Not counted in "Total" values.

Table AV-2
Summary of Moisture and Particulate Testing for the Paper Sort


Table AV-3
Summary of Moisture and Particulate Testing for the MGP Sort


Table AV-4 presents the results of the moisture and particulate tests that were performed on the refuse samples showing, and Table AV-5 presents the results of the tests performed on the recycling samples.

| Material | Component | Average | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Material | 77.67\% | 18.09\% |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Moisture | 17.02\% | 14.61\% |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Particulates | 5.32\% | 13.77\% |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-deposit | Material | 77.67\% | 18.09\% |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-deposit | Moisture | 17.02\% | 14.61\% |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-deposit | Particulates | 5.32\% | 13.77\% |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Material | 60.87\% | 18.09\% |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Moisture | 26.93\% | 12.01\% |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Particulates | 12.21\% | 12.28\% |
| Clothing Textiles | Material | 84.45\% | 12.86\% |
| Clothing Textiles | Moisture | 14.02\% | 11.27\% |
| Clothing Textiles | Particulates | 1.53\% | 2.82\% |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Material | 48.88\% | 8.24\% |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Moisture | 42.72\% | 12.55\% |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Particulates | 8.40\% | 8.19\% |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Material | 57.32\% | 22.34\% |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Moisture | 27.00\% | 12.13\% |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Particulates | 15.69\% | 14.82\% |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Material | 92.56\% | 7.84\% |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Moisture | 6.85\% | 7.36\% |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Particulates | 0.59\% | 1.60\% |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Material | 91.07\% | 9.78\% |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Moisture | 7.26\% | 9.33\% |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Particulates | 1.67\% | 3.25\% |
| High Grade Paper | Material | 84.94\% | 11.49\% |
| High Grade Paper | Moisture | 13.41\% | 11.27\% |
| High Grade Paper | Particulates | 1.64\% | 4.66\% |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Material | 69.08\% | 12.13\% |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Moisture | 25.61\% | 10.44\% |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Particulates | 5.31\% | 6.05\% |

Table AV-4
Refuse Moisture and Particulate Analysis Results

| Material | Component | Average | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Newspaper | Material | $66.04 \%$ | $17.87 \%$ |
| Newspaper | Moisture | $28.59 \%$ | $13.14 \%$ |
| Newspaper | Particulates | $5.36 \%$ | $14.71 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Material | $67.23 \%$ | $20.87 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Moisture | $19.69 \%$ | $13.09 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Particulates | $13.08 \%$ | $24.48 \%$ |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Material | $70.15 \%$ | $13.80 \%$ |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Moisture | $24.43 \%$ | $9.47 \%$ |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Particulates | $5.43 \%$ | $9.13 \%$ |
| Other Film | Material | $55.20 \%$ | $16.91 \%$ |
| Other Film | Moisture | $35.29 \%$ | $17.82 \%$ |
| Other Film | Particulates | $9.50 \%$ | $6.14 \%$ |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Material | $79.85 \%$ | $11.74 \%$ |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Moisture | $12.23 \%$ | $8.30 \%$ |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Particulates | $7.93 \%$ | $6.37 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Material | $61.14 \%$ | $19.11 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Moisture | $29.38 \%$ | $14.82 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Particulates | $9.48 \%$ | $13.02 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Material | $90.83 \%$ | $1.95 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Moisture | $7.97 \%$ | $3.65 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Particulates | $1.20 \%$ | $1.69 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Deposit | Material | $86.82 \%$ | $11.42 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Deposit | Moisture | $11.83 \%$ | $11.03 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Deposit | Particulates | $1.36 \%$ | $2.53 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Non-deposit | Material | $86.82 \%$ | $11.42 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Non-deposit | Moisture | $11.83 \%$ | $11.03 \%$ |
| PET bottles: Non-deposit | Particulates | $1.36 \%$ | $2.53 \%$ |
| Phone books | Material | $90.73 \%$ | $1.93 \%$ |
| Phone books | Moisture | $7.14 \%$ | $1.08 \%$ |
| Phone books | Particulates | $2.13 \%$ | $3.01 \%$ |
| Plain OCC/Kraft Paper | Maiterial | $66.28 \%$ | $20.02 \%$ |
| Plain OCC/Kraft Paper | $31.32 \%$ | $20.38 \%$ |  |
| Plain OCC/Kraft Paper | $2.39 \%$ | $4.95 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table AV-4
Refuse Moisture and Particulate Analysis Results

| Material | Component | Average | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic Bags | Material | $49.62 \%$ | $10.15 \%$ |
| Plastic Bags | Moisture | $34.91 \%$ | $9.73 \%$ |
| Plastic Bags | Particulates | $15.47 \%$ | $9.32 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Material | $75.05 \%$ | $10.44 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Moisture | $22.24 \%$ | $9.31 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Particulates | $2.70 \%$ | $4.15 \%$ |
| Rigid polystyrene | Material | $79.38 \%$ | $14.46 \%$ |
| Rigid polystyrene | Moisture | $14.00 \%$ | $11.58 \%$ |
| Rigid polystyrene | Particulates | $6.63 \%$ | $10.52 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates | Material | $60.95 \%$ | $18.22 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates | Moisture | $34.16 \%$ | $15.69 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates | Particulates | $4.89 \%$ | $8.41 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Material | $70.26 \%$ | $13.95 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Moisture | $17.89 \%$ | $9.16 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Particulates | $11.85 \%$ | $9.96 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Material | $86.62 \%$ | $9.99 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Moisture | $10.12 \%$ | $7.28 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Particulates | $3.27 \%$ | $4.36 \%$ |

Table AV-5
Recycling Moisture and Particulate Analysis Results

| Material | Component | Average | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Material | $96.28 \%$ | $5.85 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Moisture | $3.28 \%$ | $5.00 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | Particulates | $0.44 \%$ | $0.97 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-Deposit | Material | $96.28 \%$ | $5.85 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-Deposit | Moisture | $3.28 \%$ | $5.00 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-Deposit | Particulates | $0.44 \%$ | $0.97 \%$ |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Material | $85.91 \%$ | $8.24 \%$ |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Moisture | $9.84 \%$ | $5.01 \%$ |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | Particulates | $4.25 \%$ | $4.66 \%$ |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Material | $92.07 \%$ | $15.61 \%$ |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Moisture | $7.35 \%$ | $15.35 \%$ |
| HDPE Natural Bottles | Particulates | $0.58 \%$ | $1.09 \%$ |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Material | $96.55 \%$ | $3.31 \%$ |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Moisture | $2.64 \%$ | $2.48 \%$ |
| HDPE Colored Bottles | Particulates | $0.80 \%$ | $1.48 \%$ |
| High Grade Paper | Material | $93.78 \%$ | $2.30 \%$ |
| High Grade Paper | Moisture | $5.94 \%$ | $1.99 \%$ |
| High Grade Paper | Particulates | $0.27 \%$ | $0.91 \%$ |
| \#3-\#7 Containers: \#5 PP | Material | $100.00 \%$ | NA |
| \#3-\#7 Containers: \#5 PP | Moisture | $0.00 \%$ | NA |
| \#3-\#7 Containers: \#5 PP | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | NA |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Material | $83.04 \%$ | $14.44 \%$ |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Moisture | $15.04 \%$ | $14.60 \%$ |
| Mixed Low Grade Paper | Particulates | $1.93 \%$ | $4.08 \%$ |
| Newspaper | Material | $79.91 \%$ | $18.71 \%$ |
| Newspaper | Moisture | $17.69 \%$ | $18.29 \%$ |
| Newspaper | Particulates | $2.40 \%$ | $4.66 \%$ |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Material | $65.57 \%$ | $24.71 \%$ |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Moisture | $30.35 \%$ | $25.81 \%$ |
| Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC | Particulates | $4.08 \%$ | $4.16 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table AV-5
Recycling Moisture and Particulate Analysis Results

| Material | Component | Average | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Material | $79.97 \%$ | $15.56 \%$ |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Moisture | $15.79 \%$ | $12.86 \%$ |
| Other Nonrecyclable Paper | Particulates | $4.23 \%$ | $6.71 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates, Cups | Material | $94.07 \%$ | $5.76 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates, Cups | Moisture | $5.93 \%$ | $5.76 \%$ |
| Single Use Plates, Cups | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other Film | Material | $79.24 \%$ | $19.33 \%$ |
| Other Film | Moisture | $9.58 \%$ | $10.27 \%$ |
| Other Film | Particulates | $11.17 \%$ | $12.36 \%$ |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Material | $91.05 \%$ | $21.67 \%$ |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Moisture | $6.12 \%$ | $13.75 \%$ |
| Expanded Polystyrene | Particulates | $2.83 \%$ | $8.00 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Material | $92.91 \%$ | $12.21 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Moisture | $4.39 \%$ | $6.23 \%$ |
| Single-Use Food Svc | Particulates | $2.69 \%$ | $6.02 \%$ |
| Other Plastics Materials | Material | $100.00 \%$ | NA |
| Other Plastics Materials | Moisture | $0.00 \%$ | NA |
| Other Plastics Materials | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | NA |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Material | $97.50 \%$ | $1.85 \%$ |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Moisture | $2.50 \%$ | $1.85 \%$ |
| Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Rigid Polystyrene | Material | $94.94 \%$ | $5.38 \%$ |
| Rigid Polystyrene | Moisture | $2.90 \%$ | $2.52 \%$ |
| Rigid Polystyrene | Particulates | $2.16 \%$ | $5.29 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Material | $73.91 \%$ | $26.38 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Moisture | $6.70 \%$ | $3.67 \%$ |
| Paper Bags | Particulates | $19.39 \%$ | $23.88 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Material | $92.03 \%$ | $7.63 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Moisture | $7.97 \%$ | $7.63 \%$ |
| Paperbacks | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table AV-5
Recycling Moisture and Particulate Analysis Results

| Material | Component | Average | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| PET Bottles | Material | $94.45 \%$ | $5.20 \%$ |
| PET Bottles | Moisture | $5.34 \%$ | $5.30 \%$ |
| PET Bottles | Particulates | $0.21 \%$ | $0.65 \%$ |
| Phone Books | Material | $92.42 \%$ | $3.31 \%$ |
| Phone Books | Moisture | $7.58 \%$ | $3.31 \%$ |
| Phone Books | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Plain OCC/Kraft paper | Material | $81.86 \%$ | $16.66 \%$ |
| Plain OCC/Kraft paper | Moisture | $14.25 \%$ | $13.42 \%$ |
| Plain OCC/Kraft paper | Particulates | $3.89 \%$ | $12.01 \%$ |
| Plastic Bags | Material | $74.25 \%$ | $27.44 \%$ |
| Plastic Bags | Moisture | $13.53 \%$ | $16.38 \%$ |
| Plastic Bags | Particulates | $12.21 \%$ | $15.56 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Material | $86.26 \%$ | $6.39 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Moisture | $13.55 \%$ | $6.48 \%$ |
| Polycoated Containers | Particulates | $0.20 \%$ | $0.78 \%$ |
| Clothing Textiles | Material | $69.89 \%$ | $19.11 \%$ |
| Clothing Textiles | Moisture | $29.57 \%$ | $19.45 \%$ |
| Clothing Textiles | Particulates | $0.54 \%$ | $0.93 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Material | $90.24 \%$ | $10.41 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Moisture | $9.76 \%$ | $10.41 \%$ |
| Non-Clothing Textiles | Particulates | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Material | $91.54 \%$ | $8.83 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Moisture | $4.88 \%$ | $3.58 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | Particulates | $3.58 \%$ | $8.26 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

To make the moisture and particulate adjustments to the results of the PWCS, we must first take into account that not all moisture in newspaper, or any other material, is due to the migration of moisture from other sources during collection. Even newly manufactured newspaper has a certain level of moisture. To account for this, the moisture and particulate adjustment has been made by assuming that, had the newspaper (or other material) in the refuse actually been recycled, it would have had proportionately the same level of moisture and particulate matter as the recycled newspaper (or other material). In other words, the moisture and particulate levels in the recycled material has been used as the baseline moisture and particulate levels.

Therefore, the moisture and particulate adjustment to each material consisted of applying the difference between the moisture and particulate levels found in the refuse samples and the moisture and particulate levels found in the recycling samples.

Table AV-6 compares the results of the Refuse Sort and the results of the Refuse Sort adjusted for moisture and particulate testing.

Table AV-6
Comparison of the Results of the Refuse Sort Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream(1) | Weekly Unadjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(2) | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(1)(2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 3.71\% | 3.19\% | 2,210.19 | 1,903.62 |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 1.35\% | 1.14\% | 804.52 | 679.19 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 0.67\% | 0.61\% | 399.96 | 364.61 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 7.34\% | 6.31\% | 4,373.54 | 3,763.01 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 0.23\% | 0.22\% | 135.54 | 133.24 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 0.18\% | 0.18\% | 109.68 | 108.36 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.60\% | 0.52\% | 357.61 | 311.96 |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 0.47\% | 0.41\% | 278.40 | 247.21 |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 7.49\% | 6.24\% | 4,463.58 | 3,718.73 |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.51\% | 0.34\% | 305.84 | 204.52 |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 0.65\% | 0.59\% | 388.28 | 350.11 |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 0.33\% | 0.31\% | 197.92 | 182.81 |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 0.64\% | 0.59\% | 383.61 | 354.31 |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 0.31\% | 0.30\% | 182.74 | 180.90 |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles Other Rigid | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 0.45\% | 0.43\% | 268.56 | 257.85 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.03\% | 0.03\% | 15.66 | 15.66 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.08\% | 0.08\% | 45.02 | 45.02 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.01\% | 0.01\% | 7.83 | 7.83 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.01\% | 0.01\% | 8.48 | 8.48 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.22\% | 0.22\% | 132.60 | 132.60 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 41.18 | 41.18 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 42.72 | 42.72 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.16\% | 0.14\% | 95.34 | 80.50 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.69\% | 0.46\% | 411.62 | 272.77 |

Table AV-6
Comparison of the Results of the Refuse Sort Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream(1) | Weekly Unadjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(2) | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(1)(2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plastic | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 0.61\% | 0.50\% | 362.88 | 298.82 |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 2.79\% | 2.10\% | 1,664.19 | 1,254.23 |
| Plastic | Film | Other Film |  | 5.21\% | 3.95\% | 3,103.20 | 2,357.17 |
|  | Other Rigid | Plastic Crates and Soda Bottle |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Carriers |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 35.80 | 35.80 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single-Use Food Svc |  | 0.78\% | 0.60\% | 465.09 | 359.73 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Single Use Cameras |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Disposable Razors |  | 0.01\% | 0.01\% | 4.26 | 4.26 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products | Other Plastics Materials |  | 1.67\% | 1.67\% | 994.00 | 994.00 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Deposit | 0.28\% | 0.28\% | 167.38 | 167.38 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Clear Glass | Non-Deposit | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 594.78 | 594.78 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Deposit | 0.15\% | 0.15\% | 88.59 | 88.59 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Green Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.16\% | 0.16\% | 96.59 | 96.59 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Deposit | 0.25\% | 0.25\% | 151.43 | 151.43 |
| Glass | Container Glass | Brown Glass | Non-Deposit | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 34.43 | 34.43 |
| Glass | Mixed Cullet | Mixed Cullet |  | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 300.38 | 300.38 |
| Glass | Other Glass | Other Glass |  | 0.20\% | 0.20\% | 119.28 | 119.28 |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Deposit | 0.17\% | 0.14\% | 101.86 | 82.90 |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Cans | Non-Deposit | 0.03\% | 0.02\% | 16.11 | 13.11 |
| Metal | Aluminum | Aluminum Foil/Tins |  | 0.60\% | 0.45\% | 356.92 | 267.53 |
| Metal | Aluminum | Other Aluminum |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 28.21 | 28.21 |
| Metal | Other Metal | Other Non-Ferrous |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 37.49 | 37.49 |
| Metal | Ferrous | Tin Food Cans |  | 0.91\% | 0.87\% | 544.72 | 517.90 |
| Metal | Ferrous | Empty Aerosol Cans |  | 0.12\% | 0.12\% | 73.65 | 73.65 |
| Metal | Ferrous | Other Ferrous |  | 1.03\% | 1.03\% | 614.61 | 614.61 |
| Metal | Other Metal | Mixed Metals |  | 0.56\% | 0.56\% | 335.45 | 335.45 |
| Organic | Yard | Leaves and Grass |  | 6.23\% | 6.23\% | 3,712.61 | 3,712.61 |
| Organic | Yard | Prunings |  | 3.04\% | 3.04\% | 1,815.19 | 1,815.19 |
| Organic | Wood | Stumps/Limbs |  | 0.67\% | 0.67\% | 402.35 | 402.35 |
| Organic | Food | Food |  | 15.93\% | 15.93\% | 9,498.60 | 9,498.60 |
| Organic | Wood | Non-C\&D, Untreated Wood |  | 0.38\% | 0.38\% | 224.39 | 224.39 |
| Organic | Textiles | Non-Clothing Textiles |  | 2.07\% | 1.59\% | 1,234.32 | 950.29 |
| Organic | Textiles | Clothing Textiles |  | 3.70\% | 3.70\% | 2,205.01 | 2,205.01 |
| Organic | Textiles | Carpet/Upholstery |  | 1.27\% | 1.27\% | 754.66 | 754.66 |

Table AV-6
Comparison of the Results of the Refuse Sort Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream(1) | Weekly Unadjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(2) | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(1)(2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Disposable Diapers/Sanitary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organic | Diapers/Hygiene | Products |  | 3.81\% | 3.81\% | 2,269.39 | 2,269.39 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Animal By-Products |  | 1.25\% | 1.25\% | 743.58 | 743.58 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Rubber Products |  | 0.32\% | 0.32\% | 189.07 | 189.07 |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Leather | 0.37\% | 0.37\% | 222.30 | 222.30 |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Other | 0.09\% | 0.09\% | 55.81 | 55.81 |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.20\% | 0.20\% | 119.97 | 119.97 |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 32.47 | 32.47 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 4.20\% | 4.20\% | 2,504.07 | 2,504.07 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 3.98\% | 3.98\% | 2,370.43 | 2,370.43 |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 0.27\% | 0.27\% | 162.46 | 162.46 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.24\% | 0.24\% | 142.13 | 142.13 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.67 | 2.67 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 28.92 | 28.92 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.10\% | 0.10\% | 60.42 | 60.42 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. Untreated Dimension Lumber, |  | 0.19\% | 0.19\% | 115.01 | 115.01 |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Pallets, Crates |  | 0.45\% | 0.45\% | 267.55 | 267.55 |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 2.99\% | 2.99\% | 1,784.14 | 1,784.14 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 1.16\% | 1.16\% | 693.64 | 693.64 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 34.48 | 34.48 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.58\% | 0.58\% | 348.15 | 348.15 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 12.14 | 12.14 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 1.74\% | 1.74\% | 1,036.63 | 1,036.63 |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.23\% | 0.23\% | 139.58 | 139.58 |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.36\% | 0.36\% | 214.93 | 214.93 |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 43.76 | 43.76 |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.55 | 0.55 |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 29.45 | 29.45 |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 37.57 | 37.57 |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 39.56 | 39.56 |

Table AV-6
Comparison of the Results of the Refuse Sort Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream(1) | Weekly Unadjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(2) | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream(1)(2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 40.02 | 40.02 |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.65 | 2.65 |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.07 | 0.07 |
|  |  | Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  |  |  |  |  |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 23.43 | 23.43 |
| HHW | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | 0.09\% | 0.09\% | 50.74 | 50.74 |
| Moisture | Moisture | Moisture |  | NA | 4.43\% | NA | 2,643.51 |
| Particulates | Particulates | Particulates |  | NA | 2.28\% | NA | 1,357.32 |
| (1) The adjusted results were developed after moisture and particulate adjustment results were applied to the unadjusted composition study results. Moisture and particulate testing was performed on only a subset of categories. The other categories were assumed to have insufficient moisture and particulates to warrant testing. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is not possible to determine the source of the moisture and particulates in each material. Moisture may have come from food waste, grass clippings, or ambient precipitation. Particulate matter might be glass, food waste, or some other material.
Because the moisture and particulate levels in the recycled materials are used as the baseline, no adjustment has been made to these results, so they have not been repeated here (see the PWCS Report, Section 7 for the results of the Recycling Sort).
Table AV-7 presents the comparison of the Aggregated Waste stream before and after for moisture and particulate adjustments.

Table AV-7
Comparison of Results of the Aggregated Waste Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(3)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)(3)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paper | ONP | Newspaper |  | 7.17\% | 5.73\% | 5,150.99 | 4,116.31 |
| Paper | OCC | Plain OCC/Kraft paper |  | 3.24\% | 2.65\% | 2,323.31 | 1,901.88 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | High Grade Paper |  | 0.99\% | 0.93\% | 711.69 | 667.44 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Mixed Low Grade Paper |  | 8.71\% | 7.23\% | 6,253.87 | 5,192.92 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Phone Books |  | 0.52\% | 0.48\% | 370.04 | 342.01 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paperbacks |  | 0.29\% | 0.27\% | 207.29 | 190.78 |
| Paper | Mixed Paper | Paper Bags |  | 0.56\% | 0.41\% | 398.87 | 294.80 |
| Paper | Bev Cartons | Polycoated Containers |  | 0.53\% | 0.46\% | 379.81 | 327.60 |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Compostable/Soiled/ Waxed OCC |  | 6.25\% | 4.10\% | 4,489.32 | 2,943.70 |
| Paper | Compostable Paper | Single Use Plates, Cups |  | 0.43\% | 0.40\% | 307.45 | 289.24 |
| Paper | Other Paper | Other Nonrecyclable Paper |  | 0.72\% | 0.58\% | 518.51 | 414.68 |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Deposit | 0.36\% | 0.34\% | 257.94 | 243.63 |
| Plastic | PET Bottles | PET Bottles | Non-Deposit | 0.86\% | 0.81\% | 617.90 | 583.62 |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles | HDPE Natural Bottles |  | 0.44\% | 0.40\% | 315.75 | 290.72 |
| Plastic | HDPE Bottles Other Rigid | HDPE Colored Bottles |  | 0.56\% | 0.54\% | 401.31 | 387.49 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#1 Pet | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 15.76 | 15.76 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#1-\#2 Tubs/Trays | \#2 HDPE | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 50.58 | 50.58 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#3 PVC | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 10.81 | 10.81 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#4 LDPE | 0.01\% | 0.01\% | 9.21 | 9.21 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#5 PP | 0.23\% | 0.23\% | 164.97 | 164.97 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | \#3-\#7 Containers | \#7 Other | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 49.79 | 49.79 |
| Plastic | Other Plastic Products Other Rigid | Other PVC |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 46.59 | 46.59 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Rigid Polystyrene |  | 0.16\% | 0.15\% | 115.17 | 109.35 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging Other Rigid | Expanded Polystyrene |  | 0.59\% | 0.53\% | 420.25 | 382.64 |
| Plastic | Containers/Packaging | Other Rigid Containers/Packaging |  | 0.61\% | 0.60\% | 438.18 | 427.23 |
| Plastic | Film | Plastic Bags |  | 2.39\% | 1.78\% | 1,717.49 | 1,275.31 |
|  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |

Table AV-7
Comparison of Results of the Aggregated Waste Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments ${ }^{(1)}$


Table AV-7
Comparison of Results of the Aggregated Waste Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(3)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)(3)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organic | Textiles | Shoes | Rubber | 0.17\% | 0.17\% | 124.34 | 124.34 |
| Organic | Textiles | Other Leather Products |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 33.52 | 33.52 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Fines |  | 3.61\% | 3.61\% | 2,592.14 | 2,592.14 |
| Organic | Misc. Organic | Miscellaneous Organics |  | 3.31\% | 3.31\% | 2,380.15 | 2,380.15 |
| App. \& Elec. | Household Appliance | Small Appliances |  | 0.37\% | 0.37\% | 268.99 | 268.99 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Other | 0.20\% | 0.20\% | 142.13 | 142.13 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Audio/Visual Equipment | Cell Phones | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.05 | 3.05 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Computer Monitors |  | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 28.92 | 28.92 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Televisions |  | 0.08\% | 0.08\% | 60.42 | 60.42 |
| App. \& Elec. | Electronic.AV/Computer | Other Computer Equip. <br> Untreated Dimension Lumber, Pallets, |  | 0.22\% | 0.22\% | 154.78 | 154.78 |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Crates |  | 0.39\% | 0.39\% | 278.15 | 278.15 |
| Const. Debris | Wood | Treated/Contaminated Wood |  | 2.49\% | 2.49\% | 1,789.10 | 1,789.10 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Gypsum Scrap |  | 0.97\% | 0.97\% | 694.46 | 694.46 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Fiberglass Insulation |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 34.52 | 34.52 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Rock/Concrete/Bricks |  | 0.49\% | 0.49\% | 350.92 | 350.92 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Asphaltic Roofing |  | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 12.14 | 12.14 |
| Const. Debris | Inorganic C\&D | Other C\&D Debris |  | 1.46\% | 1.46\% | 1,045.26 | 1,045.26 |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Misc. Inorganics |  | 0.22\% | 0.22\% | 160.42 | 160.42 |
| Misc. | Misc. Inorganic | Ceramics |  | 0.33\% | 0.33\% | 237.49 | 237.49 |
| HHW | HHW | Oil Filters |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| HHW | HHW | Antifreeze |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Wet-Cell Batteries |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 43.76 | 43.76 |
| HHW | HHW | Gasoline/Kerosene |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.55 | 0.55 |
| HHW | HHW | Motor Oil/Diesel Oil |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Latex Paints Water and Solvent-Based |  | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 29.45 | 29.45 |
| HHW | HHW | Adhesives/glues |  | 0.05\% | 0.05\% | 38.00 | 38.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Oil-Based Paint/Solvent |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 42.33 | 42.33 |
| HHW | HHW | Pesticides/Herbicides/Rodenticides |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| HHW | HHW | DRY-CELL Batteries |  | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 42.20 | 42.20 |
| HHW | HHW | Fluorescent Tubes |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.71 | 2.71 |
| HHW | HHW | Mercury-Laden waste Compressed Gas Cylinders/Fire |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| HHW | HHW | Extinguishers |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| HHW | HHW | Asbestos |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HHW | HHW | Explosives |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table AV-7
Comparison of Results of the Aggregated Waste Before and After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments ${ }^{(1)}$

| Material Group | Material Subgroup | Material Category | Material Subcategory | Unadjusted \% of Waste Stream | Adjusted \% of Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(3)}$ | Weekly Adjusted Tonnage in Waste Stream ${ }^{(2)(3)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HHW | HHW | Smoke Detectors |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 1.45 | 1.45 |
| HHW | HHW | Home Medical Products |  | 0.03\% | 0.03\% | 23.71 | 23.71 |
| HHW | HHW | Other Potentially Harmful Wastes |  | 0.07\% | 0.07\% | 50.74 | 50.74 |
| Moisture | Moisture | Moisture |  | NA | 7.13\% | NA | 5,118.86 |
| Particulates | Particulates | Particulates |  | NA | 2.14\% | NA | 1,539.15 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 71,802.25 | 71,802.25 |

(1) Results are the aggregate of the refuse stream and recycling stream results. "Small Appliances" were defined in the refuse stream as any small appliance. This definition was later revised for the recycling sort to include only those small appliances with less than $50 \%$ metal. All other small appliances in the recycling stream were included in the "Other Ferrous" category
(2) The adjusted results were developed after moisture and particulate analysis results were applied to the unadjusted composition study results. Moisture and particulate testing was performed on only a subset of categories. The other categories were assumed to have insufficient moisture and particulates to warrant analysis.
(3) Tonnage values are based on $71,802.25$ tons which is the average weekly tonnage of waste that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY

The results of the Refuse Sort showing the percentages of the nine major material groups and the percentages adjusted for moisture and particulate testing are presented graphically in Figure AV-1

Figure 1 PWCS Refuse Composition by Material Group



As noted in the PWCS Report, the materials designated for recycling by DSNY in the Refuse Sort represented 22 percent of all materials. As Figure AV-2 shows, when the results are adjusted for moisture and particulates, the percentage drops to 20 percent.

Figure 2 Summary of Materials Designated for Recycling in the PWSC Refuse Sort


Adjusted


The results of the Aggregated Waste Stream showing the percentages of the nine major material groups and the percentages adjusted for moisture and particulate testing are presented graphically in Figure AV-3

Figure 3 PWCS Waste Composition by Material Group


Adjusted


The materials designated for recycling by DSNY in the Aggregated Waste Stream represented 33 percent of all materials. As Figure AV-4 shows, when the results are adjusted for moisture and particulates, the percentage drops to 32 percent.

Figure 4 Summary of Materials Designated for Recycling in the PWSC Waste Sort
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## Appendix W <br> Bulk Metal in the MGP Stream

## Bulk Metal in the MGP Stream

## MGP Sample Acquisition

As noted in Section 3.4.2 of the PWCS Report, the protocol for Metal, Glass, and Plastic ("MGP") sample acquisition was modified during the course of the PWCS MGP sort in order to more accurately reflect the amount of bulk metal items present in the MGP stream. Appendix W discusses the sampling methodology initially used during the MGP sort, the modified sample acquisition approach, and the reasoning behind the change in sampling methodology.

## Development of Initial MGP Sampling Protocol

On May 7, 2004, a field visit was made to the Hugo Neu Schnitzer processing facility located in Brooklyn. The purpose of the site visit was to observe the MGP collected by DSNY collection vehicles and determine the best approach to removing the 100 to 125 pound samples from the collected MGP loads.

Based on the on-site review, we determined that a bobcat front-end loader equipped with a $1 / 2$ cubic yard bucket with a grab-arm would be suitable for taking a sample from the tipped MGP loads. The random selection of a portion of the tipped load in which to "grab" the sample would be made by the Sample Manager prior to the dumping of the load. The bobcat operator would then grab a bucket-load from that section of the load. The bucket would be lowered so that the Sample Manager could pull material from the bucket into a 96-gallon toter.

After each toter had been weighed, it was marked with the date, sample number, a sample code, and the truck number. Once the MGP sample's weight had been confirmed, the remainder of the tipped load was managed as it normally would be. In addition, the Sample Manager completed a Sample Management Form for each sample. An example of completed Sample Management Form is shown in Appendix E.

After all the MGP samples were weighed and labeled, they were loaded on an R. W. Beck truck and transported to the Greenpoint Marine Transfer Station ("MTS") where they were unloaded and positioned for sorting.

This methodology has been successfully used by R. W. Beck Project Team staff in prior studies for other local and state government and private sector clients for the purposes of sampling commingled recycling containers. Based on the review of the MGP loads on the day of the site visit, we believed that this methodology would also prove suitable for MGP sampling at the Hugo Neu Schnitzer processing facility.

## Modification of MGP Sampling Protocol

Sampling of the MGP at the Hugo Neu Schnitzer facility began on Monday, June 7th and was completed on Saturday, June 12th. Sampling was initiated using the protocol developed in conjunction with the May site visit.

MGP sampling proceeded as planned over the initial three days of the MGP sort. During these three days, a number of over-sized metal bulky items were observed in the MGP loads delivered to the Hugo Neu Schnitzer facility by the DSNY collection vehicles. However, relatively few of
the items were located in the random section of the loads selected for sampling. In cases where an item was too large to fit inside the 96 -gallon toter, (e.g., a bed frame or metal cabinet), the item was weighed separately on-site, the weight recorded on the MGP Sampling Form, and the item returned to the tipped load for normal processing.

As the MGP sort progressed, the number and size of metal bulk items present in the incoming loads of MGP called into question the sampling protocol. Many of these items were too large to handle using the bobcat loader. Due to the physical dimensions of many of these bulk metal items (including durable products such as ranges, water heaters, air conditioner units, bed frames, refrigerators, bicycles, etc.), we were concerned that such items were not being appropriately sampled from the MGP stream. In many instances, bulk items in the area from which the MGP sample was taken did not get captured by the bobcat loader due to their large dimension. On one occasion, for example, the area from which the MGP sample was to be taken in the load consisted of a twisted pile of metal bed frames and bikes, which the loader was unable to grab. The sampling protocol used during the early part of the week required that a bulk item be included in a sample if the bulk item was scooped up by the bobcat loader. If the bulk item either remained in the bucket of the loader or fell out of the bucket as it pulled away from the load from which the MGP sample was being taken, it was included in the sample.

To ensure that over-size bulk materials were appropriately included in the sampling process, it was decided to make two modifications to the MGP sampling protocol. First, due to the significant size of many of these large bulky metal items, the bobcat front end loader was replaced with a much larger front end loader, with a 5 cubic yard bucket. Second, a procedural change was made in the MGP sampling protocol to allow the Sample Manager to include any bulk items in the sample, if the Sample Manager believed the items would have been selected for sampling except for the fact that the item's dimensions precluded it from being grabbed by the front end loader for sampling.

As before, bulk items included in the sample were weighed by the Sample Manager and the weight recorded directly on the Sample Management Form. The bulk items were then discarded at the facility for processing, and were not transported to the MTS for further sorting. After preweighing the bulky item(s) and subtracting the weight of the bulk item(s) from the 100 to 125 pound target sample size, the Sample Manager sampled from the remainder of the grab sample until the total weight fell within the targeted range. By pre-weighing the bulk items during the sample acquisition process, the remaining quantity of material requiring physical sorting at the MTS was reduced for some samples. The R. W. Beck Project Team believes this methodology most accurately captures representative samples that include both bulk and non-bulk items in the MGP stream.

These methodological changes were implemented beginning on the morning of Thursday, June 10th. As a consequence, the results of the MGP sampling reflected in the PWCS Report probably under-estimated the amount of bulk metal items in the MGP samples taken during the week-long study period, primarily as a result of potentially under-reporting bulk metal items early in the week. However, for purposes of remaining conservative (i.e. under-reporting metal content), the full-week results have been reported. The revised methodology will be used during the Phase I Study for MGP sampling.

A listing of the bulky metal items separated from the MGP loads, along with the weight of each item, the date the item was sampled, the borough of origin, a description of each item, and the material category into which the items was recorded is provided in Table AW-1.

Table AW-1
Bulk Items in MGP Sort

| Date <br> Sampled | Borough |  | Bulk Item | Category |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | | Total Bulk |
| :---: |
| Weight |

Table AW-1
Bulk Items in MGP Sort

| Date <br> Sampled | Borough | Bulk Item | Category | Total Bulk <br> Weight |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Curtain Rod | Other Ferrous | 8 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Bed Frame | Other Ferrous | 10 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Stove Top | Other Ferrous | 9 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Stove Top | Other Ferrous | 7 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Refrigerator Door | Other Ferrous | 22 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Chair | Other Ferrous | 12 |
| $6 / 11 / 2004$ | Manhattan | Metal Shelf | Other Ferrous | 12 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Plastic Vacuum Cleaner Bottom | Small Appliances | 8 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Air Conditioner | Small Appliances | 66 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Washing Machine (part) | Small Appliances | 80 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Air Conditioner | Small Appliances | 48 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Appliance Cover | Other Ferrous | 5 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Container | Other Ferrous | 10 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Bed Frame | Other Ferrous | 7.5 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Pan | Other Ferrous | 5.5 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Chair | Other Ferrous | 7 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Ceiling Fan - Parts | Other Ferrous | 14 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Container | Other Ferrous | 12 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Dishwasher or similar appliance | Small Appliances | 71 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Refrigerator Door | Other Ferrous | 10 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Brooklyn | Metal Cabinet | Other Ferrous | 13 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Canister Vacuum - Plastic + Metal | Small Appliances | 12 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Child's Bicycle | Other Ferrous | 28 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Microwave Oven | Small Appliances | 31.5 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Metal Frame | Other Ferrous | 4.5 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Freezer Door (Part) | Other Ferrous | 17 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Freezer Door (Part) | Other Ferrous | 21 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Metal File Drawer | Other Ferrous | 15 |
| $6 / 12 / 2004$ | Staten Island | Steel Pipes | Other Ferrous | 22 |
|  |  |  | Total | 1195.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Results of Methodological Changes

As a result of the methodological change in MGP Sampling, we expected to obtain greater percentages of metals, from both appliances and other bulk items that had been inappropriately excluded by the original sampling protocol. The results, as shown in Table AW-2, confirm this.

## Table AW-2 <br> Comparison of Material Group Results for First Half and Second Half of MGP Sort

|  | First Half |  |  | Second Half |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Material | Average | Lower <br> Boundary | Upper <br> Boundary | Average | Lower <br> Boundary | Upper <br> Boundary |
| Paper | $5.10 \%$ | $4.35 \%$ | $5.91 \%$ | $4.30 \%$ | $3.50 \%$ | $5.19 \%$ |
| Plastic | $21.90 \%$ | $20.04 \%$ | $23.81 \%$ | $19.79 \%$ | $18.02 \%$ | $21.61 \%$ |
| Glass | $39.93 \%$ | $35.46 \%$ | $44.48 \%$ | $27.86 \%$ | $24.24 \%$ | $31.63 \%$ |
| Metal | $25.47 \%$ | $22.67 \%$ | $28.27 \%$ | $38.63 \%$ | $34.21 \%$ | $43.05 \%$ |
| Organic | $3.91 \%$ | $2.79 \%$ | $5.20 \%$ | $2.26 \%$ | $1.70 \%$ | $2.89 \%$ |
| App. \& Elec. | $2.13 \%$ | $1.35 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $6.30 \%$ | $4.14 \%$ | $8.46 \%$ |
| Const. Debris | $0.27 \%$ | $0.15 \%$ | $0.41 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ | $0.15 \%$ | $0.45 \%$ |
| Misc. | $1.22 \%$ | $0.75 \%$ | $1.80 \%$ | $0.43 \%$ | $0.27 \%$ | $0.64 \%$ |
| HHW | $0.08 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ | $0.16 \%$ | $0.09 \%$ | $0.26 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |

The results shown in Table AW-2 show that Appliances \& Electrical Material rose from two percent to six percent, and Metal Material rose from 25 percent to 39 percent. Glass Material was the primary group that was significantly reduced as a consequence of changing the bulk metal sampling protocol, falling from 40 percent to 28 percent.
The results for individual materials show that within the Appliance \& Electrical Group, Small Appliances changed from 0.88 percent to 4.56 percent. Within the Metal Group, Other Ferrous increased from 14.08 percent to 29.01 percent. In the Glass Group, Mixed Cullet decreased from 27 percent to 16 percent.

Given the nature of the protocol modifications, these are precisely the material categories and groups in which we would expect to see significant changes. Table AW-3 contains results for material sub-categories of the three groups highlighted in Table AW-2.

Table AW-3
Comparison of Material Category Results for First Half and Second Half of MGP Sort

|  |  | First Half |  | Second Half |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Material |  | Lower | Upper |  | Lower | Upper |
|  | Average | Boundary | Boundary | Average | Boundary | Boundary |
| Aluminum Cans: Deposit | $0.36 \%$ | $0.29 \%$ | $0.44 \%$ | $0.42 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ | $0.54 \%$ |
| Aluminum Cans: Non-Deposit | $0.41 \%$ | $0.29 \%$ | $0.55 \%$ | $0.33 \%$ | $0.25 \%$ | $0.41 \%$ |
| Aluminum Foil/Tins | $1.17 \%$ | $0.87 \%$ | $1.51 \%$ | $0.71 \%$ | $0.56 \%$ | $0.87 \%$ |
| Empty Aerosol Cans | $0.69 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ | $0.86 \%$ | $0.55 \%$ | $0.42 \%$ | $0.69 \%$ |
| Mixed Metals | $0.81 \%$ | $0.44 \%$ | $1.27 \%$ | $0.93 \%$ | $0.50 \%$ | $1.49 \%$ |
| Other Aluminum | $0.14 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ | $0.22 \%$ | $0.24 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ | $0.39 \%$ |
| Other Ferrous | $14.08 \%$ | $11.98 \%$ | $16.18 \%$ | $29.01 \%$ | $25.13 \%$ | $32.89 \%$ |
| Other Non-Ferrous | $0.23 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ | $0.36 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ | $0.50 \%$ |
| Tin Food Cans | $7.59 \%$ | $6.78 \%$ | $8.43 \%$ | $6.13 \%$ | $5.36 \%$ | $6.94 \%$ |
| Total Metal | $\mathbf{2 5 . 4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 6 7 \%}$ | $28.27 \%$ | $38.63 \%$ | $34.21 \%$ | $43.05 \%$ |
| Brown Glass: Deposit | $1.16 \%$ | $0.80 \%$ | $1.59 \%$ | $0.97 \%$ | $0.66 \%$ | $1.35 \%$ |
| Brown Glass: Non-Deposit | $0.44 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ | $0.64 \%$ | $0.14 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ | $0.23 \%$ |
| Clear Glass: Deposit | $1.07 \%$ | $0.73 \%$ | $1.48 \%$ | $0.87 \%$ | $0.59 \%$ | $1.20 \%$ |
| Clear Glass: Non-Deposit | $6.11 \%$ | $5.02 \%$ | $7.30 \%$ | $5.78 \%$ | $4.74 \%$ | $6.91 \%$ |
| Green Glass: Deposit | $1.05 \%$ | $0.72 \%$ | $1.45 \%$ | $0.99 \%$ | $0.66 \%$ | $1.38 \%$ |
| Green Glass: Non-Deposit | $2.65 \%$ | $1.82 \%$ | $3.63 \%$ | $2.34 \%$ | $1.47 \%$ | $3.40 \%$ |
| Mixed Cullet | $26.74 \%$ | $22.77 \%$ | $30.91 \%$ | $16.29 \%$ | $13.11 \%$ | $19.73 \%$ |
| Other Glass | $0.70 \%$ | $0.43 \%$ | $1.04 \%$ | $0.49 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ | $0.71 \%$ |
| Total Glass | $39.93 \%$ | $35.46 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 2 4 \%}$ | $31.63 \%$ |
| Audio/Visual Equipment: Cell |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phones | $0.01 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.01 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Audio/Visual Equipment: Other | $0.25 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ | $0.40 \%$ | $1.12 \%$ | $0.58 \%$ | $1.84 \%$ |
| Computer Monitors | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other Computer Equip. | $1.00 \%$ | $0.58 \%$ | $1.52 \%$ | $0.61 \%$ | $0.32 \%$ | $1.00 \%$ |
| Small Appliances | $0.88 \%$ | $0.51 \%$ | $1.25 \%$ | $4.56 \%$ | $2.85 \%$ | $6.28 \%$ |
| Televisions | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Total App. \& Elec. | $\mathbf{2 . 1 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 3 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1 4 \%}$ | $8.46 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Conclusions

Based on the results of the PWCS, we believe that the original protocol for acquiring MGP samples was inappropriate in terms of accounting for bulk items. The bobcat front end loader was too small to handle the over-sized items found in the NYC recyclables stream. However, overall protocol and QA/QC procedures highlighted this issue relatively early in the sampling period. Our managers took quick and appropriate actions to modify the sampling protocol to accurately reflect the character of the MGP stream.

Our statistical analysis of the samples obtained both before and after the change in MGP sampling protocol supports our conclusions regarding the potential under-reporting of bulk metal items. The use of larger front-end loaders in conjunction with an improved protocol with respect to over-size items will help to ensure that such items are appropriately included in the sampling results.

The statistical analysis contained in this report may reflect an under-reporting of the metals contained in the MGP stream, since we have based our results on the entire week's sampling. But given the nature of a preliminary study and the a priori skepticism that would meet relatively high metal percentages in the MGP stream, we believe it is better to err on the side of under-reporting metals.

## Appendix X <br> Capture Rates

## Capture Rates

### 1.1 Introduction

One metric used to assess New York City's recycling program is the "Capture Rate." This term refers to the amount of a specific material, such as paper designated for recycling, that is collected divided by the total amount of that material in both the refuse and recycling streams. For example, if 50 tons of designated paper is collected for recycling and the total amount of designated paper in the refuse and recycling streams is 100 tons, the capture rate for designated paper is 50 percent. Essentially, the capture rate measures how much of a material is being recycled out of all of that same material that is "out there".
Appendix X presents calculations for capture rates for the PWCS. Three capture rates have been calculated:

1. A capture rate for Paper, MGP, and combined recycling materials before any adjustment for moisture and particulate testing.
2. A capture rate for Paper, MGP, and combined recycling materials after adjustments for moisture and particulate testing.
3. A capture rate for Paper, MGP, and combined recycling materials, adjusted for moisture and particulate testing and accounting for the 64 percent of appliances in MGP with 50 percent or more metal.

In addition, a survey of thirty of the largest municipal recycling programs in the United States was conducted to gauge the use of capture rates in these cities. Twenty of the 30 programs contacted responded to the survey. The purpose of the survey was to determine how many municipalities use capture rates for measuring the effectiveness of their recycling programs.

### 1.1.1 PWCS Capture Rates

Tables AX-1, AX-2, and AX-3 present the three capture rates for the PWCS.
Table AX-1 presents the PWCS capture rates before any adjustments for moisture and particulate testing. It shows the amount of paper and metal, glass and plastic ("MGP") collected for recycling as a percentage of the total amount of designated paper and MGP collected in the combined refuse and recycling materials.

Table AX-1
PWCS Capture Rates Before Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Tonnage |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Recycling Stream |  |  |
| Designated Paper | $7,301.44$ |  |
| (1) |  |  |
| Designated MGP | $4,882.01$ (1) |  |
| Total Designated Paper and MGP | $10,577.90{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Total Recycling Stream | $\mathbf{1 2 , 1 8 3 . 4 5}$ |  |
| Waste Stream | Tonnage | \% of Waste Stream |
| Designated Paper | $15,415.94$ | $21.47 \%$ |
| Designated MGP | $8,566.01$ | $11.93 \%$ |
| Total Designated Paper and MGP | $23,981.95$ | $33.40 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Total Waste Stream | $71,802.26$ (1) |  |
| Capture Rate for Paper Recycling ${ }^{(2)}$ | $7,301.44 / 15,415.94=47.36 \%$ |  |
| Capture Rate for MGP Recycling ${ }^{(2)}$ | $4,882.01 / 8,566.01=56.99 \%$ |  |
| Total Capture Rate ${ }^{(2)}$ | $12,183.45 / 23,981.95=50.80 \%$ |  |

(1) Tonnage values are based on the average weekly tonnage that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY.
(2) Capture rate assessed by weight of collected material over weight of designated material in the waste stream.

In the PWCS Refuse Sort, a series of moisture and particulate tests were conducted for selected materials to determine how much moisture and foreign matter migrated from the collected waste to the selected materials. The results of these tests are described in more detail in Appendix V. Table AX-2 presents the capture rates after the adjustments for moisture and particulate testing.

Table AX-2
PWCS Capture Rates After Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

|  | Tonnage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Recycling Stream |  |  |
| Designated Paper | $7,301.44{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Designated MGP | $4,882.01^{(1)}$ |  |
| Total Recycling Stream | $12,183.45{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Waste Stream | Tonnage $\quad \%$ of Waste Stream |  |
| Designated Paper | $14,289.03$ | $19.90 \%$ |
| Designated MGP | $8,337.30$ | $11.61 \%$ |
| Total Designated Paper and MGP | $22,626.33$ | $31.51 \%$ |
| Total Waste Stream | $71,802.26{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Capture Rates for Paper Recycling ${ }^{(2)}$ | $7,3014.44 / 14,289.03=51.10 \%$ |  |
| Capture Rates for MGP Recycling ${ }^{(2)}$ | $4,882.01 / 8,337.30=58.56 \%$ |  |
| Total Capture Rate ${ }^{(2)}$ | $12,183.45 / 22,626.33=53.85 \%$ |  |
| (1) Tonnage values are based on the average weekly tonnage that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY. |  |  |
| (2) Capture rate assessed by weight of collected material over weight of designated material in the waste stream. |  |  |

During the PWCS Refuse Sort, all small appliances in the refuse stream were designated as nonrecyclable. However, during the Recycling Sort, a subsort was conducted which separated small appliances into those made of 50 percent or more of metal and those made of less than 50 percent metal. The small appliances made of 50 percent or more of metal were designated as recyclable. The values in Table AX-3 represents the capture rates in the event that all possible metal was extracted and deemed recyclable from all small appliances as they entered the waste stream. In addition, Table AX-3 shows results after adjustments for moisture and particulate testing.

Table AX-3
PWCS Capture Rates After Accounting for Small Appliances and Moisture and Particulate Adjustments

| Tonnage |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Recycling Stream |  |  |
| Designated Paper | $7,301.44{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Designated MGP | $4,882.01$ (1) |  |
| Total Recycling Stream | $\mathbf{1 2 , 1 8 3 . 4 5 ~}{ }^{(1)}$ |  |
| Waste Stream | Tonnage | \% of Waste Stream |
| Designated Paper | $12,706.12$ | $17.70 \%$ |
| Designated MGP | $8,463.74$ | $11.79 \%$ |
| Total Designated Paper and MGP | $21,169.86$ | $29.48 \%$ |
| Total Waste Stream | $71,802.26$ (1) |  |
| Capture Rates for Paper Recycling ${ }^{(2)}$ | $7,301.44 / 12,706.12=57.46 \%$ |  |
| Capture Rates for MGP Recycling ${ }^{(3)}$ | $4,882.01 / 8,463.74=57.68 \%$ |  |
| Total Capture Rate ${ }^{(2)}$ | $12,183.45 / 21,169.86=57.55 \%$ |  |

(1) Tonnage values are based on the average weekly tonnage that was collected during May and June 2004, as provided by DSNY.
(2) Capture rate assessed by weight of collected material over weight of designated material in the waste stream.

### 1.1.2 Municipal Survey

To determine how widely capture rates are used to measure the success of municipal recycling programs, a telephone survey of 30 of the largest municipal recycling programs in the United States was conducted. Of the 30 municipal programs contacted, 20 responded.
The contact person in each city's recycling program was asked if the term "capture rate" was used and, if so, how was it calculated. If the answer to both questions was affirmative, then the person was asked to provide the most current estimate of the capture rate. Table AX-4 presents the results of the telephone survey.

Table AX-4
NYC Waste Composition Study
Results of Capture Rate Telephone Research

|  | Houston | San Antonio | Detroit | Washington D.C. | Memphis | Portland | Tucson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact | Ed Kim | Steven Davies | Angela (would not give last name) | William B. Easley, Jr. | Andy Ashford | Bruce Walker | Don Gibson |
| Title | Recycling Supervisor | Manager | Program Supervisor | Recycling Program Officer | Administrator, Recycling \& Composting | Solid Waste Director | Recycling Coordinator |
| Summary of Capture Rate Discussion | Houston does not make a distinction between what they "capture" and what they recycle. Their capture rate is identical to their recycling rate. <br> When posed with NYC's method, they responded that they do not use such a metric at all. According to Mr. Kim, everybody (and hence every program) has their own interpretations with respect to terminology. | San Antonio does not use this term at all. San Antonio conjectured that the majority of Texas does not use this term. In fact, the contact had never heard of this term, and does not perform a calculation similar to NYC. | Detroit does not report a recycling or capture rate (this is in accord with <br> WasteNews.com). <br> They specialize in <br> Waste to Energy and <br> Glass and plastic recycling, and produce a quarterly report for Wayne County. The contact offered to investigate the term further, but as far as she knows no one uses the term capture rate (it was new to the contact). Detroit does not perform a calculation similar to NYC. | Washington defines a capture rate in the identical fashion to NYC, but currently does not calculate one. The program is seriously considering implementing this calculation in the near future. The reason they have not done so is that they have yet to "get a handle on recycling/diversion rates" and "who is doing what". The contact is of the opinion that the level of specificity provided by capture rates is extremely useful and is hopeful that D.C. will implement calculations sooner rather than later. | Mr. Ashford has been in the recycling industry for 25+ <br> years, and had never heard of a capture rate. The city of <br> Memphis focuses on an aggregate recycling rate (as we have defined). Organic waste recycling is a big focus in Memphis from a revenue <br> standpoint, and in the opinion of Mr. Ashford any computation that attempts to estimate the amount of designated <br> recyclables in the total waste stream is too conjectural and too specific. | Portland defines capture rate in the same fashion as NYC. However, they do not report a capture rate, nor do they compute one for tracking purposes. <br> Specifically, a capture rate for <br> Portland would be "the amount of commodity $x$ recycled/ estimated total amount of $x$ available in the overall waste stream". | Tucson does not use a capture rate, nor do they perform any calculations based on estimates whatsoever. When the program was initiated, the University of Arizona Garbology Project Statistical estimate of $32 \%$ was the number for recycling rates estimated, given that $100 \%$ of people recycled $100 \%$ of what they could (this was deemed unrealistic). An adjusted initial estimate was used for program approval, at roughly 19\%. Since February of 2003, the city has implemented a new tracking system whereby they track total tonnage of waste collected in each of the city's 12 zones, as well as the total tonnage of recyclables collected, to produce a "true zonal diversion rate" (this is the same as a recycling rate by definition in Tucson). |

Table AX-4
NYC Waste Composition Study
Results of Capture Rate Telephone Research
(continued)

|  | Denver | Chicago | Philadelphia | Fort Worth | Oklahoma City | Baltimore | Dallas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact | Charlotte Pitt | Chris Sauve | David Robinson | Ed Shumpert | Charles Lombardy | Valentina Yukoma | John A. Barlow IV |
| Title | Recycling Coordinator | Recycling Coordinator | Recycling Coordinator | Recycling Coordinator | Recycling Coordinator | Recycling Analyst | Waste Diversion Manager |
| Summary of Capture Rate Discussion | Denver is quote "not that sophisticated". <br> They do not use, nor calculate a capture rate, although the contact was aware of the term (not the specific definition used by NYC, however.) Denver is only concerned with an aggregate recycling rate. The state of Colorado has no goals/standards for municipal recycling data, so any calculations made for the program are for internal purposes only. | Chicago does not know what a capture rate means. The contact intimated that there may be a similar calculation done to NYC's but that that would require more investigation on his part. However, he was certain that the term "capture rate" is not used (this is validated by a thorough review of their detailed recycling report.) | Philadelphia does not use the term "capture rate". The contact was not aware of the term at all in any defined form. Philadelphia is primarily concerned with a recycling rate. | Fort Worth does not use a capture rate, and does not compute a capture rate as defined by NYC. Fort Worth is primarily concerned with an aggregate recycling/diversion rate. | Oklahoma City does not use, nor have they heard of, the term capture rate. They also do not perform a calculation similar to NYC's calculation. The city is primarily concerned with an aggregate recycling/diversion rate. | Baltimore had not heard of the term capture rate. <br> When posed with the capture rate calculation as defined by NYC, the contact was certain that such a calculation was not performed. Baltimore is primarily concerned with an aggregate diversion rate. | The city of Dallas does not use the term capture rate. The only calculation other than a recycling rate that is done is performed by Dallas' contractor. The contractor that provides Dallas with an Annual Report provides values for each particular recyclable as a percent of the total recycling stream for the year, in addition to an aggregate recycling rate. |

Table AX-4
NYC Waste Composition Study

## Results of Capture Rate Telephone Research

 (continued)|  | Seattle | Milwaukee | Nashville | Jacksonville | Austin | San Francisco |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact | Hans Van Dusen | Mary Bengsch | Shelly Sloan | John Sherhorn | Bob Fernandez | Kevin Drew |
| Title | Solid Waste Contracts Manager | Recycling Specialist | Operations Manager | Manager | Manager | SFEnvironment Representative |
| Summary of Capture Rate Discussion | The city of Seattle is aware of the term capture rate as defined by NYC. They do not track these rates regularly, but only on a "case-by-case", or "as needed" basis. Only aggregate recycling/diversion rates are tracked regularly. | Milwaukee, when posed the question regarding capture rates, immediately assumed the term was synonymous with recycling rate. When told of the calculation as performed by NYC, the contact was certain that such a calculation is not performed, and that the term capture rate is not used. Milwaukee is concerned only with an aggregate recycling rate. | According to the contact, the city of Nashville does not use the term capture rate (it was new to the contact). However, the contact made a referral to the operation manager who is in charge of all statistical analysis related to the program so as to be certain that she was giving a valid response. It appears that Nashville does compute a capture rate as defined by NYC, but may not call this calculation by that name. A message has been sent out to the referral contact to make certain that Nashville has provided accurate information. | The city of Jacksonville is currently at a "crossroads", as the responsibilities of program outreach have been combined with recycling oversight in the recent past. Jacksonville has recycling contracts for residential recycling, yard waste, and tires. They track volume that goes into landfills (the Jacksonville landfill). As far as "capture rate" is concerned, they define it as how much of each recyclable is "captured" out of the total waste stream. The contact intimated that the Florida Department of Environmental Protection has a model that is used to estimate capture percentages for smaller counties, and referred R. W. Beck to another contact at FDEP for further inquiry if necessary. Karen Moore from the FDEP stated that capture rates are not tracked as defined by NYC for Florida, and that FDEP currently uses the waste composition model produced by R. W. Beck, that provides percent of total values which are extrapolated from field data collection. | The city of Austin does not use the term capture rate, nor do they compute a capture rate as defined by NYC under another name. The contact was very interested in knowing whether other recycling programs in Beck's research were found to be using a "capture rate". Austin's main calculation is its recycling rate, which compares the amount of recyclables recovered vs. amount of material collected. However, the contact warned that since the city does not collect all of the waste in Austin (for example, multi-family homes are excluded), the recycling rate is somewhat skewed. Another calculation offered by the contact compares recovered recyclable material that is outbound (sold) vs. unsold (defined to be residue). | San Francisco does not use the term capture rate. Every year, after the completion of their diversion study, waste characterization/allocation study values from studies performed in 1990 and 1996 are used to "extrapolate or interpolate" exactly how much waste is being extracted. These results are presented graphically, and there is no general terminology used to describe them. The contact acknowledged the fact that the numbers from 1990 and/or 1996 are fairly old, which may make the results less representative than desired to some extent. |

As Table AX-4 shows, most cities were unfamiliar with the term "Capture Rate," as defined by New York City, and none of the respondents use capture rates to measure the success of their recycling program.

