



SUMMARY REPORT – MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE (MSW) RECYCLING & DISPOSAL DATA for CONNECTICUT CITIES & TOWNS - FY2013

Notes about the Data Presented Below

Data presented below was updated August 2015 by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CTDEEP) Bureau of Materials Management & Compliance Assurance (MM&CA). Questions? Corrections? Please e-mail [Judy Belaval](mailto:judy.belaval@ctdeep.org) at the CTDEEP Bureau of MM&CA or call (860) 424-3237.

- ♦ **MSW recycling data** in this report is based on (1) the tonnage of bottles, cans, and paper **reported** received for recycling from CT municipalities by CT solid waste facilities permitted to process or transfer recyclables; (2) tonnage of other material recycled **as reported** in the FY2013 Annual Municipal Recycling Reports; and (3) tonnage of recyclables direct hauled out-of-state **as reported** by haulers. The tonnage of MSW recycled includes both “[designated recyclable items](#)” and other MSW recyclable items and also includes material reported reused through municipal swap areas.
- ♦ **MSW disposal data** in this report is based on (1) tonnage of MSW generated within the borders of CT municipalities and **reported** received for disposal and/or transfer to disposal by CT solid waste transfer stations, resource recovery facilities and landfills; (2) tonnage of MSW **reported** direct hauled to out-of-state disposal by haulers and/or CT municipalities (as reported on the FY2013 Annual Municipal Recycling Reports). It includes MSW generated by both the residential and non-residential sectors. It generally does not knowingly include wastes such as construction and demolition wastes, industrial sludges, or land-clearing debris.
- ♦ The data presented below reflects only information reported to the CTDEEP. MSW disposal and recycling tonnages could likely be underestimated for those CT towns or cities if their disposed MSW and/or their recyclables were delivered directly to an out-of-state destination or directly to an end market without first going through a CT permitted SW facility and that tonnage was not reported to the CTDEEP by either the hauler or the municipality. If disposal tonnages are under reported, the MSW recycling rate for that town would be over-estimated since the percent recycled = tons recycled/(tons recycled + tons disposed).
- ♦ The accuracy of the data presented below is contingent upon the accuracy of data submitted to the CTDEEP by the reporting entities identified above.
 - Rows with blue shading indicate extremely low MSW disposal rates (<600 pounds/person/year) or significant drop in MSW disposed as compared to previous years – with no obvious explanation. Data regarding the amount of MSW disposed for that town may not be completely captured in reports submitted to the CTDEEP.
 - Rows with brown shading indicate municipalities with extremely high MSW disposal rates (>1800 pounds/person/year). This may be due to data issues; however in many cases, these higher disposal rates can be attributed to demographics i.e. large number of businesses, manufacturers, universities, casinos etc.; influx of summer residents; specific industry generating large amounts of waste, etc..
- ♦ Towns in green font have tonnages combined with another town because they share a municipal TS which does not have a scale and therefore tons received are not tracked by town of origin.
- ♦ Towns in red font had not, as of August 2015, submitted their FY2013 Annual Municipal Recycling Report to the CTDEEP and therefore are in violation of annual municipal recycling reporting (AMRR) requirements pursuant to CGS Section 22a-220(h)
- ♦ PPY= pounds/person/year;
- ♦ Combined = (Tons of Recyclables Reported as Residential) + (Tons of Recyclables Reported as Non-Residential) + (Tons of Recyclables Reported as Mixed Residential and Non-Residential)

[Please note data qualifiers at the end of this document.](#)

FY2013 Summary - MSW Recycling And Disposal Data For Connecticut Cities & Towns

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes) Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | |
| ANDOVER | 151.74 | 151.74 | 248.24 | 248.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 248.24 | 0.00 | 585.88 | 358.12 | 3,272 | 336 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements LOW disposal rate |
| ANSONIA | 1.04 | 105.69 | 9.95 | 1,012.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,012.40 | 0.00 | 10,397.00 | 1,085.40 | 19,158 | 3,359 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| ASHFORD | 201.77 | 234.64 | 432.20 | 502.59 | 1.00 | 64.02 | 19.58 | 587.19 | 0 | 2,449.56 | 1,143.59 | 4,284 | 540 | 0 | |
| AVON | 235.74 | 476.95 | 2,154.99 | 4,360.05 | 0.00 | 79.00 | 18.39 | 4,457.44 | 35.21 | 11,077.92 | 1,211.83 | 18,283 | 8,055 | 1120 | |
| Combined data for: BARKHAMSTED, NEW HARTFORD, WINCHESTER - RRDD1 | 173.20 | 226.96 | 1,882.11 | 2,466.28 | 279.59 | 484.65 | 112.3 | 3,342.82 | 98.87 | 11,827.53 | 1,088.44 | 21,733 | 5,482 | 247.1 | |
| BEACON FALLS | 104.65 | 198.32 | 317.34 | 601.42 | 117.50 | 8.40 | 5.69 | 733.01 | 0 | 2,678.73 | 883.34 | 6,065 | 843 | 0 | |
| BERLIN | 188.34 | 247.56 | 1,927.01 | 2,532.90 | 730.00 | 113.06 | 48.11 | 3,424.07 | 169.58 | 9,799.09 | 957.74 | 20,463 | 11,623 | 0 | |
| BETHANY | 0.64 | 139.12 | 1.77 | 386.06 | 0.00 | 76.40 | 9.47 | 471.93 | 0 | 1,823.92 | 657.27 | 5,550 | 1,111 | 0 | |
| BETHEL | 102.66 | 181.07 | 983.50 | 1,734.71 | 292.50 | 210.00 | 31.14 | 2,268.35 | 1.62 | 10,271.33 | 1,072.11 | 19,161 | 7,036 | 4.26 | |
| BETHLEHEM | 189.39 | 190.66 | 337.69 | 339.94 | 0.00 | 48.17 | 23.59 | 411.70 | 0 | 1,527.74 | 856.84 | 3,566 | 696 | 0 | |
| BLOOMFIELD | 176.69 | 447.75 | 1,820.13 | 4,612.24 | 263.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4,875.61 | 0 | 18,570.30 | 1,802.77 | 20,602 | 19,046 | 0 | HIGH disposal rate |

¹ Most data re bottles, cans, paper (BCP) recycled from within the borders of the municipality is based on FY2013 quarterly recycling facility reports submitted to the CTDEEP

² Data re organics, scrap metal, and other recyclables (other than BCP) recycled by the municipality is based on FY2013 Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRR) Submitted to the CTDEEP

³ Most data re MSW disposed from within the borders of the municipality is based on FY2013 quarterly TS, RRF, LF reports submitted to the CTDEEP

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| BOLTON | 238.35 | 252.32 | 591.10 | 625.75 | 20.40 | 7.96 | 6.57 | 660.68 | 21.32 | 2,049.85 | 826.55 | 4,960 | 1,261 | 0 | |
| BOZRAH | 70.05 | 741.10 | 92.29 | 976.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 976.40 | 0 | 3,289.85 | 2,497.04 | 2,635 | 1,112 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements HIGH disposal rate |
| BRANFORD | 31.94 | 180.57 | 447.56 | 2,530.12 | 3,303.00 | 303.21 | 75.19 | 6,211.52 | 1146.18 | 12,365.79 | 882.51 | 28,024 | 12,598 | 0 | |
| BRIDGEPORT | 73.60 | 171.59 | 5,388.78 | 12,562.41 | 3,753.53 | 538.80 | 146.95 | 17,001.69 | 0 | 97,905.41 | 1,337.28 | 146,425 | 42,360 | 312 | |
| BRIDGEWATER | 225.62 | 242.89 | 192.00 | 206.70 | 0.00 | 29.52 | 11.29 | 247.51 | 1.29 | 601.75 | 707.11 | 1,702 | 252 | 0 | |
| BRISTOL | 176.07 | 257.40 | 5,335.28 | 7,799.54 | 8,240.69 | 287.56 | 164.50 | 16,492.29 | 833.53 | 40,593.84 | 1,339.66 | 60,603 | 21,592 | 0 | |
| Combined data for BROOKFIELD, SHERMAN, NEW MILFORD | 150.01 | 269.72 | 3,620.27 | 6,509.07 | 2,821.79 | 240.02 | 83.09 | 9,653.97 | 2.26 | 26,765.67 | 1,109.09 | 48,266 | 15,769 | 2798.14 | Winters Bros Recycling Facilities Reported a Large Increase in FY2013- of non-residential BCP |
| BROOKLYN | 159.50 | 165.90 | 654.17 | 680.44 | 27.00 | 3.00 | 17.00 | 727.44 | 72.68 | 2,508.59 | 611.63 | 8,203 | 1,521 | 0 | |
| BURLINGTON | 231.02 | 238.21 | 1,089.74 | 1,123.63 | 75.15 | 37.50 | 27.28 | 1,263.56 | 305.11 | 3,539.01 | 750.27 | 9,434 | 907 | 55.05 | |
| CANAAN | 94.93 | 506.68 | 57.81 | 308.57 | 18.50 | 29.84 | 12.70 | 369.61 | 34.24 | 461.54 | 757.87 | 1,218 | 826 | 0 | |
| CANTERBURY | 147.68 | 147.68 | 377.02 | 377.02 | 0.00 | 79.95 | 21.51 | 478.48 | 8.4 | 2,597.95 | 1,017.61 | 5,106 | 515 | 0 | |
| CANTON | 193.73 | 213.41 | 1,002.65 | 1,104.49 | 855.00 | 96.70 | 46.34 | 2,102.53 | 0 | 4,481.41 | 865.89 | 10,351 | 3,520 | 0 | |
| CHAPLIN | 221.64 | 225.65 | 253.34 | 257.92 | 0.00 | 16.99 | 2.50 | 277.41 | 0 | 818.11 | 715.76 | 2,286 | 338 | 0 | |
| CHESHIRE | 105.12 | 430.09 | 1,539.99 | 6,300.87 | 286.30 | 41.95 | 16.64 | 6,645.76 | 289.09 | 17,154.65 | 1,170.97 | 29,300 | 15,431 | 15 | |
| CHESTER | 169.35 | 309.57 | 359.45 | 657.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 657.39 | 27.78 | 1,217.31 | 573.53 | 4,245 | 2,132 | 534.83 | |
| CLINTON | 142.23 | 314.17 | 938.45 | 2,072.90 | 116.80 | 87.43 | 276.91 | 2,554.04 | 177.97 | 6,102.25 | 924.86 | 13,196 | 4,111 | 286.93 | |
| COLCHESTER | 181.10 | 222.95 | 1,465.76 | 1,804.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,804.48 | 0 | 7,358.91 | 909.24 | 16,187 | 3,573 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| COLEBROOK | 252.68 | 252.68 | 184.58 | 184.58 | 0.00 | 2.73 | 8.09 | 195.40 | 7.11 | 621.56 | 850.87 | 1,461 | * | 0 | |
| COLUMBIA | 202.90 | 224.20 | 554.02 | 612.18 | 95.00 | 42.17 | 13.07 | 762.42 | 0 | 1,338.96 | 490.37 | 5,461 | 1,048 | 631.26 | Low Disposal Rate |
| CORNWALL | 227.96 | 227.96 | 159.46 | 159.46 | 0.00 | 37.74 | 18.87 | 216.07 | 37.47 | 452.46 | 646.83 | 1,399 | 416 | 0 | |
| COVENTRY | 221.10 | 278.42 | 1,373.56 | 1,729.70 | 64.00 | 1.24 | 19.66 | 1,814.60 | 0 | 4,499.96 | 724.34 | 12,425 | 1,404 | 0 | |
| CROMWELL | 136.11 | 294.82 | 967.52 | 2,095.74 | 1,125.00 | 178.76 | 44.35 | 3,443.85 | 124.61 | 8,214.44 | 1,155.58 | 14,217 | 6,967 | 0 | |
| DANBURY | 83.69 | 227.17 | 3,464.95 | 9,405.65 | 4,921.62 | 19.92 | 95.50 | 14,442.69 | 54.26 | 58,911.88 | 1,422.87 | 82,807 | 43,595 | 8580 | |
| DARIEN The MSW disposed data for this town is questionable and probably not accurate- | 0.00 | 171.62 | 0.00 | 1,811.78 | 11,418.77 | 230.50 | 71.02 | 13,532.07 | 38.11 | 5,353.00 | 507.06 | 21,114 | 7,814 | 0 | The MSW data for this town is questionable and probably not accurate- LOW disposal rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSW disposal under-reported – haulers possibly hauling directly to out-of-state destinations but not reporting tonnage to Darien or the CTDEEP High tonnage of organics reported recycled/composted – AMRR |
| DEEP RIVER | 166.62 | 181.42 | 383.47 | 417.53 | 1,650.00 | 142.59 | 35.92 | 2,246.04 | 38.11 | 2,947.04 | 1,280.49 | 4,603 | 1,487 | 2970 | High tonnage of organics reported recycled/composted – AMRR – three times higher than in previous years – Probably most of it was disaster debris . |
| DERBY | 0.28 | 41.24 | 1.79 | 264.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 264.54 | 0 | 7,493.26 | 1,168.08 | 12,830 | 4,872 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| Combined data for: DURHAM, MIDDLEFIELD | 162.53 | 186.51 | 957.62 | 1,098.93 | 1,110.00 | 226.37 | 29.99 | 2,465.29 | 106.53 | 5,526.56 | 937.98 | 11,784 | 4,016 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| EASTFORD The MSW data for this town is questionable and probably not accurate- | 192.64 | 615.12 | 166.63 | 532.08 | 0.00 | 25.97 | 37.41 | 595.46 | 10.01 | 354.83 | 410.21 | 1,730 | 568 | 0 | The MSW disposal data for this town is questionable and probably not accurate- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOW disposal rate; • Large tonnage increase in nonres OCC reported by Willimantic Waste Recycling facility FY2012 and FY2013 – accuracy of that tonnage not confirmed |
| EAST GRANBY | 199.14 | 235.29 | 516.16 | 609.87 | 202.59 | 54.28 | 11.82 | 878.56 | 0 | 3,535.11 | 1,363.85 | 5,184 | 3,747 | 0 | |
| EAST HADDAM | 205.18 | 205.18 | 939.52 | 939.52 | 285.00 | 0.00 | 34.55 | 1,259.07 | 0 | 3,368.33 | 735.60 | 9,158 | 1,425 | 0 | |
| EAST HAMPTON | 146.31 | 209.87 | 946.64 | 1,357.83 | 468.75 | 48.96 | 3.61 | 1,879.15 | 0 | 5,950.16 | 919.65 | 12,940 | 1,887 | 0 | |
| EAST HARTFORD | 131.14 | 283.55 | 3,362.03 | 7,268.98 | 7,646.70 | 203.98 | 88.42 | 15,208.08 | 0 | 29,371.14 | 1,145.70 | 51,272 | 28,975 | 0 | |
| EAST HAVEN | 72.89 | 107.51 | 1,063.79 | 1,569.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,569.09 | 0 | 11,950.40 | 818.80 | 29,190 | 6,342 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| EAST LYME | 246.46 | 305.71 | 2,328.08 | 2,887.72 | 920.00 | 91.00 | 63.82 | 3,962.54 | 66.54 | 10,544.25 | 1,116.27 | 18,892 | 5,463 | 4350 | |
| EASTON | 203.75 | 203.79 | 774.54 | 774.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.51 | 781.23 | 0 | 2,748.67 | 723.05 | 7,603 | 915 | 0 | |
| EAST WINDSOR | 155.12 | 264.54 | 883.19 | 1,506.18 | 73.05 | 257.59 | 18.92 | 1,855.74 | 0 | 6,740.50 | 1,183.89 | 11,387 | 7,072 | 140 | |
| ELLINGTON | 178.81 | 240.41 | 1,410.75 | 1,896.72 | 180.00 | 8.13 | 62.83 | 2,147.68 | 0 | 5,629.70 | 713.57 | 15,779 | 3,293 | 13.4 | |
| ENFIELD | 123.79 | 329.66 | 2,764.14 | 7,361.38 | 4,562.40 | 126.39 | 103.05 | 12,153.22 | 137.6 | 31,334.26 | 1,403.24 | 44,660 | 18,420 | 0 | |
| ESSEX | 214.21 | 337.09 | 712.05 | 1,120.50 | 825.00 | 44.90 | 34.47 | 2,024.87 | 86.16 | 4,060.01 | 1,221.42 | 6,648 | 3,692 | 870 | |
| FAIRFIELD | 163.61 | 194.05 | 4,944.97 | 5,865.10 | 25,736.50 | 394.72 | 251.86 | 32,248.18 | 0 | 35,211.54 | 1,164.98 | 60,450 | 24,436 | 10,305.5 | |
| FARMINGTON | 182.17 | 309.34 | 2,325.29 | 3,948.57 | 3,300.83 | 14.78 | 17.85 | 7,282.03 | 47.16 | 16,174.09 | 1,267.12 | 25,529 | 30,938 | 0 | |
| FRANKLIN | 4.60 | 169.04 | 4.58 | 168.28 | 40.87 | 9.96 | 3.01 | 222.12 | 0 | 1,525.62 | 1,532.52 | 1,991 | 973 | 19.65 | |
| GLASTONBURY | 212.61 | 302.49 | 3,688.51 | 5,247.97 | 3,051.83 | 280.36 | 180.49 | 8,760.65 | 130.82 | 20,450.40 | 1,178.77 | 34,698 | 16,505 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| GOSHEN | 217.29 | 217.66 | 320.72 | 321.27 | 0.00 | 18.64 | 1.34 | 341.25 | 72.35 | 1,309.47 | 887.17 | 2,952 | 397 | 3.52 | FY2013 AMRR – missing four months of data |
| GRANBY | 269.05 | 310.40 | 1,522.29 | 1,756.26 | 815.57 | 148.80 | 74.38 | 2,795.01 | 582.05 | 5,375.92 | 950.14 | 11,316 | 2,340 | 414 | |
| GREENWICH | 0.25 | 264.24 | 7.70 | 8,225.15 | 25,073.32 | 467.26 | 430.01 | 34,195.74 | 0.97 | 44,218.43 | 1,420.56 | 62,255 | 34,719 | 0 | |
| GRISWOLD | 122.83 | 148.81 | 736.12 | 891.82 | 0.00 | 55.20 | 0.00 | 947.02 | 2.91 | 4,471.52 | 746.12 | 11,986 | 1,345 | 0 | |
| GROTON | 124.21 | 235.59 | 2,477.82 | 4,699.48 | 3,355.00 | 958.04 | 114.63 | 9,127.15 | 305.56 | 26,933.54 | 1,350.19 | 39,896 | 25,706 | 9,072 | |
| Combined data for: GUILFORD, MADISON | 150.23 | 207.63 | 3,056.69 | 4,224.65 | 2,213.60 | 184.93 | 907.98 | 7,531.16 | 174.42 | 22,281.57 | 1,095.08 | 40,694 | 11,875 | 0 | |
| HADDAM | 128.53 | 131.72 | 530.68 | 543.86 | 50.00 | 121.00 | 57.22 | 772.08 | 0 | 2,921.95 | 707.67 | 8,258 | 1,321 | 0 | |
| HAMDEN | 7.06 | 179.51 | 214.72 | 5,462.67 | 11,102.20 | 101.91 | 118.78 | 16,785.56 | 1520.66 | 30,727.35 | 1,009.72 | 60,863 | 20,430 | 5,940 | |
| Combined data for: HAMPTON, SCOTLAND | 153.25 | 153.25 | 274.24 | 274.24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274.24 | 0 | 858.21 | 479.58 | 3,579 | 282 | 0 | LOW disposal rate In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| HARTFORD | 78.66 | 264.09 | 4,911.73 | 16,491.20 | 5,641.00 | 104.10 | 607.68 | 22,843.98 | 0.32 | 90,093.24 | 1,442.73 | 124,893 | 112,709 | 0 | |
| HARTLAND | 126.42 | 126.42 | 134.76 | 134.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.29 | 144.05 | 0 | 649.37 | 609.17 | 2,132 | 129 | 0 | |
| HARWINTON | 204.16 | 208.10 | 571.66 | 582.67 | 32.00 | 10.40 | 21.54 | 646.61 | 420.54 | 2,036.35 | 727.27 | 5,600 | 608 | 0 | |
| HEBRON | 175.91 | 177.38 | 846.48 | 853.53 | 80.00 | 93.00 | 45.45 | 1,071.98 | 0 | 3,160.06 | 656.70 | 9,624 | 1,848 | 0 | |
| KENT | 187.19 | 321.30 | 276.20 | 474.08 | 0.00 | 15.46 | 13.38 | 502.92 | 62.99 | 1,340.59 | 908.57 | 2,951 | 1,325 | 1.8 | |
| KILLINGLY | 137.65 | 506.52 | 1,188.52 | 4,373.59 | 0.00 | 40.88 | 41.71 | 4,456.18 | 41.99 | 11,751.03 | 1,360.94 | 17,269 | 8,549 | 7.03 | |
| KILLINGWORTH | 179.96 | 202.77 | 585.22 | 659.42 | 0.00 | 165.20 | 43.18 | 867.80 | 0 | 2,438.12 | 749.73 | 6,504 | 673 | 628.85 | |
| LEBANON | 108.15 | 133.42 | 396.17 | 488.71 | 94.14 | 49.64 | 43.37 | 675.86 | 0 | 2,532.25 | 691.30 | 7,326 | 1,323 | 1,219.42 | |
| LEDYARD – MSW disposed includes Mashantocket/Pequot | 175.61 | 279.87 | 1,323.83 | 2,109.80 | 550.00 | 84.58 | 38.98 | 2,783.36 | 220.61 | 14,107.74 | 1,871.43 | 15,077 | 11,606 | 429 | HIGH disposal rate |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| 8,381.78 tons | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LISBON | 0.00 | 153.57 | 0.00 | 334.40 | 0.00 | 76.16 | 11.32 | 421.88 | 0 | 3,941.48 | 1,810.09 | 4,355 | 1,771 | 21.5 | HIGH disposal rate |
| LITCHFIELD | 128.91 | 273.07 | 538.39 | 1,140.46 | 1,350.00 | 69.38 | 60.60 | 2,620.44 | 279.59 | 5,114.34 | 1,224.55 | 8,353 | 3,462 | 330.23 | |
| LYME | 261.41 | 261.41 | 314.09 | 314.09 | 87.00 | 17.31 | 124.84 | 543.24 | 99.48 | 783.65 | 652.23 | 2,403 | 215 | 0 | |
| Combined data for: MADISON, GUILFORD | 150.23 | 207.63 | 3,056.69 | 4,224.65 | 2,213.60 | 184.93 | 907.98 | 7,531.16 | 174.42 | 22,281.57 | 1,095.08 | 40,694 | 11,875 | 0 | |
| MANCHESTER | 157.91 | 460.45 | 4,602.11 | 13,419.61 | 10,450.97 | 334.65 | 138.29 | 24,343.52 | 132.43 | 36,080.06 | 1,237.97 | 58,289 | 27,508 | 0 | |
| MANSFIELD | 106.02 | 179.75 | 1,359.60 | 2,305.07 | 110.00 | 53.62 | 18.99 | 2,487.68 | 213.7 | 9,296.09 | 724.90 | 25,648 | 11,293 | 0 | |
| MARLBOROUGH | 206.67 | 206.67 | 664.76 | 664.76 | 0.00 | 70.57 | 28.03 | 763.36 | 0 | 2,404.72 | 747.62 | 6,433 | 1,156 | 39.71 | |
| MERIDEN | 93.03 | 274.89 | 2,820.46 | 8,334.51 | 4,185.00 | 96.08 | 26.15 | 12,641.74 | 773.04 | 30,616.25 | 1,009.80 | 60,638 | 21,549 | 317 | |
| MIDDLEBURY | 219.26 | 306.56 | 830.12 | 1,160.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,160.63 | 0 | 2,632.15 | 695.23 | 7,572 | 3,940 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| Combined data for: DUHAM, MIDDLEFIELD | 162.53 | 186.51 | 957.62 | 1,098.93 | 1,110.00 | 226.37 | 29.99 | 2,465.29 | 106.53 | 5,526.56 | 937.98 | 11,784 | 4,016 | 0 | |
| MIDDLETOWN | 55.45 | 207.90 | 1,312.09 | 4,919.38 | 7,287.51 | 73.51 | 164.76 | 12,445.16 | 1881.43 | 29,708.83 | 1,255.52 | 47,325 | 27,488 | 2805 | |
| MILFORD | 162.61 | 270.00 | 4,307.57 | 7,152.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7,152.34 | 0 | 32,030.73 | 1,209.14 | 52,981 | 28,415 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| MONROE | 122.28 | 167.26 | 1,210.18 | 1,655.41 | 499.50 | 48.72 | 37.08 | 2,240.71 | 0 | 6,381.59 | 644.80 | 19,794 | 5,591 | 0 | |
| MONTVILLE | 161.28 | 298.80 | 1,587.47 | 2,941.05 | 241.00 | 103.44 | 48.19 | 3,333.68 | 275.29 | 20,365.35 | 2,069.02 | 19,686 | 13,263 | 0 | HIGH disposal rate |
| MORRIS | 121.91 | 127.64 | 143.61 | 150.36 | 0.00 | 21.00 | 8.45 | 179.81 | 30.04 | 874.17 | 742.08 | 2,356 | 456 | 0 | |
| NAUGATUCK | 48.97 | 258.71 | 778.04 | 4,110.19 | 590.60 | 2.13 | 77.28 | 4,780.20 | 1220.09 | 14,931.94 | 939.88 | 31,774 | 7,767 | 0 | |
| NEW BRITAIN | 116.72 | 216.45 | 4,269.26 | 7,916.83 | 1,777.67 | 226.81 | 62.70 | 9,984.01 | 2023.47 | 43,543.66 | 1,190.48 | 73,153 | 24,772 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| NEW CANAAN | 1.67 | 160.20 | 16.80 | 1,610.80 | 4,966.75 | 230.52 | 48.92 | 6,856.99 | 0 | 9,012.00 | 896.27 | 20,110 | 6,368 | 6,997.76 | Relatively low disposal for a Fairfield county town |
| NEW FAIRFIELD | 122.65 | 141.39 | 865.39 | 997.65 | 147.63 | 26.16 | 30.15 | 1,201.59 | 0.97 | 5,124.44 | 726.25 | 14,112 | 1,579 | 0 | |
| NEW HARTFORD, BARKHAMSTED, WINCHESTER RRDD1 | 173.20 | 226.96 | 1,882.11 | 2,466.28 | 279.59 | 484.65 | 112.3 | 3,342.82 | 98.87 | 11,827.53 | 1,088.44 | 21,733 | 5,482 | 247.1 | |
| NEW HAVEN | 0.00 | 271.25 | 0.00 | 17,731.49 | 5,262.89 | 50.47 | 113.14 | 23,157.99 | 2379.86 | 103,990.50 | 1,590.79 | 130,741 | 79,314 | 3,191.03 | |
| NEWINGTON | 171.65 | 786.35 | 2,626.46 | 12,032.00 | 3,320.00 | 221.94 | 96.86 | 15,670.80 | 121.13 | 21,417.35 | 1,399.74 | 30,602 | 16,547 | 2,721.69 | |
| NEW LONDON | 104.21 | 238.70 | 1,443.72 | 3,306.85 | 617.99 | 84.81 | 9.54 | 4,019.19 | 49.1 | 20,696.53 | 1,493.96 | 27,707 | 13,883 | 563.8 | |
| NEW MILFORD, BROOKFIELD, SHERMAN | 150.01 | 269.72 | 3,620.27 | 6,509.07 | 2,821.79 | 240.02 | 83.09 | 9,653.97 | 2.26 | 26,765.67 | 1,109.09 | 48,266 | 15,769 | 2798.14 | |
| NEWTOWN | 150.59 | 246.05 | 2,111.39 | 3,449.86 | 221.54 | 348.99 | 124.91 | 4,145.30 | 32.3 | 14,886.09 | 1,061.70 | 28,042 | 7,965 | 4,216.41 | |
| NORFOLK | 190.67 | 192.06 | 160.64 | 161.81 | 2.00 | 32.92 | 8.98 | 205.71 | 43.93 | 751.02 | 891.42 | 1,685 | 340 | 0 | |
| NORTH BRANFORD | 248.45 | 431.28 | 1,786.21 | 3,100.70 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 22.86 | 3,134.56 | 180.88 | 3,889.96 | 541.06 | 14,379 | 4,542 | 0 | LOW disposal rate • Single stream spiked when the town switched to automated pickup |
| NORTH CANAAN | 91.77 | 94.76 | 149.54 | 154.41 | 20.00 | 42.25 | 2.22 | 218.88 | 194.77 | 2,343.98 | 1,438.47 | 3,259 | 1,925 | 0 | |
| NORTH HAVEN | 0.00 | 426.59 | 0.00 | 5,126.12 | 5,323.20 | 25.71 | 30.66 | 10,505.69 | 631.11 | 17,598.46 | 1,464.52 | 24,033 | 18,147 | 104.94 | |
| NORTH STONINGTON | 144.92 | 152.08 | 384.25 | 403.24 | 100.00 | 73.95 | 33.86 | 611.05 | 19.38 | 2,649.12 | 999.10 | 5,303 | 1,550 | 0 | |
| NORWALK | 1.48 | 141.16 | 64.50 | 6,153.89 | 5,887.41 | 426.50 | 331.10 | 12,798.90 | 781.34 | 94,918.87 | 2,177.29 | 87,190 | 44,463 | 7,676.1 | HIGH disposal rate |
| NORWICH | 107.43 | 396.42 | 2,175.52 | 8,027.96 | 2,242.00 | 80.31 | 52.51 | 10,402.78 | 227.39 | 24,399.20 | 1,204.84 | 40,502 | 17,070 | 0 | |
| OLD LYME | 331.43 | 367.75 | 1,258.10 | 1,395.98 | 1,400.99 | 107.27 | 17.28 | 2,921.52 | 0 | 3,687.08 | 971.31 | 7,592 | 2,583 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| OLD SAYBROOK | 227.43 | 467.13 | 1,164.20 | 2,391.23 | 0.00 | 162.67 | 39.02 | 2,592.92 | 220.35 | 9,583.96 | 1,872.23 | 10,238 | 5,912 | 1,791 | HIGH disposal rate |
| ORANGE | 136.14 | 494.68 | 948.59 | 3,446.70 | 943.01 | 72.43 | 40.69 | 4,502.83 | 0 | 13,399.69 | 1,923.17 | 13,935 | 9,877 | 2,743.61 | HIGH disposal rate |
| OXFORD | 138.80 | 166.85 | 889.63 | 1,069.44 | 0.00 | 119.53 | 62.06 | 1,251.03 | 292.22 | 5,002.05 | 780.41 | 12,819 | 3,173 | 0 | |
| PLAINFIELD | 86.04 | 182.31 | 656.80 | 1,391.68 | 186.49 | 57.31 | 19.17 | 1,654.65 | 0 | 9,344.30 | 1,224.12 | 15,267 | 4,323 | 0 | |
| PLAINVILLE | 150.14 | 239.35 | 1,337.71 | 2,132.52 | 32.08 | 4.29 | 16.41 | 2,185.30 | 613.86 | 11,705.15 | 1,313.78 | 17,819 | 9,277 | 0 | |
| PLYMOUTH | 145.99 | 170.83 | 882.44 | 1,032.61 | 300.00 | 156.64 | 61.47 | 1,550.72 | 101.75 | 5,143.65 | 850.96 | 12,089 | 2,061 | 0 | |
| POMFRET | 94.65 | 137.00 | 199.56 | 288.87 | 0.00 | 29.55 | 16.20 | 334.62 | 8.4 | 969.66 | 459.88 | 4,217 | 1,577 | 0 | LOW disposal rate |
| PORTLAND | 189.46 | 364.82 | 897.28 | 1,727.80 | 0.00 | 92.73 | 65.41 | 1,885.94 | 107.88 | 4,229.07 | 892.96 | 9,472 | 2,281 | 6,600 | |
| PRESTON | 109.75 | 171.87 | 260.81 | 408.45 | 0.00 | 63.69 | 20.41 | 492.55 | 30.04 | 2,060.57 | 867.06 | 4,753 | 836 | 0 | |
| PROSPECT | 100.46 | 139.86 | 484.33 | 674.27 | 1,530.00 | 119.18 | 28.96 | 2,352.41 | 77.2 | 4,293.63 | 890.61 | 9,642 | 1,980 | 0 | |
| PUTNAM | 114.27 | 284.03 | 542.28 | 1,347.87 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,347.87 | 0 | 5,985.87 | 1,261.38 | 9,491 | 6,400 | 0 | |
| REDDING | 58.35 | 88.32 | 271.31 | 410.66 | 699.15 | 51.09 | 55.77 | 1,216.67 | 0 | 2,155.83 | 463.67 | 9,299 | 1,678 | 0 | LOW disposal rate |
| RIDGEFIELD | 92.85 | 253.07 | 1,162.72 | 3,169.13 | 805.00 | 145.44 | 118.57 | 4,238.14 | 549.62 | 16,781.50 | 1,340.11 | 25,045 | 10,460 | 3.66 | |
| ROCKY HILL | 165.42 | 321.60 | 1,631.76 | 3,172.42 | 3,487.00 | 238.20 | 58.26 | 6,955.88 | 78.17 | 13,040.58 | 1,321.97 | 19,729 | 13,891 | 0 | |
| ROXBURY | 187.55 | 189.27 | 209.78 | 211.70 | 0.00 | 53.41 | 16.09 | 281.20 | 42.31 | 866.00 | 774.25 | 2,237 | 314 | 0 | |
| SALEM | 110.64 | 147.91 | 231.69 | 309.72 | 0.00 | 34.89 | 12.71 | 357.32 | 0 | 1,202.11 | 574.07 | 4,188 | 647 | 167.86 | LOW disposal rate |
| Combined data for: SALISBURY, SHARON | 125.60 | 343.15 | 404.94 | 1,106.33 | 214.54 | 163.12 | 60.06 | 1,544.05 | 311.05 | 3,190.15 | 989.50 | 6,448 | 3,115 | 0 | |
| Combined data for: SCOTLAND, HAMPTON | 153.25 | 153.25 | 274.24 | 274.24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274.24 | 0 | 858.21 | 479.58 | 3,579 | 282 | 0 | LOW disposal rate In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| SEYMOUR | 4.46 | 144.83 | 36.94 | 1,199.27 | 350.00 | 113.00 | 37.10 | 1,699.37 | 0 | 8,048.37 | 971.97 | 16,561 | 4,412 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| Combined data for: SHARON, SALISBURY | 125.60 | 343.15 | 404.94 | 1,106.33 | 214.54 | 163.12 | 60.06 | 1,544.05 | 311.05 | 3,190.15 | 989.50 | 6,448 | 3,115 | 0 | |
| SHELTON | 0.00 | 301.27 | 0.00 | 6,064.65 | 210.00 | 3.81 | 190.64 | 6,469.10 | 0 | 21,599.17 | 1,072.96 | 40,261 | 22,050 | 0 | |
| SHERMAN, BROOKFIELD, NEW MILFORD | 150.01 | 269.72 | 3,620.27 | 6,509.07 | 2,821.79 | 240.02 | 83.09 | 9,653.97 | 2.26 | 26,765.67 | 1,109.09 | 48,266 | 15,769 | 2,798.14 | |
| SIMSBURY | 230.46 | 340.69 | 2,721.73 | 4,023.52 | 497.15 | 142.47 | 13.35 | 4,676.49 | 31.65 | 13,998.19 | 1,185.28 | 23,620 | 9,447 | 0 | |
| SOMERS | 99.72 | 210.72 | 570.94 | 1,206.48 | 300.00 | 159.52 | 39.22 | 1,705.22 | 0 | 3,371.88 | 588.92 | 11,451 | 2,593 | 0 | LOW disposal rate- Tons disposed at Agawam RRF much lower in FY2013 |
| SOUTHBURY | 165.29 | 224.29 | 1,642.76 | 2,229.09 | 0.00 | 126.95 | 31.61 | 2,387.65 | 0 | 9,698.97 | 975.90 | 19,877 | 8,396 | 0 | |
| SOUTHINGTON | 146.20 | 206.79 | 3,175.04 | 4,490.80 | 9,198.00 | 304.46 | 92.30 | 14,085.56 | 171.51 | 30,720.16 | 1,414.57 | 43,434 | 14,833 | 0 | |
| SOUTH WINDSOR | 197.09 | 460.86 | 2,545.97 | 5,953.15 | 5,155.00 | 38.38 | 85.56 | 11,232.09 | 57.82 | 17,192.49 | 1,330.95 | 25,835 | 12,406 | 0 | |
| SPRAGUE | 123.90 | 193.09 | 185.11 | 288.47 | 0.00 | 26.92 | 21.38 | 336.77 | 0.32 | 982.38 | 657.55 | 2,988 | 615 | 0 | |
| STAFFORD | 139.91 | 206.41 | 838.55 | 1,237.14 | 131.00 | 137.01 | 53.00 | 1,558.15 | 128.72 | 5,958.67 | 994.19 | 11,987 | 3,620 | 0 | |
| STAMFORD | 168.02 | 641.40 | 10,510.67 | 40,122.76 | 29,533.26 | 612.47 | 265.96 | 70,534.45 | 1053.74 | 120,095.11 | 1,919.85 | 125,109 | 75,096 | 0 | HIGH disposal rate • Large increase in organics composted/recycled as compared to previous years • Also increases in residential single stream and ONP |
| Combined data for: STERLING. VOLUNTOWN | 162.63 | 250.33 | 521.24 | 802.31 | 0 | 48.96 | 16.93 | 868.20 | 0 | 2,067.31 | 645.03 | 6,410 | 747 | 300.88 | |
| STONINGTON | 104.56 | 188.74 | 970.15 | 1,751.16 | 5,698.00 | 202.81 | 87.90 | 7,739.87 | 1226.92 | 11,783.82 | 1,270.08 | 18,556 | 7,162 | 498 | |
| STRATFORD | 121.91 | 381.16 | 3,174.28 | 9,924.92 | 5,560.00 | 407.00 | 157.13 | 16,049.05 | 154.39 | 29,438.68 | 1,130.58 | 52,077 | 25,438 | 7,900 | |
| SUFFIELD | 178.14 | 213.76 | 1,413.40 | 1,695.97 | 303.00 | 108.00 | 42.46 | 2,149.43 | 0 | 6,041.24 | 761.44 | 15,868 | 4,229 | 0 | |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| THOMASTON | 116.74 | 234.27 | 454.59 | 912.24 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 16.98 | 933.22 | 261.63 | 3,886.32 | 998.03 | 7788 | 2,724 | 0 | |
| THOMPSON | 0.00 | 1.45 | 0.00 | 6.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.78 | 0 | 2,762.55 | 589.47 | 9,373 | 1,575 | 0 | LOW disposal rate In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| TOLLAND | 236.77 | 282.11 | 1,771.54 | 2,110.76 | 0.00 | 9.04 | 48.76 | 2,168.56 | 0 | 6,098.72 | 815.12 | 14,964 | 3,701 | 0 | |
| TORRINGTON | 164.19 | 281.68 | 2,939.70 | 5,043.20 | 268.76 | 83.63 | 64.72 | 5,460.31 | 1413.75 | 24,309.02 | 1,357.74 | 35,808 | 15,953 | 131.89 | |
| TRUMBULL | 142.10 | 279.55 | 2,594.34 | 5,103.66 | 7,394.00 | 487.00 | 127.17 | 13,111.83 | 250.97 | 17,961.70 | 983.83 | 36,514 | 16,018 | 7369 | |
| UNION | 176.31 | 176.31 | 75.11 | 75.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.83 | 89.94 | 0 | 209.43 | 491.62 | 852 | 111 | 0 | LOW disposal rate |
| VERNON | 172.26 | 257.27 | 2,508.23 | 3,746.13 | 6,050.00 | 184.70 | 32.15 | 10,012.98 | 0 | 16,292.86 | 1,118.94 | 29,122 | 8,565 | 0 | |
| Combined data for: VOLUNTOWN, STERLING | 162.63 | 250.33 | 521.24 | 802.31 | 0 | 48.96 | 16.93 | 868.20 | 0 | 2,067.31 | 645.03 | 6,410 | 747 | 300.88 | |
| WALLINGFORD | 87.42 | 324.09 | 1,974.69 | 7,321.10 | 3,341.00 | 232.97 | 87.75 | 10,982.82 | 1166.7 | 32,537.87 | 1,440.40 | 45,179 | 28,057 | 0 | |
| WARREN | 187.16 | 379.27 | 135.41 | 274.40 | 0.00 | 43.71 | 5.46 | 323.57 | 93.54 | 613.02 | 847.30 | 1,447 | 149 | 65 | |
| WASHINGTON | 330.64 | 387.39 | 584.24 | 684.51 | 0.00 | 91.82 | 9.45 | 785.78 | 519.9 | 2,223.66 | 1,258.44 | 3,534 | 1,559 | 278.75 | |
| WATERBURY | 54.86 | 153.62 | 3,014.77 | 8,442.43 | 1,733.00 | 81.76 | 118.01 | 10,375.20 | 0 | 81,516.42 | 1,483.26 | 109,915 | 38,890 | 0 | |
| WATERFORD | 231.16 | 323.35 | 2,257.62 | 3,158.04 | 13.37 | 108.30 | 53.36 | 3,333.07 | 184.76 | 12,879.32 | 1,318.72 | 19,533 | 11,153 | 0 | |
| WATERTOWN | 159.28 | 222.01 | 1,772.84 | 2,471.08 | 440.00 | 134.43 | 16.38 | 3,061.89 | 45.87 | 10,791.12 | 969.51 | 22,261 | 8,011 | 0 | |
| WESTBROOK | 110.82 | 177.33 | 383.10 | 613.02 | 63.40 | 63.87 | 27.47 | 767.76 | 76.87 | 5,503.24 | 1,591.91 | 6,914 | 3,922 | 9,800 | |
| WEST HARTFORD | 111.30 | 330.02 | 3,521.27 | 10,440.80 | 7,032.89 | 106.89 | 136.46 | 17,717.04 | 60.72 | 37,550.97 | 1,186.93 | 63,274 | 28,316 | 329.13 | |
| WEST HAVEN | 14.01 | 199.62 | 387.99 | 5,529.80 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,529.80 | 0 | 24,186.67 | 873.10 | 55,404 | 14,849 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |

| Column 1 City or Town | Column 2 BOTTLES, CANS, PAPER (BCP) RECYCLED ¹ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | | | OTHER MSW RECYCLED ² (other than BCP) Based Mostly on Annual Municipal Recycling Reports (AMRRs) Submitted to the CTDEEP | | | Column 6 MSW RECYCLED Sum of Columns 1-5 | Column 7 Home Composted & Grasscycled Estimate Based on (AMRRs) Tons | Column 8 MSW DISPOSED ³ (Based Mostly on Permitted SW Facility Reports Submitted to the CTDEEP) | | Column 9 Residential Population July 2012 (DPH) | Column 10 # of People Working within the Borders of the Municipality in 2013 DOL | Column 11 Tons of other Material (not MSW) Recycled | Column 12 Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Column 3 ORGANICS RECYCLED | Column 4 SCRAP METAL RECYCLED | Column 5 OTHER RECYCLED | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential Lbs/Person/Yr | Combined Residential & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | Residential Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Residential & NonRes Tons | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | | Combined Res & NonRes Tons | Res & NonRes Lbs/Person/Yr | | | | |
| WESTON | 0.00 | 164.06 | 0.00 | 849.02 | 0.00 | 125.12 | 43.14 | 1,017.28 | 0 | 5,594.73 | 1,081.11 | 10,350 | 1,262 | 2,477.24 | |
| WESTPORT | 269.93 | 284.31 | 3,653.22 | 3,847.82 | 2,068.00 | 296.22 | 118.37 | 6,330.41 | 0 | 14,537.95 | 1,074.18 | 27,068 | 15,420 | 2,500 | |
| WETHERSFIELD | 208.51 | 267.21 | 2,784.66 | 3,568.65 | 3,000.00 | 107.26 | 14.36 | 6,690.27 | 400.94 | 14,859.94 | 1,112.69 | 26,710 | 9,924 | 1,594.56 | |
| WILLINGTON | 189.73 | 223.26 | 568.63 | 669.12 | 0.00 | 89.39 | 44.37 | 802.88 | 0 | 1,534.67 | 512.07 | 5,994 | 1,480 | 0 | LOW disposal rate |
| WILTON | 0.22 | 114.63 | 2.06 | 1,067.06 | 0.00 | 91.33 | 41.37 | 1,199.76 | 0 | 7,782.87 | 836.10 | 18,617 | 11,717 | 1,787.06 | |
| Combined data for: WINCHESTER, BARKHAMSTED, NEW HARTFORD- RRDD1 | 173.20 | 226.96 | 1,882.11 | 2,466.28 | 279.59 | 484.65 | 112.3 | 3,342.82 | 98.87 | 11,827.53 | 1,088.44 | 21,733 | 5,482 | 247.1 | |
| WINDHAM | 150.21 | 344.46 | 1,884.44 | 4,321.38 | 113.35 | 87.84 | 65.27 | 4,587.84 | 0 | 14,499.54 | 1,155.76 | 25,091 | 10,740 | 0 | |
| WINDSOR | 139.71 | 601.09 | 2,035.56 | 8,757.92 | 846.75 | 218.30 | 104.76 | 9,927.73 | 0 | 15,287.70 | 1,049.26 | 29,140 | 24,191 | 0 | |
| WINDSOR LOCKS | 171.28 | 667.38 | 1,074.43 | 4,186.46 | 2,290.00 | 0.00 | 26.75 | 6,503.21 | 0 | 8,572.67 | 1,366.60 | 12,546 | 12,819 | 0 | |
| WOLCOTT | 0.96 | 14.79 | 8.04 | 123.66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 123.66 | 0 | 8,509.20 | 1,017.60 | 16,724 | 2,966 | 0 | In violation of annual municipal recycling reporting requirements |
| WOODBIDGE | 165.16 | 170.91 | 740.32 | 766.10 | 382.50 | 99.20 | 25.62 | 1,273.42 | 0 | 2,830.00 | 631.34 | 8,965 | 3,786 | 0 | |
| WOODBURY | 159.76 | 196.91 | 786.64 | 969.58 | 107.50 | 144.80 | 47.26 | 1,269.14 | 0 | 4,855.25 | 986.04 | 9,848 | 2,020 | 1,489.95 | |
| WOODSTOCK | 147.62 | 215.65 | 583.39 | 852.25 | 0.00 | 101.71 | 26.78 | 980.74 | 21.32 | 2,857.12 | 722.96 | 7,904 | 1,749 | 0 | |

QUALIFIERS FOR DATA USED TO CALCULATE MSW RECYCLED & DISPOSED

Recycling Data Qualifiers:

◆ FY2013 MSW recycling stats for each municipality are based on (1) Information reported by CT permitted solid waste recycling processing facilities and recycling transfer stations in reports submitted to the CTDEEP (tonnages of bottles, cans, and paper received from each CT municipality) and (2) the Annual Municipal Recycling Reports submitted to the CTDEEP (for tonnages of other material collected for recycling).

◆ Types of recyclables not included in the data presented above:

- We have found that even though they submit recycling reports to the CTDEEP, many municipalities do not report the tonnage of all the materials generated within their town and recycled because those figures are often difficult to obtain.
- Figures for tonnages of material recycled are not complete for many non-residential recyclables – such as recyclables backhauled by national retail chains to out-of-state distribution centers for recycling.
- Tonnages generally do not include glass, metal, and plastic recycled through the CT bottle deposit law infrastructure.
- Tonnages do not include: most of the commercially recycled scrap metal, automobile scrap metal, waste oil recycled by businesses or garages, or storage batteries which are recycled through the Connecticut storage battery deposit infrastructure.

◆ The tonnage of leaves recorded as being recycled (composted) at municipal sites is usually estimated on the basis of cubic yards. The reliability of the conversion factor may be affected by the moisture content of the leaves.

◆ An attempt is made to estimate tonnages of yard and food waste home composted and tonnages of grass “grasscycled” based on municipal demographics and descriptions of municipal programs to promote home composting and grasscycling.

◆ Tonnage of landclearing and demolition material reported recycled (by the annual municipal recycling reports) is presented in the column “Other Waste Recycled” and is not included in the MSW stats.

◆ Tonnages of MSW reported as “recycled” from each municipality reflect the amount of MSW recyclables reported **collected for recycling** from within the borders of that municipality, and **not the amount actually used to make products**. Contamination, out-throws, residue, etc may be disposed both at the recycling processing facility and at the mill or manufacturing facility using the material to make a product. That residue is not subtracted from the tonnages reported recycled by each municipality.

In contrast, **statewide** MSW recycling stats are based on the amount of bottles, cans, and paper **marketed** by the recycling processing facilities (not the amount collected or reported received by those processing facilities).

In the future, in order to achieve greater transparency about the tonnage of recyclable material actually used to make a product, an attempt will be made to adjust town-by-town recycling stats to account for the quality of the material collected and the quality of the processing system used to prepare the recyclables to market specifications. This anticipated change in the paradigm for reporting recycling stats is contingent upon the availability of more comprehensive and accurate data re the quality of the material received by end users such as manufacturers and mills.

MSW Disposal Data Qualifiers

◆ FY2013 MSW disposal stats for each municipality are based on data submitted to the CTDEEP by CT permitted solid waste facilities and by CT municipalities; their accuracy is **contingent upon the accuracy of reporting** by both the reporting SW facility and the haulers delivering the MSW to the facilities.

- ◆ Data regarding MSW hauled directly out-of-state for disposal (without passing through a CT permitted SW facility) is generally not reported to the CTDEEP. As a result of such data gaps, disposal rates for some towns may be higher and their recycling percentages lower than reported above. However, starting in FY2011, some of those data gaps will be filled as haulers start complying with new reporting requirements (pursuant to [CGS Sec. 22a-220a\(j\)](#)).
- ◆ Tonnages of MSW disposed do not always include the tonnage of oversized- MSW (furniture, carpets, etc.) which is sometimes reported to the CTDEEP as "bulky waste" or “construction and demolition” waste (C&D waste) instead of being reported as MSW.
- ◆ MSW disposal figures represent combined residential and non-residential disposal tonnages.

In the future, it is anticipated that the CTDEEP will require MSW disposal tonnages to be identified and reported as either residential or non-residential in order to better track the effectiveness and success of strategies and programs that address reduction of residential waste vs non-residential waste.

Comparing Town Recycling Rates

Please keep in mind that it is somewhat misleading to judge the success of a municipality’s recycling program by arbitrarily comparing one town’s recycling rate to that of another town:

- 1) Recycling potential varies from municipality to municipality and can be affected by demographics.
 - For example – historically towns or cities with higher per capita incomes tended to generate more newspapers and magazines – which contributed to higher potential recycling rates (this might change as news media changes).
 - Recycling in multi-family dwellings can present greater challenges– but can be successful with the implementation of effective recycling strategies.
 - The number and type of businesses, institutions, etc. in a municipality will affect the municipality’s MSW stats e.g. the per capita MSW disposal rate, generation rate, and recycling rate.
- 2) Obtaining accurate MSW disposal and recycling tonnages by town or city of origin is challenging. The origin of MSW disposed or recycled as reported by Connecticut SW facilities in the reports they submit to the CTDEEP is not always accurate or complete. Accuracy of such data is contingent upon accurate reporting by both the hauler and the solid waste facility.

The above qualifiers need to be considered when trying to compare one municipality’s recycling percentage or rate to that of another municipality.