AGENDA

MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
AND
ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD

January 11, 2018

4:00 P.M.

StopWaste Offices
1537 Webster Street
Oakland, CA 94612
510-891-6517

Meeting is wheelchair accessible. Sign language interpreter may be available upon five (5) days’ notice to 510-891-6500.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Page

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

1  1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of December 14, 2017 (Tom Padia)

7  2. Board Attendance Record (Tom Padia)

9  3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Tom Padia)

V. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

An opportunity is provided for any member of the public wishing to speak on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Board, but not listed on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to three minutes.

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

11  1. Five Year Program Review (Meri Soll)

   It is recommended that the Recycling Board accept the final Five Year Program Review report by HF&H Consultants.

27  2. Grants to Nonprofits Program – Year in Review (Meri Soll)

   This item is for information only.
3. Recycling Board Municipal Panels: Topics for 2018 (Meghan Starkey)
   Staff recommends that the Recycling Board & Planning Committee provide direction to Agency staff on the topics for 2018.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
DRAFT

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
AND
ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD

Thursday, December 14, 2017

4:00 P.M.

StopWaste Offices
1537 Webster Street
Oakland, CA 94612
510-891-6500

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dianne Martinez, President, called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL
Adan Alonzo, Recycling Programs
Bernie Camara, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Peter Maass, ACWMA
John Moore, Environmental Organization
Jim Oddie, ACWMA
Michael Peltz, Solid Waste Industry Representative
Jerry Pentin, ACWMA
Toni Stein, Environmental Educator
Sarah Vared, Source Reduction Specialist
Dianne Martinez, ACWMA

Absent:
Tim Rood, ACWMA

Staff Present:
Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
Rachel Balsley, Senior Program Manager
Justin Lehrer, Senior Program Manager
Farand Kan, Deputy County Counsel
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Present:
Karen Cook, Alameda County GSA
Sarah Church, Alameda County GSA
Joshua Perez, Independent Recycling Services

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT
Board member Adan Alonzo tendered his resignation effective today due to personal health reasons. Board member Alonzo offered his sincere thanks and expressed appreciation for serving
on the Board. He pledged to keep in touch with the Board and staff. Board member Pentin stated that prior to accepting the resignation of Board member Alonzo he would like to install him as the next President of the Recycling Board. Board member Pentin made a motion to reorder the agenda and to hear item VI. 3 Election of Officers for 2018 prior to the consent calendar. There were no public comments. Board member Oddie seconded and the motion carried 9-0. The Clerk called the roll: (Ayes: Alonzo, Camara, Maass, Martinez, Moore, Oddie Peltz, Pentin, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood, Stein).

Board member Peltz made the motion to elect Board member Alonzo as President of the Recycling Board. Board member Maass seconded and the motion carried 9-0. The Clerk called the role: (Ayes: Alonzo, Camara, Maass, Martinez, Moore, Oddie Peltz, Pentin, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood, Stein).

The Board recessed for five minutes.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of November 9, 2017 (Tom Padia)
2. Board Attendance Record (Tom Padia)
3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Tom Padia)

Board member Pentin made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board member Stein seconded and the motion carried 9-0.

IV. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was none.

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

1. County of Alameda General Services Agency Environmental Purchasing Update (Rachel Balsley)

   This item is for information only.

Rachel Balsley provided an overview of the staff report and introduced Karen Cook and Sarah Church, County of Alameda GSA. Ms. Cook and Ms. Church presented a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview on the implementation of recycled content and environmentally preferable purchasing (EPP) programs at the County of Alameda. A link to the staff report and the presentation is available here: Alameda-County-GSA-Update-12-14-17.pdf

Board member Stein inquired if the GSA program coordinates with StopWaste with regard to green building materials. Ms. Cook stated yes, through an ordinance adopted in 2003, the county is required to meet LEED silver in all large building projects and most of the projects are LEED gold with one LEED platinum. They have also developed a set of design guidelines that looks at the entire range of sustainability, e.g. space requirements to meet the MRO requirements in new facilities, materials in restrooms meet the green cleaning guidelines, etc. Board member Stein inquired if the GSA has contracts for bins that cities can piggyback onto, and does the GSA reach out to school districts. Ms. Cook stated no, they do not have a competitively bid contract for waste and recycling containers. It is handled on an as needed basis. They have put together information around the state contract that can be shared with member agencies if they are interested. Ms. Balsley added the StopWaste schools
infrastructure project has supported a number of school purchases with recycling and composting bins, and last year, we leveraged our partnerships with a couple of the vendors with our free indoor food scraps bin program and they provided discount rates to some of the schools. Board member Moore inquired about the tools utilized by the jail food services contract to recover surplus food or to prevent food waste, and also inquired if the GSA finds markets for materials that do not have a robust secondary market. Ms. Church stated that the GSA contracts with Aramark and they have their own system for tracking in-kitchen food waste and they regularly share reports with staff. Ms. Church added they are somewhat limited as to what they can do but they are planning to do a waste assessment of the full facility to help inform operationally as to the type of equipment being used, food trays as well as food items. Ms. Cook stated that she is unaware of any efforts to develop new markets.

Board members Maass inquired as to how Alameda county measures up to the other 9 bay area counties with regard to using greener content. Ms. Cook stated that Alameda county and San Francisco county are the two counties that are most often on the national scene. Board member Vared commented with respect to prison operations that across the country an occurring trend is to have onsite digesters at prisons as a way to both process the waste and increase food security. Board member Vared inquired if providing technical assistance to other markets provides a revenue stream. Ms. Cook stated no, they are sharing best practices. Board member Vared inquired about the top challenges going forward in increasing green purchasing and sustainability overall. Ms. Cook stated that they are beginning to look more towards the supply chain and how the GSA can possibly have any influence.

There were no comments from the public. President Martinez thanked Ms. Cook and Ms. Church for their presentation.

2. **Packaging Update (Justin Lehrer)**
   This item is for information only.

Justin Lehrer provided an overview of the staff report and presented a PowerPoint presentation. The report and the presentation is available here: Packaging-Update-12-14-17.pdf

Board member Maass commented that the gel pouches used for food are also used by the pharmaceutical industry and inquired if they can be reused in food packaging. Mr. Lehrer stated that he would speculate that the food industry would be cautious about reusing the pouches. Mr. Lehrer added that he is following an industry focus on cold chain packaging products for shipping temperature-sensitive materials within their required temperature range during transit. Board member Pentin commented that he was participating in a diving shoot on the pacific islands and residents would dump their garbage in the ocean. Board member Pentin added that he spoke to local officials and they enacted legislation to address the dumping problem. He added that he is pleased to learn that other governments are starting to identify the problem of plastic in the waste stream. Board member Moore commented that he is not convinced that CalRecycle has done enough in reaching out to the recycling community with regard to getting to 75% diversion or with packaging waste reduction and inquired if they are allowing staff the opportunity to actively participate in their process. Mr. Lehrer stated yes, they are very inclusive and in his opinion they have very good people working on packaging issues. Board member Moore requested that Mr. Lehrer arrange an invitation for NCRA to participate in the process. Mr. Lehrer stated that it is an open process and that he would follow up with him.

Board member Stein inquired if the Dow Chemical Hefty energy bag grant program is operating in Alameda County. Mr. Lehrer stated that the map intends to show that they hope to grow the program in
the 50 states in the next 5 years. Board member Stein stated that the Office of Environmental Health this week listed saran wrap in Prop 65.

Board member Peltz stated that with respect to pharmaceutical plastics due to personal identity issues these plastics are typically shredded. Board member Peltz inquired if Cal Recycle is looking more intently at market development subsidies or investments in helping existing manufacturers and processors to expand their capacity to handle a broader range of plastics, such as #3-7 rigids, so that we do not have to rely on foreign markets. Mr. Lehrer stated that he has heard rumblings but it has not come up in these particular workshops. Mr. Padia added there is a portion of the cap and trade revenue that is dedicated to CalRecycle for infrastructure development and a significant portion is geared towards organics and a certain amount towards paper, plastics and glass. He is unsure if any funding is targeted towards market development. Board member Vared indicated that she had a contact at FreshRealm and that they provide fulfillment services for several of the meal kit providers.

President Martinez thanked Mr. Lehrer for his presentation.

3. Election of Officers for 2018 (Tom Padia)
   Elect Officers for 2018.

Due to the sudden resignation by Board member Alonzo, President Martinez made a motion to nominate Board member Pentin to serve as President for 2018. Board member Oddie seconded and the motion carried 9-0 (Ayes: Camara, Moore, Maass, Martinez, Oddie, Peltz, Pentin, Stein, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood. Vacant: Recycling Programs).

President Pentin made a motion to nominate Board member Oddie to serve as First Vice President. Board member Martinez seconded and the motion carried 9-0 (Ayes: Camara, Moore, Maass, Martinez, Oddie, Peltz, Pentin, Stein, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood. Vacant: Recycling Programs).

President Pentin nominated Board member Vared to serve as Second Vice President. Board member Oddie made the motion to accept the nomination of Board member Vared as Second Vice President and President Pentin seconded and the motion carried 9-0 (Ayes: Camara, Moore, Maass, Martinez, Oddie, Peltz, Pentin, Stein, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood. Vacant: Recycling Programs).

There were no public comments on this item.

4. 2018 Meeting Schedule (Arliss Dunn)
   It is recommended that the WMA/EC, P&A Committee, and the Recycling Board/Planning Committee, each adopt their respective regular meeting schedules for 2018.

There was no discussion on this item and there were no public comments. President Pentin made a motion adopt the regular meeting schedule for 2018 for the Recycling Board. Board member Maass seconded and the motion carried 9-0 (Ayes: Camara, Moore, Maass, Martinez, Oddie, Peltz, Pentin, Stein, Vared. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Rood. Vacant: Recycling Programs).
VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT
Joshua Perez commented with respect to Target Stores if we are following up with them to make sure that they are following through. Mr. Perez added his support for the How 2 Recycle label and stated that it is important that the public understands the labeling.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
Board member Martinez stated that the city of Emeryville has been implementing their tri-stream waste program at their joint K-12 city facility campus. She added that she has been volunteering in the lunch room directing the kids on where to properly place materials. Board member Martinez stressed the importance of volunteers, and thanked StopWaste staff for the technical assistance and added they are using the Measure D funds to fund the consultant’s work and to reward, the lunch room and cafeteria staff as well as the custodians. Board member Martinez added they have seen significant reduction in the amount of waste going into the landfill.

Mr. Padia thanked Board member Martinez for her service as President of the Recycling Board for 2017. Board member Peltz completed his second 2 year term on the Recycling Board. Mr. Padia thank Board member Peltz for his service and presented him with a recycled content glass bowl. Board member Peltz stated that he enjoyed his tenure on the Recycling Board and thanked staff and the Board members for their support.

IX. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULAR MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Alonzo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Camara</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Maass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Martinez</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Moore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Oddie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Peltz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pentin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sherman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Stein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Vared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERIM APPOINTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Biddle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Southworth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelia Young</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure D: Subsection 64.130, F: Recycling Board members shall attend at least three fourths (3/4) of the regular meetings within a given calendar year. At such time, as a member has been absent from more than one fourth (1/4) of the regular meetings in a calendar year, or from two (2) consecutive such meetings, her or his seat on the Recycling Board shall be considered vacant.

X=Attended
A=Absent
I=Absent - Interim Appointed
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DATE: January 11, 2018

TO: Recycling Board

FROM: Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director

SUBJECT: Written Reports of Ex Parte Communications

BACKGROUND

Section 64.130 (Q)(1)(b) of the Alameda County Charter requires that full written disclosure of ex parte communications be entered in the Recycling Board's official record. At the June 19, 1991 meeting of the Recycling Board, the Board approved the recommendation of Legal Counsel that such reports be placed on the consent calendar as a way of entering them into the Board's official record. The Board at that time also requested that staff develop a standard form for the reporting of such communications. A standard form for the reporting of ex parte communications has since been developed and distributed to Board members.

At the December 9, 1999 meeting of the Recycling Board, the Board adopted the following language:

   Ex parte communication report forms should be submitted only for ex parte communications that are made after the matter has been put on the Recycling Board’s agenda, giving as much public notice as possible.

Per the previously adopted policy, all such reports received will be placed on the consent calendar of the next regularly scheduled Recycling Board meeting.
DATE: January 11, 2018

TO: Planning Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director

BY: Meri Soll, Senior Program Manager

SUBJECT: Five Year Program Review

SUMMARY
In August 2016 the Recycling Board approved a schedule and scope of work for the “Five Year Program Review” and in November 2016 the Recycling Board approved award of a competitively bid contract to a consulting team led by HF&H Consultants, LLC to perform the program evaluation component of the Measure D-mandated “Five Year Audit.” The consulting team included subconsultants Kies Strategies and Mr. Kelly Runyon. The final report for the separate financial and compliance component of this Five Year Audit was presented to the Recycling Board in September 2017 by Crowe Horwath LLP. Staff from HF&H will present key findings and recommendations of the Five Year Program Review at the January 11, 2018 meeting. The Executive Summary is attached (Attachment A) and an electronic file of the full report (137 pages) is available at http://www.stopwaste.org/file/4575.

DISCUSSION
Subsection 64.040 (C) of Measure D requires a comprehensive financial, statistical and programmatic audit and analysis to be performed within four years of the effective date of the Act and every five years thereafter. Following is the text from Measure D relating to the comprehensive audit:

SUBSECTION 64.040: RECYCLING POLICY GOALS AND RECYCLING PLAN
C. The Recycling Board shall contract, not more than four (4) years after the effective date of this Act, and then every five (5) years thereafter, for an audit to determine compliance with the Recycling Plan and the degree of progress toward the recycling policy goal then in effect. Said audits shall be conducted by an independent auditor (or auditors) with experience in source reduction and recycling. The reports of said audits shall be completed within one (1) year and issued to each municipality, the Board of Supervisors and the Authority. Said reports shall include at least the following:

1. A narrative and analytical evaluation of all recycling programs within Alameda County, whether funded through this Act or not, both Alameda County-wide and within each municipality;
2. A statistical measure of the progress toward the recycling policy goal then in effect;
3. An evaluation of the Recycling Board's activities, including, but not limited to, an accounting of the monies spent by the Recycling Board; and
4. Recommendations to the Recycling Board, the Board of Supervisors, the Authority and the municipal governing bodies for the maintenance and expansion of recycling programs, and any necessary resulting amendments to the Recycling Plan.
SCOPE OF WORK
As in previous years, the program review utilized a “forward looking” approach with actionable recommendations. In addition, the review considered StopWaste’s recent goal-setting process in order to provide a report that will be useful for the next round of long range strategic planning. Tasks included in the scope of work:

- Compile Comparative Tables. The goal for this task shifted from historical comparisons between member agencies to maximizing value data for developing member-agency specific metrics as well as agency-wide metrics. Data compiled included targeted, high value data as opposed to exhaustive profiles of each jurisdiction’s programs.

- Collect and review benchmark study data, hauler reports and CalRecycle reported data to assess diversion data and outcomes for each member agency. Develop metrics for diversion rates by jurisdictions and data on “percentage of good stuff in the garbage” (GSIG).

- Review of submitted Measure D forms (focus on 2014 and 2015 data) with a comparison of values to the Agency Benchmark Study to assess GSIG to provide a data set for member agencies to measure their progress. Review of non-Agency studies relating to material optimization issues and upstream activities, including food waste prevention and recovery as well as reuse and repair to provide insight as to what other leading agencies are working on in this arena.

- Research and review waste characterization studies from other states, regions and jurisdictions and compare to Agency programs and studies. Develop data on commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill streams and identify trends over time. Results to provide context to our local goal of “less than 10% ‘good stuff’ in the garbage by 2020.”

FINDINGS
Representatives from HF&H will present key findings of their research at the January 11 meeting. Key findings include:

- With regard to residential Good Stuff in the Garbage, Alameda County jurisdictions are leading the way on resource conservation efforts nationally. None of the other jurisdictions studied are even close to reaching the goal of less than 10% good stuff found in the garbage.

- StopWaste is on the forefront of food waste reduction and recovery programs compared to other entities studied.

- The Agency’s approach to promoting third party certification, specifically the certification incentive program for mixed C&D facilities, is a cost effective approach to assessing recovery at processing facilities.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Recycling Board accept the final Five Year Program Review report by HF&H Consultants and that the findings and recommendations be used to inform the next Agency strategic planning process expected to begin in 2018 (for after 2020).

Attachment: Five Year Program Review Executive Summary
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview
This Five Year Review (Review) has a “forward-looking” and topical focus. The Review seeks to provide information and analysis to support StopWaste’s current and future strategic planning efforts, including to measure progress towards StopWaste’s “Good Stuff in Garbage” (GSIG) goal and to support strategic planning past 2020. This summary is organized as follows:

- Where are Recycling Markets Headed?
- Pending Organics Management Issues
- The Value of Third-Party Certification
- Developing Metrics for Better Measurement
- “Ultimate Disposition” of Discards: from Collection to New Products

Where are Recycling Markets Headed?

The National Sword

In late July 2017, the Chinese national government announced its “National Sword” policy, introducing a great deal of uncertainty into the recyclables export markets. In general terms, the policy seeks to ban the import of fiber (paper and paper-related materials) and plastics with more than 0.3 percent contamination. The National Sword should not come as a surprise. The policy is a logical extension of the earlier “Green Fence” policy to reduce contamination of incoming materials, coupled with the interests of a rapidly developing economy in encouraging use of its own feedstock materials. There is ongoing speculation about the possible impacts of the National Sword.

In general, note that when there are market restrictions relatively cleaner material will be accepted while more contaminated material will not, and cleaner material will receive more favorable pricing.

Our first suggestion is “don’t panic.” The details of how the National Sword will be implemented, and its impacts on commodity pricing are not yet known. Our second, related suggestion is to avoid modifying recycling collection programs by dropping collected materials, or by allowing disposal. Fortunately, the Bay Area has close proximity to markets, and in the short-term there is likely to be an available market for nearly any material.
The “Evolving Ton”

The “evolving ton” is a related complication for collectors and processors.

Managing Risk

Many franchise agreements from the 1990s and early 2000s included revenue-sharing mechanisms. These provisions provided for member agencies and franchisees to share the risks and benefits of uncertain market revenues. It is now common for franchisees to enjoy the benefits as well as absorb the risks, but there may be value in returning to arrangements with shared risk. Key objectives for structuring these types of provisions should include simplicity and use of published indices and other objective measures to reduce disputes. There are many approaches for structuring these provisions, consideration of which is beyond the scope of the Review.

Pending Organics Management Issues

CalRecycle is developing regulations for SB 1383, the Short-Lived Climate Pollutants Reduction Act. In many ways, the Mandatory Recycling Ordinance (MRO) anticipates the requirements of SB 1383, including required material separation, outreach, and enforcement. Two provisions of SB 1383 are among those that will directly affect member agencies. First, SB 1383 requires landfill diversion of a broad range of organics by 2022, most of which member agencies are now collecting. Among the added materials are textiles. The Review covers approaches other jurisdictions are taking to textile recovery. Second, SB 1383 will increase demand for organics processing capacity, while more stringent facility siting and operating requirements from the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) will make facility siting more difficult. Together, the requirements will increase the cost of processing and possibly make it higher relative to the cost of landfilling.

Urban wood is another organic material for which demand for collection and recovery will increase.

Wood waste recovered from C&D has historically been used as a fuel for biomass plants. However, at the same time as demand for collection and recovery has increased through State action, there are significant growing market barriers for management of discarded urban wood.

The Value of Third Party Certification

Third party certification is a unifying theme of the Review. Perhaps most visibly, StopWaste’s promotion of third party certification for mixed C&D facilities currently provides a cost-effective means of ensuring that C&D recovery efforts meet expectations without each member agency needing to conduct its own review of facility performance. The C&D certification process has the added value of addressing change over time, as discarded materials, processing technology and markets all evolve. Among other StopWaste programs, third party certification is an important element of materials optimization and green building (LEED certification). Among areas of interest to the Agency and member agencies for which third party certification could be of value:

- Assessment of recyclables and organics processing facility performance parallel to that for C&D, including verification of facility residue rates.
• Documenting residue levels during intermediate processing, as discussed in regard to ultimate disposition of materials.

• Ensuring responsible handling of e-scrap in regard to data security and environmental and labor impacts of e-scrap recycling practices, especially overseas.

**Developing Metrics for Better Measurement**

**Overview**

StopWaste’s Strategic Plan contains two goals for 2020. One goal, based upon the questionable State methodology of calculating total waste generation, is to achieve diversion of discards from landfill of “75% and Beyond.” The Agency and the member agencies use CalRecycle’s per-capita disposal method to track progress towards this goal. The second aspirational goal is to reduce GSIG to no more than ten percent by weight. The Agency’s FY 2017-18 budget includes “interim goals” for assessing progress towards meeting the ten percent GSIG goal.

![Figure ES-1: Interim Goals for Materials Management](image)

The Review analyzes the use of metrics, primarily as a means of measuring progress towards “downstream” interim goals of improving sorting. The Review also provides analysis of issues related to more “upstream” issues, and especially the interim goal for food recovery.

Metrics may provide “direct” measurement when based on data collected through waste sorts or other direct observation of GSIG or related behavior, such as through surveying. “Indirect” measurement involves use of surrogate “indicators” that provide for more simple and less costly assessment of progress using readily-available data to measure factors such as changes in program participation, the volume of subscribed service, the per-capita weight of specific discards, or the weight of material collected in
relation to the available volume. The Agency’s current Characterization Study will provide crucial data for creating a new GSIG baseline.¹

**Data Sources**

Figure ES-2 and the following text summarize the data sources analyzed for the Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Data Sub-Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recyclables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>California State</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discard Stream</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>California State</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td>Measure D Forms</td>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td>Hauler Reporting</td>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td>Other Data</td>
<td>Member Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Service Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td>StopWaste</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Characterizations</td>
<td>Disposal Stream (GSIG)</td>
<td>StopWaste, Various Jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverted Streams</td>
<td>Jurisdictions, Facility Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Other” refers to C&D, food transported for recovery, and other materials.

1. **Disposal Reporting Data.** CalRecycle uses jurisdiction-specific disposal data to calculate an actual annual per-capita disposal rate for comparison to a CalRecycle target rate.

2. **State Discard Stream Reporting Data.** Draft regulations for recent state legislation (AB 901) expands the disposal reporting system to create the “Recycling and Disposal Reporting System.” Reliable data will likely not be available until later in 2018 or early in 2019, and may prove to be more useful at the state or regional level, than at a more local level.

¹ Given the wide variation of factors affecting the materials discard “system” in multiple ways, equating cause and effect is generally difficult if not impossible. Statisticians refer to the difficulty of separating “signal from noise,” which requires having an adequate amount of data and applying statistical analysis to isolate the cause(s) of a given outcome. For example, to what degree was increased organics participation for September for a given member agency a function of recent outreach efforts, the end of the summer vacation season, greater organics participation rates due to higher seasonal volumes of yard trimmings and/or other factors?
3. **Member Agency Collection Data.** StopWaste staff have used a “Measure D Form” since 2013 to collect annual data from each member agency, with a focus on franchise collection of recyclables, organics, and garbage from residences and businesses.²

4. **Benchmark Service Audit Data.** From 2013 through mid-2017, StopWaste funded “waste sorts” (characterization of the types of material contained primarily in material collected for disposal) to collect and directly analyze GSIG.

5. **Waste Characterization Data.** The Review focuses on the use of applicable waste characterization data from other jurisdictions to measure GSIG, with the addition of data from the current Characterization Study, once completed.

**Progress Towards the “75% and Beyond” Goal**

As shown in Figure ES-3, based on a calculated Agency-wide diversion rate for 2015 of 73 percent, the “75% and Beyond” goal is within reach.

**Figure ES-3: Member Agency Disposal Tonnages and Diversion Rates, 2012 through 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>2012 Tonnages</th>
<th>2012 Rate</th>
<th>2013 Tonnages</th>
<th>2013 Rate</th>
<th>2014 Tonnages</th>
<th>2014 Rate</th>
<th>2015 Tonnages</th>
<th>2015 Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>36,625</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>35,121</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35,880</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>32,036</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>73,917</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60,659</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68,874</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67,246</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>24,478</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>27,919</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>34,787</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>34,731</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>18,052</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>17,973</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>8,419</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>144,771</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>138,179</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>158,694</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>160,861</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>106,953</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>101,757</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>93,153</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>106,975</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>57,720</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>57,317</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60,456</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64,811</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>31,370</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>35,891</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>33,081</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>36,190</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>284,151</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>281,139</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>269,850</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>254,262</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>77,170</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80,682</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74,666</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>91,292</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>103,238</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>115,220</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>73,145</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76,743</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>36,778</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>36,959</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>37,208</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>36,223</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>71,243</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71,235</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76,340</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tons/Avg Rate (Weighted)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,076,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,069,782</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,035,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,050,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant amounts of material collection, processing, and disposal activity occur outside of the franchise agreement, and are thus not “municipally-controlled.” This is especially true for C&D and commercial recyclables. Figures ES-4 and ES-5 illustrate the value of the “municipally-controlled” concept in highlighting both the importance of monitoring material collected through the franchise to ensure increased diversion over time, as well as the crucial role that material collected outside of each member agency.

² Private sector companies provide collection of dry commercial materials in Berkeley; all other residential and commercial services are municipally-provided.
agency’s franchise plays in contributing to overall diversion of discards and to achieving “75% and Beyond.”

**Figure ES-4: Municipally-Controlled Disposal Tonnages, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Total Disposal Tonnages</th>
<th>Municipally-Controlled Disposal Tonnages</th>
<th>Municipally-Controlled Disposal (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>32,036</td>
<td>26,341</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>68,221</td>
<td>40,136</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>34,731</td>
<td>28,435</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>8,419</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>174,899</td>
<td>121,839</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>108,106</td>
<td>84,555</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>65,094</td>
<td>41,654</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>36,190</td>
<td>26,253</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>254,262</td>
<td>156,410</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>91,292</td>
<td>52,201</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>82,466</td>
<td>36,402</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>38,420</td>
<td>30,513</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County *</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley Sanitary District</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro Loma Sanitary District</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 1,074,746 724,230 67%

**Figure ES-5: Municipally-Controlled Material Tonnages, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Total Recyclables</th>
<th>Total Organics</th>
<th>Total Disposal</th>
<th>Total Generated</th>
<th>Diversion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>11,458</td>
<td>11,835</td>
<td>26,341</td>
<td>49,634</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>15,877</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>40,136</td>
<td>78,616</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>19,185</td>
<td>9,980</td>
<td>28,435</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>121,839</td>
<td>182,780</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>23,703</td>
<td>22,772</td>
<td>84,555</td>
<td>131,030</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>18,657</td>
<td>20,642</td>
<td>41,654</td>
<td>80,952</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>5,296</td>
<td>26,253</td>
<td>36,947</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>53,601</td>
<td>156,410</td>
<td>248,511</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>11,878</td>
<td>52,201</td>
<td>72,519</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>8,097</td>
<td>9,788</td>
<td>36,402</td>
<td>54,286</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>9,724</td>
<td>9,619</td>
<td>30,513</td>
<td>49,857</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley Sanitary District</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>14,213</td>
<td>33,126</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro Loma Sanitary District</td>
<td>15,599</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>50,803</td>
<td>85,167</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 223,388 247,513 724,230 1,195,131 39%
Benchmark Service GSIG Data

The Review Team computed the average weights, in pounds, of recyclables and food scraps (excluding food-soiled paper) found in garbage set-outs for each member agency. For recyclables, as shown in Figure ES-6, for households with GSIG, a year-by-year trend analysis did not identify distinct trends but did find a clear and consistent lower bound across the member agencies. Single-family residents that put recyclables in their trash tend to dispose of at least two pounds of recyclables. StopWaste might consider setting a goal of, for example, “one pound or less.”

**Figure ES-6: Single Family Households with Recyclables in Garbage**

- **Summary:** Single-family residents that put recyclables in their trash tend to dispose of at least two pounds of recyclables.
- **Notes:**
  - Each of the symbols on the left shows two parameters that, for a given jurisdiction and year, describe the amount of recyclables in single-family garbage carts. The thin black bar indicates the average weight of those recyclables. The wide blue bar indicates the variation in weight between the samples.
  - For example, in Alameda in 2013, the sampled residences that had recyclables in their garbage had, on average, 2.1 pounds of that material; and we can say with 90% confidence that in all of Alameda the average is between 1.8 and 2.3 pounds.
  - To prevent skewing of the data, residences with NO recyclables in their garbage were excluded from this analysis.
For food scraps, Figure ES-7 indicates a very clear declining trend from 2014 through 2016 in the weight of food scraps in the garbage for nearly all jurisdictions. However, unlike for recyclables, there was no clear and consistent minimum value across member agencies, which suggests that there is significant opportunity for continued improvement. The Review Team recommends setting a weight-based goal of (for example) two pounds or less, that would allow for a more concrete measurement of progress towards the interim goals of less than 20 percent food in the GSIG, and less than 10 percent GSIG overall.

**Figure ES-7: Single Family – Households with Food Scraps in Garbage**

*Summary:* For organics, there was no clear and consistent minimum value across member agencies, although most jurisdictions show a reduced average amount of organics over time.

*Notes:* See notes to Figure 3-12 on the previous page for discussion of error bars.

Sorting organics into food scraps and other distinct components did not begin until mid-2014. Hence there is no food scrap data for 2013, and only partial data for 2014. To prevent skewing of the data, residences with NO recyclables in their garbage were excluded from this analysis.
General Recommendations for Downstream Metrics

Two Types of Metrics

The Review Team recommends use of two broad types of metrics:

1. Weight per-capita measures such as pounds per-resident or per-household.
2. Volume measures such as changes in subscribed service, and related density measures such as pounds per-volume of subscribed service.

Weight per-capita and volume-based metrics utilize data from the annual Measure D Forms and overall best meet the criteria for useful metrics in that they are relatively simple, necessary data is available, they require minimal calculation, and are replicable. The Review outlines logical steps for developing member agency and countywide metrics using the two approaches described above, progressing from the general to the specific. Use of multiple metrics provides different information that can lead to more nuanced understanding. Use of multiple metrics can also provide a useful cross-check, helping to identify inconsistencies in the underlying data.

Use of Weight in Measuring Progress towards Reduced GSIG

There is benefit to using weight in addition to, or rather than, percentages to set goals for reducing GSIG. As further discussed in the Review, weight is an absolute measure that does not mask changes in the composition of each of the streams, and in particular due to the “Evolving Ton.” This is especially true for recyclables, for which a reduced percentage of GSIG by weight may be the result of changes in recyclables composition that reduce density, rather than reflecting changes in behavior.

Estimates of Edible Food

Based on review of data from a variety of sources, the Review Team concludes that:

1. “Edible food” is probably a little less than half of all food wastes in the single-family, multi-family or commercial streams.
2. As a first approximation, “edible food” in the Alameda County residential disposal stream (single-family and multi-family combined) is likely in the range of 8 to 12 percent of the total disposal stream.

Review of Waste Characterization Data from Other Jurisdictions

The waste characterization analysis is intended to provide a means of comparing the new GSIG data from the Characterization Study, once available, to data from previous StopWaste waste characterizations, from the Benchmark Service audits, and from other jurisdictions in the U.S and Canada with high-performing programs and comparable levels of success in achieving relatively high diversion goals. The Review Team:
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- Developed summary profiles identifying key policies, programs and characteristics for six selected jurisdictions, with a focus on the factors that are most likely key to driving diversion and discard practices within each jurisdiction.
- Prepared a sampling of graphic comparisons, using the data contained in the Tool, to illustrate how the Tool can be used to assess possible associations between waste characterization data and key program features for specific jurisdictions, as well as identify possible larger patterns across data from multiple jurisdictions.

Figure ES-8 summarizes key policy and program features for the six jurisdictions, providing a high-level snapshot of key factors that can play the largest role, all else being equal, in driving discard behavior.3

Figure ES-8: Summary Policies and Programs for Selected Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>EPR</th>
<th>Diversion Goal</th>
<th>Mandatory Separation</th>
<th>Disposal Ban(s)</th>
<th>“Bottle Bill”</th>
<th>Low Volume Garbage Option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County, Oregon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures ES-9 and ES-10 illustrate use of the Tool. Figure ES-9 shows the percentage of GSIG in single-family garbage, for waste characterization data from Alameda County, as well as from San Francisco, California state, King County (Seattle), Washington, and Vancouver, British Columbia.

3 Of course, many other factors also influence discard behavior, such as reduced collection rates for commercial recycling and organics relative to those for garbage. Note that the availability of low generator garbage options can result in added contamination of the recycling or organics streams. Such shifts in material can be detected only if data is simultaneously collected for all three streams.
Figure ES-9: Percent of GSIG for Single-Family

Figure ES-10 shows information for all of the studies, combining single-family and multi-family as a single residential sector, total GSIG is generally in the 40% to 60% range.

With regard to residential GSIG, Alameda County is as successful as other jurisdictions in reducing GSIG. Note also that none of the jurisdictions are close to reaching a goal such as 10 percent for residential GSIG.

Figure ES-10: Percent of GSIG for Combined Residential

Unlike most other studies, the StopWaste Benchmark analyses did not separate containers from fibers but provided a single percentage that includes both.
“Ultimate Disposition” of Discards: from Collection to New Products

Ultimate disposition can be thought of as: “What happens to collected discards (recyclables, organics or C&D) once they are delivered for initial processing?” The key related question is, “Do diversion rates reported by processors tell the full story, or is there additional unreported residue associated with additional stages of processing?” Discarded recyclables and organics are generally processed in multiple steps, often at different facilities operated by different entities. Agency and member agency value in understanding “secondary” processing is heightened by the recent issues related to the Chinese recyclables markets.

The Review discusses use of franchise agreements to require processing and marketing planning, jurisdiction-specific residue rates that reflect additional steps in processing, and certifications of end-use. The Review Team concludes that franchise agreements are not adequate tools for monitoring, reporting, and providing a useful understanding of the ultimate disposition of most materials. The Review’s primary recommendation is to encourage third party certification and market self-policing for both organics and recyclables and, ideally, facility-wide residue reporting. In addition, submittal of annual processing and marketing plans should be required; member agency staff should discuss market issues with haulers on a regular basis.
DATE: January 11, 2018
TO: Planning Committee/Recycling Board
FROM: Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
BY: Meri Soll, Senior Program Manager
SUBJECT: Grants to Nonprofits Program – Year in Review

SUMMARY
The Recycling Board has awarded grants through the Grants to Nonprofits program (GNP) for over 22 years, totaling close to $8.6 million dollars in funding. At the January 11, 2018 Recycling Board Meeting, staff will provide an update on the grant program.

DISCUSSION
The table below identifies budgeted grant funds available in FY 17/18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Funds Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRANT FOCUS AREAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive and Reuse Grants</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Waste Prevention Grants*</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Thrift Grants</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Grants</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Part of FY grant solicitation but will utilize Food Waste Prevention Grant funds not Grants to Non Profits funds).

This fiscal year, the grants program will concentrate on the Agency’s guiding principles with an emphasis placed on supporting grants that focus on waste prevention, reuse and repair. Funds will still be available for projects that involve typical discard management activities but priority will be given to projects that meet the revised guiding principles.

This fiscal year we will increase the amount of funding available for reuse operating grants from $15,000 to $20,000 per grant. The increase is based on feedback from a recent Reuse and Repair Stakeholder roundtable the Agency hosted. Stakeholders shared that operating reuse and repair organizations in Alameda County has become increasingly difficult as rents and labor have skyrocketed over the past years. If we would like these types of services and organizations to continue to be available in Alameda County, then more support is needed.
Funding for the competitive grant focus area will be distributed commensurate with diversion and impact.

Mini grants (up to $5k) and Charity Thrift Block Grants (up to $15k) are offered on a first-come, first-served basis until funds are expended.

In the past, Community Outreach Grants to promote food scrap recycling have been offered through the GNP project; however funding for these outreach grants are now part of the Community Outreach project with a focus on food waste prevention.

Grant Application Review

Staff has developed and implemented a robust application review, which includes the following processes:

- Every application is reviewed internally by a minimum of two staff members, selected for their expertise in the grant focus area.
- Staff utilizes a two-page grant assessment form, completed for each applicant by every reviewer. This assessment form is a revised version of the Board approved project assessment tool, originally developed for the evaluation of Target projects, to better assess a grant applicant’s request for funds.
- Staff conducts site tours for every new applicant to assess organizational capacity, project conception and implementation activities.
- As the grants program funding and priority areas have transformed over the years, language has been added to the RFP that addresses declining funding availability: “Funds for this grant program are limited. Applicants who have been awarded reuse grants in past years should not presume award of funding for every year”.

Grant to Non Profits (GNP) Administration

Competitive, reuse and food waste prevention grant funds are distributed on an annual cycle with an application deadline of March 2018. Outreach for applications for the focus areas identified above will be conducted as part of one solicitation. These focus areas offer the largest pot of funds available. Past experience has shown that deadlines for these types of grants are needed to procure qualified applications.

Funding for charity thrift and mini grants are available on a first come - first served basis until funds are expended. A nonprofit can only request funding from ONE grant program focus area with the exception of charity thrifts, who can apply for funding from the Charity Thrift Block Grant and one other grant program.

Grant approvals under $50,000 are processed administratively; using the Executive Director’s signing authority. All grants issued under the Executive Director’s signing authority are listed in a summary provided at the next regularly scheduled Recycling Board meeting. Recommended grants greater than $50,000 are brought to the Recycling Board for approval. In addition, recent grant recipients and their accomplishments are highlighted at meetings throughout the year to keep the Board informed.

Staff promotes the grants program in a variety of ways including press releases, outreach to member agencies, mailing to nonprofits in Alameda County, as well as direct outreach to potential recipients. In addition, the Agency regularly utilizes social media such as Instagram, Twitter and Facebook to promote grant opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION

There is no recommendation at this time. This item is for information only.
DATE: January 11, 2018
TO: Recycling Board & Planning Committee
FROM: Tom Padia, Deputy Director
BY: Meghan Starkey, Senior Program Manager
SUBJECT: Recycling Board Municipal Panels: Topics for 2018

SUMMARY
StopWaste periodically convenes a panel of staff members from member agencies to speak to the Recycling Board on current issues related to solid waste and recycling. StopWaste staff is seeking direction from the Board about the topics for 2018.

DISCUSSION
Approximately once each quarter, staff from member agencies come to the Recycling Board to present perspectives on issues affecting them. Representatives from different sized cities and/or different regions of the county implement programs or develop policies on issues of common concern, yet their approach will vary according to the conditions within their own member agency.

Past topics have included organics diversion (both residential and commercial); mandatory recycling; promotion and outreach; multifamily recycling; schools recycling; handling of special materials at the curb; franchise contract management; large events recycling; construction and demolition (C&D) debris management, and commercial enclosures/internal space. Their perspectives have focused not only on successes, but also the real challenges facing them. A number of issues – including organics recycling, franchise contracts, mandatory, multifamily, C&D and schools – are recurrent topics because of their local importance.

TAC members and StopWaste staff have developed a list of suggested topics for the Recycling Board to consider for 2018. Board members should feel free to suggest topics not on this list as well:

- Litter clean up (tentatively scheduled for February meeting)
- Single family and multifamily door to door outreach
- City strategic plans
- Commercial and multifamily trash enclosures
- Effective communications, especially through social marketing
- Data management

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Recycling Board & Planning Committee provide direction on the topics for 2018.
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ISRI says more chaos is likely to result from China’s enforcement actions

ISRI says more chaos is likely to result from China’s enforcement actions

The Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries (ISRI), Washington, issued an alert to its members dated Dec. 11, 2017, updating them about its recent meetings in Beijing with Chinese and U.S. government officials and its industry association counterparts. The association also offers guidance to its members regarding implementation of China’s new import rules.

The alert, which is signed by ISRI President Robin Wiener and Chair Mark Lewon of Utah Metal Works, Salt Lake City, explains that China is facing “a serious environmental crisis,” and the country’s central government has prioritized cleaning up the country’s environment. “Their focus is not on any one industry but across all sectors of the country’s economy regardless of the impact on jobs and production,” the alert states. “A
wide-ranging series of actions—including closures, aggressive enforcement and the tightening of environmental controls—are being implemented in industries as far ranging as agriculture, coal, oil and recycling.”

The association says the actions are coming from the highest level of the Chinese government and little time and few resources are being given to the country’s government agencies charged with developing and implementing these rules to ensure they “get it right.”

The alert reads, “The Chinese are struggling to distinguish between what is waste (that they do not want in their country at any cost) and valuable resources, i.e., scrap (that they understand is needed as feedstock for Chinese manufacturing). And in their rush to meet President Xi Jinping’s directive to develop rules to prevent ‘foreign waste’ from entering their country, they have created terms and standards inconsistent with the global trade.” ISRI adds, “During our meetings it was clear that there is little understanding within the Chinese government of the chaos they have created.”

The association says AQSIQ (General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine) is unprepared to implement the bans on mixed paper and postconsumer plastics Jan. 1, 2018, adding that representatives from the agency “could not answer questions as to the meaning of the terms. Thus,” ISRI concludes, “the likelihood of individual inspectors at the ports understanding what they are inspecting—and what they are looking for—is very low.”

While ISRI says the Chinese government is listening to what it has to say on the matter, “they have limited time and ability to take in all the comments.”

ISRI notes that a working group comprised of officials from the U.S., Canadian, U.K., E.U., Australian, New Zealand and Japanese embassies in Beijing are coordinating strategy and speaking to the Chinese government on behalf of the recycling industry. “We briefed this group last week and were very pleased with the concerns expressed by each and their joint commitment to provide support,” the association says.

According to the alert, ISRI “attempted during our meetings to get clarifications to the Chinese government’s
definition of ‘carried waste,’ the specific scope of paper and plastics to be banned and the specific timing that these actions will come into force. For ‘carried waste,’ it is very clear they do not want imported trash but are confused as to how to define what is trash and what is not. Beyond that, the government does not know the answers to our questions, which included very specific examples of grades that are typically exported to China. Furthermore, they have not fully prepared for the implementation of the regulations, and we believe even more confusion and inconsistency is yet to come.”

ISRI suggests that its members be vigilant when loading to avoid including dirt, wood, concrete or other materials or even recyclables that do not belong in that particular load. The association also advises including more photos and thoroughly documenting the condition and contents of shipments before export. It also tells its members to expect rejections. “We anticipate a greater number of rejections of material before and after shipping, and it will not necessarily be related to scrap quality but unfortunately on misunderstandings by inspection officials as to what they are looking for.”

ISRI encourages its members to keep records of their experiences, including reasons given for rejections, and to share this data with the association.

“As to next steps, comments to the World Trade Organization are due this week,” ISRI notes in the alert. “Based on what we now know, we are rewriting our comments to include very specific information about the industry, including specifics on the various grades of scrap traded globally, suggestions on quality standards and detailed questions to try to get as much clarity and guidance as possible.”

ISRI adds that members are welcome to submit comments by the Dec. 15 deadline, adding, “There is a specific process to do this, so please feel free to reach out to Adina Renee Adler for guidance if you are interested in doing so.”

Adler can be contacted at aadler@isri.org.
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POST DOE WRAP: NYMEX lower on crude stock builds
Posted On November 15, 2017

NYMEX crude and products futures prices were lower early Wednesday after government figures showed an increase...

Atar Capital acquires HAVI's recycling and waste solutions business
Posted On September 5, 2017

Atar Capital acquires HAVI's recycling and waste solutions business <![CDATA[Above: Anthony DiIenno remains president and CEO of RWS. Atar Capital, Los Angeles, has announced that it…}}]>

https://www.cra-recycle.org/2017/12/isri-says-more-chaos-is-likely-to-result-from-chinas...
Steelmaking momentum stalls in US
Posted On April 6, 2017

Steelmaking momentum stalls in US <![CDATA[Steel output in the United States declined in the final week of March compared to the week before, potentially signaling...
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Dell Launches World’s First Ocean Plastics Supply Chain

by Leon Kaye (http://www.triplepundit.com/author/leon-kaye/) on Wednesday, Dec 13th, 2017  ☛ CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT


Today, Dell announced that it will work with several of the world’s leading brands to develop what it describes as the world’s first commercial-scale, ocean-bound plastics supply chain. Companies like Adidas might quibble with that claim (https://www.triplepundit.com/2017/04/another-line-shoes-made-ocean-plastic-adidas-launches-soon/), but we see it as good news all around.

Beyond simply collecting plastic, this program includes an education program that seeks to heighten awareness about the dangers plastic impose on oceans and marine life. In addition, each company participating in this initiative, named NextWave (http://nextwaveplastics.org/), has pledged to reduce its plastic footprint while reducing or eliminating consumption of single-use and non-recyclable plastics.
Brands participating in NextWave include General Motors, Herman Miller, Interface and Trek Bikes. UN Environment and the NGO Lonely Whale (https://www.lonelywhale.org/) are also participating in this initiative.

For Dell, this program builds upon the several years of work it has invested (https://www.triplepundit.com/2013/01/dell-sustainable-packaging/) in creating more sustainable and recyclable packaging (https://www.triplepundit.com/2011/10/dells-investment-sustainable-packaging-earns-certified-recyclable-rating/), as well as striving to achieve a more closed-loop system (https://www.triplepundit.com/special/circular-economy-and-green-electronics/how-dell-is-closing-the-loop/) within its supply chain.

On its own web site, Dell has projected statistics that suggest over 86 million tons, or 5 trillion pieces of plastic, are currently in the world’s oceans. Estimates suggest about 8 million tons of plastic waste wash up in oceans – an amount that could increase to 150 million tons by 2025. By mid-century, there could be more plastics in the world’s oceans (https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/oceans-plastic-fish-2050_us_569e9963e4b00f3e986327a0) than fish.

The organizations coalescing around the NextWave initiative suggest that if their plan succeeds, they could prevent 3 million pounds of plastics from entering the oceans by 2023 – the equivalent of eliminating 66 million water bottles from ending up at sea. That is a relatively small drop in the morass of ocean plastic that is ruining oceans, but if similar efforts (https://www.wired.com/insights/2014/12/can-technology-help-clean-up-the-oceans/) can continue to launch worldwide, marine ecosystems may actually stand a chance in the long run.
Dell says the origin of this program lies into the relationship it developed with Lonely Whale back in 2015. That partnership eventually led to an ocean plastics recycling program (http://www.dell.com/learn/us/en/id/press-releases/2017-02-22-dell-announces-ocean-plastics-shipment) the company started in February. For that pilot project, salvaged ocean plastic has been blended with other recycled plastic resins to mold trays used for shipping. The company concluded that during 2017, this program will prevent 16,000 pounds of plastic from entering oceans.

These programs are additional steps Dell says is it taking with a goal to only use 100 percent sustainable packaging by 2020. According to the company, Dell is the only computer hardware manufacturer to offer computers and monitors made out of both recycled e-waste plastics and carbon fiber.

The organizations participating in NextWave insist their cooperation can help move industry closer to a circular economy.

“"I am so proud to see our partnership with Dell continue to grow and inspire companies across industries to use their capabilities to address ocean health,” said Adrian Grenier, founder of Lonely Whale. “This is no individual company’s problem; this impacts every human being and company, and it is incredible to see these industry leaders coming together.”

Image credit: Dell/Flickr
(https://www.flickr.com/photos/dellphotos/31849240874/in/album-72157676264006494/)
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