

DRAFT

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

**Thursday, July 14, 2016
7:00 p.m.**

**Fremont Recycling and Transfer Station
41149 Boyce Road
Fremont, CA 94538**

**Teleconference:
Michael Peltz
Club Quarters Hotel
161 Devonshire St, Boston, MA 02110
(617) 357-6400**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Tim Rood, President, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Adan Alonzo, Recycling Programs
Don Biddle, City of Dublin for Jerry Pentin, City of Pleasanton
Bernie Larrabe, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Peter Maass, City of Albany
Dianne Martinez, City of Emeryville
Jim Oddie, City of Alameda
Daniel O'Donnell, Environmental Organization
Michael Peltz, Solid Waste Industry Representative, via teleconference
Tim Rood, City of Piedmont
Steve Sherman, Source Reduction Specialist

Members Absent:

Toni Stein, Environmental Educator

Staff Present:

Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director
Jeff Becerra, Communications Manager
Judi Ettlinger, Senior Program Manager
Meri Soll, Senior Program Manager
Farand Kan, Deputy County Counsel
Arliss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Participating:

Stacy Hart, Tri City Volunteers

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Board member Alonzo welcomed everyone to the Fremont Transfer Station. Tom Padia announced that he would be staffing the meeting in the absence of Wendy Sommer. Tom Padia introduced Farand Kan, Deputy County Counsel. Mr. Kan replaces Audrey Beaman as the attending County Counsel for the

Recycling Board. President Rood welcomed Board member Oddie, City of Alameda, as the new Authority Representative to the Recycling Board. Board members provided a roundtable introduction.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of the Draft Minutes of June 9, 2016 (Tom Padia) | Action |
| 2. Board Attendance Record (Tom Padia) | Information |
| 3. Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Tom Padia) | Information |

Board member Biddle made the motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Board member Maass seconded and the motion carried 9-0 (Sherman & Stein absent).

V. OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There was none.

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Tri City Volunteers – Grantee Presentation | Information |
| This item is for information only. | |

Meri Soll provided an overview of the staff report and introduced Stacy Hart, Agency Manager, Tri City Volunteers. Ms. Hart provided a presentation on Tri City Volunteers' grant activities. The staff report and PowerPoint presentation is available here: [Tri-City-Presentation-07-14-16.pdf](#)

President Rood inquired about the set-up of the facility and how the food is provided to clients. Ms. Hart stated that clients are provided a volunteer host that will guide them through the facility. There is a maximum on the quantity of items provided. Board member Oddie inquired if they partner with other local food organizations such as St. Vincent De Paul and Meals on Wheels to donate the excess food items. Ms. Hart stated that they partner with the Alameda County Food Bank.

President Rood inquired about the number of languages that participate in the program and inquired if the food is labeled in different languages. Ms. Hart stated that they serve cultures with seven different languages and the grant will allow them to provide food labeling in those languages as well as their educational material. Board member Biddle inquired if they are able to get volunteers in those different languages. Ms. Hart responded yes they have volunteers from all walks of life.

President Rood commended Ms. Hart on the program and thanked her for her presentation.

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 2. Grants to Nonprofits Program – Year in Review (Meri Soll) | Information |
| This item is for information only. | |

Meri Soll provided an overview of the staff report and a PowerPoint presentation. The staff report and presentation is available here: [GNP-Year-In-Review-07-14-16.pdf](#)

Board member Sherman commented that although service providers that provide services for collection of garbage and recycling and organics offer some general donations for community services he is pleased to see a government agency through Measure D funding has a formal service as well. Board member Sherman commended staff on doing an excellent job and added for next year he would like to see an additional table that talks about the percentage of the \$300-400,000 in grants that supported the purchase of equipment, education and outreach, labor (particularly overall paying jobs and jobs that went to youth).

Board member Oddie requested more information on the \$5,000 grant for the Harbor Bay project in Alameda to share with his City Council. Ms. Soll stated that she will provide the information to him and

Mr. Becerra added there is a case study on how the project leveraged the \$5,000 grant. Mr. Padia added in addition to the water savings and other benefits the lawn conversion tool strengthens and creates markets for recycled compost and mulch as the wood markets are disappearing in California. It creates opportunities to use wood chips in sheet mulch conversion projects. Board member Rood inquired about the total cost to do a landscape conversion project. Ms. Soll stated that that depending on the service area the cardboard and mulch can be freely obtained and the agency provides additional landscape design consultation and other technical assistance. Mr. Becerra stated that we work closely with water agencies and they provide rebates as well.

President Rood thanked Ms. Soll for her presentation.

3. Outreach Strategies for Programmatic Successes (Jeff Becerra & Judi Ettlinger) Information

This item is for information only.

Jeff Becerra and Judi Ettlinger provided an overview of the staff report and provided a PowerPoint presentation. The staff report and presentation is available here: [Outreach-Strategies-07-14-16.pdf](#)

Board member Rood inquired if the 10% target is by weight or volume. Mr. Becerra responded that it is by weight and added the material is separated into 3 or more categories with a breakout of the organics by food and yard waste and then weighed to obtain the percentage. Board member Sherman commented that our call to action has been to “keep the good stuff out of the bad stuff” but there may be an opportunity to reframe to say “keep the bad stuff out of the good stuff” i.e. “don’t put the trash in the organics and the recycling.” Mr. Becerra stated the outreach is tailored to the situation as the posted signage and PSA’s need to be short and quick messaging but encounters with community groups or the school’s program provides the opportunity for deeper, expanded messaging and outreach.

Board member Maass commented that most recycling decisions are made in the kitchen and people know what to do but it is a matter of convenience. He added his own kitchen is designed for recycling convenience, i.e. both the garbage and recycling bins are next to each other in a pull-out cabinet underneath the sink and inquired if staff had considered collaborating with architects for possible design elements that would reinforce the convenience for recycling. Ms. Ettlinger replied that staff has conducted several focus group and learned that one process is not universally acceptable. Mr. Becerra added we are conducting a pilot test in Fremont where we are providing some residents with a pail for recycling and others with the pail and liner and others with different outreach messaging and will be evaluating the outcome of the pilot.

President Rood thanked Mr. Becerra and Ms. Ettlinger for the presentation.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm

This page intentionally left blank

2016 - ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD ATTENDANCE

	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
REGULAR MEMBERS												
A. Alonzo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
G. Jones	X	I	X	X	X	A						
B. Larrabe	X	X	X	A	X	X	X					
P. Maass	X	X	X	X	I	X	X					
D. Martinez	X	X	X	I	X	X	X					
J. Oddie							X					
D. O'Donnell	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
M. Peltz	X	A	X	X	X	A	X					
J. Pentin	X	I	I	X	A	X	I					
T. Rood	X	X	X	X	X	I	X					
S. Sherman	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
T. Stein	X	X	X	X	X	X	A					
INTERIM APPOINTEES												
D. Biddle		X			X		X					
S. Young		X				X						
D. Sadoff			X									
D. Kalb				X								

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

This page intentionally left blank



DATE: August 11, 2016
TO: Recycling Board
FROM: Wendy Sommer, 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.

This page intentionally left blank



DATE: August 11, 2016

TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Tom Padia, Deputy Executive Director

SUBJECT: Scope of Work for Five Year Program Review

SUMMARY

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. (Actual text from this section of the Charter is included as Attachment A.) At the August 11 Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board meeting, staff will present and seek approval for a proposed “pared down” scope of services for the next program audit as previously requested by the Board.

DISCUSSION

For some time now the Board has separated the financial/compliance review from the programmatic evaluation and has conducted separate solicitation and selection processes for each. Staff is developing the Request For Proposals (RFP) for the next *program* audit, and at the May 12 meeting discussed with the Recycling Board the proposed schedule and scope of the RFP. The Board gave staff direction to scale back the scope of work for the next Five Year Program Review, and to reduce the proposed budget from the \$150,000 range to \$100,000 or less. Board members suggested the report focus less on profiles of past performance and more on recommendations for “best practices” going forward. It was requested that staff return in a few months with a proposed scaled back scope, the scope of work for the last RFP five years ago for comparison, and a link to the last report.

The current Five Year Financial & Compliance Audit for FY 11/12–15/16 is underway by Crowe Horwath and should be completed by the end of this fiscal year. The last Five Year Program Audit (hereinafter to be called “Five Year Program Review”) was performed by SAIC and is available at: http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/Documents/5_year_audit_6-28-13.pdf.

The report prior to that was performed by HF&H Consultants in two volumes and is available at:

http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/revise_d_assessment_report-final_1-08.pdf

http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/Documents/revise_d_member_agency_program_summaries_appendix_1-08%20%281%29.pdf

Program reviews have typically included summary profiles comparing local program features and results to each other and to other well-regarded and “model” waste reduction programs nationwide. Cost of the last Program Review five years ago was approximately \$144,000.

Additionally, the scopes of work for the past several Five Year Program Reviews have included tasks to research one or more topics or issues of current relevance to Alameda County’s waste reduction efforts and goals.

Budget:

The approved FY 16/17 budget includes \$181,000 in originally-projected hard costs based upon a base contract of approximately \$150,000 and a contingency of \$30,000. Funds for the Five Year Program Review come from the Grants to Non-Profits revenue stream, which allows funding for “...planning, research and studies directed at furthering the purposes of this Act.” (Subsection 64.060(B)(2)). Any cost savings for this project will be returned to the Grants to Non-Profits fund balance.

Proposed “Pared Down” Scope of Work:

The Scope of Work from the December 2011 RFP is included as Attachment B. Since the time of the last Five Year Program Review, staff has begun asking the member agencies to file an “Annual Measure D Data Request” along with the annual Measure D financial report (sample of the Data Request included as Attachment C). While the financial report details Recycling Fund revenues and expenditures, the data report includes information on municipal contracts, tonnages collected, and account subscription information. Fourteen of the sixteen member agencies receiving quarterly per capita allocations from the Recycling Fund have submitted these data requests for the last two years. A new request will be issued at the end of August with the next quarterly allocations.

Staff has not devoted significant resources to reviewing these submittals for consistency and accuracy, but they could be used as a basis for profiling member agency programs in the Five Year Program Review without a large level of new effort by a consultant. Similarly, staff collects information periodically from member agencies regarding their Construction and Demolition debris regulations and practices, commercial recycling controls and programs, Environmentally Preferable Purchasing policies and practices, Bay Friendly Landscaping policies and projects, and other program areas.

By extracting certain key program parameters and performance metrics from existing data sets, the Five Year Program Review could present a select few tables of comparative data from the member agencies, and compile other data sets and program profiles with a minimum level of back and forth communication with fourteen cities and two sanitary districts. Profiles of municipal programs outside of our county can be dropped, and research tasks on additional issues can be limited to one or two high priority topics. Finally, the RFP can state a budget ceiling and proposers can be asked to “back into” a budget maximum with their proposed level of effort.

In line with this scaled down budget, the following scope outline is proposed for inclusion in the RFP:

- Profile residential recycling program parameters (e.g. materials collected, frequency, size and type of containers) and results (e.g. pounds per household, pounds per capita, etc.) in each Alameda County municipality utilizing existing data sets. *Note: “Municipality” as defined in the County Charter includes the Oro Loma and the Castro Valley Sanitary Districts.
- Profile commercial/industrial/institutional recycling, construction and demolition debris programs, Environmentally Preferable Purchasing, and requirements for use of recycled content mulch and compost for landscapes in each of the municipalities, utilizing existing data sets.

- Compile and present existing metrics of (CalRecycle) diversion rates by jurisdiction, and StopWaste data on “percent good stuff in the garbage.”
- Propose key metrics that may be used to measure and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in the future, utilizing commonly or easily available data.
- Research other states, regions and/or jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste in 1995, 2000 and 2008, and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time (i.e. percent good stuff in the garbage).
- Develop recommendations for improvements and modifications indicated in current policies, procedures and practices for the Recycling Board, Alameda County, and the municipalities in order to achieve waste reduction and sustainability goals. Identify outside jurisdictions or organizations successfully engaged in what might be considered “best practices” in municipal waste reduction and sustainability efforts.

Schedule and Selection Process:

It is proposed that the (RFP) be released in August or early September with a due date for proposals approximately seven weeks later. As with the last Five Year Program Review, a team of staff will evaluate and rank the proposals, and interviews by a panel of Agency and member agency staff will be held with the top two or three proposers, if necessary. Recommendation of contract award would be presented to the Recycling Board no later than the regular monthly meeting on December 8, 2016. It is expected that work would be completed in or around June 2017, with a final report presented to the Board soon after.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed schedule and scope of work for the Five Year Program Review.

Attachment A: Subsection 64.040: Recycling Policy Goals and Recycling Plan

Attachment B: Scope of Work from December 2011 RFP

Attachment C: Sample Annual Member Agency Data Sheet

ATTACHMENT A

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.

ATTACHMENT B

Scope of Work from December 2011 RFP

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Meet statutory requirements of Measure D;
2. Profile and compare municipal waste reduction efforts in Alameda County with each other and with comparable jurisdictions elsewhere, and to broadly evaluate countywide waste reduction program effectiveness.
3. Profile and evaluate diversion strategies, policies, programs and metrics that might help Alameda County meet and measure its success in achieving the “75% and Beyond” diversion, “less than 10% good stuff in the garbage,” and other goals contained in the Strategic Workplan 2020:

http://www.stopwaste.org/sites/default/files/Documents/final_strategic_plan_7-28-10.pdf

V. SCOPE OF SERVICES

The consultant shall:

- Profile, compare and evaluate the residential recycling program parameters (e.g. materials collected, frequency, size and type of containers, residuals/contamination rates) and results (e.g. pounds per household, pounds per capita, cost per ton, % of residential discards diverted, etc.) in each Alameda County municipality* (including Fremont, Newark and Union City), distinguishing between singlefamily and multi-family service (where data is available), containers, papers and used motor oil versus plant debris/organics, and including graphical representations of comparative program results and analysis of possible reasons for differing results. Provide comparisons between local municipalities and jurisdictions with comparable demographics. *Note: “Municipality” as defined in the County Charter includes the Oro Loma and the Castro Valley Sanitary Districts.
- Profile, compare and evaluate the commercial/industrial/institutional recycling programs, services, policies, franchise provisions and ordinances in each of the municipalities. Evaluate publicly established refuse and/or recycling collection charges (i.e. rates) and their impact upon levels of commercial recycling and waste reduction activities in each of the 16 municipalities.
- Research and evaluate general levels and trends in private sector recycling, composting and waste prevention activity, and identify any perceived “gaps” or areas where municipal or county agencies might effectively increase levels of diversion through governmental action.
- Broadly evaluate the effectiveness and impacts of countywide waste reduction programs, focusing on the primary areas of discards management, product decisions, and communications.
- Research and report on feasibility and results of collecting “garbage” less often than weekly in areas where food waste and other organics are collected weekly for composting.
- Research other states, regions and jurisdictions that have conducted landfill waste characterization studies comparable to those conducted for StopWaste.Org in 1995, 2000 and 2008, and analyze results of overall percentages by weight of commonly recycled and composted materials remaining in the landfill stream and trends over time.
- For all of the above, develop recommendations for improvements and modifications indicated in current policies, procedures and practices for the Recycling Board, Alameda County, and the municipalities.

ATTACHMENT C

Member Agency

As Of Date

Albany

10/1/2015

Single Family Residential

(Defined as 1-4 Units)

Weekly Refuse Volume	# Refuse Accounts	# with recycling	# with organics
<30 Gallons/Mini-Can	1134	1131	1133
30-32 Gallons	2740	2732	2736
60-64 Gallons	172	172	171
90-96 Gallons	26	26	23
>96 Gallons	36	36	29

Multifamily Residential Customers

(Defined as 5+ Units)

Weekly Refuse Volume	# Refuse Accounts	# with recycling	# with organics
<1 Cubic Yards	27	27	25
1-3.9 Cubic Yards	62	62	40
4+ Cubic Yards	11	11	7

MF Accounts by Number of Units on Property

Size	# Refuse Accounts	# with recycling	# with organics
5-15 Units	81	81	60
16-60 Units	17	17	10
61-100 Units	0	0	0
100+ Units	2	2	2

Commercial Customers

(Defined as Non-Residential)

Regular Weekly Refuse Volume	# Refuse Accounts	# with recycling	# with organics
<1 Cubic Yards	225	124	55
1-3.9 Cubic Yards	88	77	23
4+ Cubic Yards	16	13	10

On Call Refuse Volume	# Refuse Accounts	# with recycling	# with organics
1-3.9 Cubic Yards	0	0	0
4+ Cubic Yards	5	0	1

Notes:

--



DATE: August 11, 2016
TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board
FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Priority Setting: Overview and Timeline

SUMMARY

With reduced resources but growing environmental challenges, staff is seeking direction for setting budgetary priorities over the coming two years. At the August 11 Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board meeting, staff will review the priority setting process and timeline. The desired end result of the process is a budgetary decision making framework that will allow the Agency to focus on staff core competencies, continue to innovate, and leverage our limited resources through partnerships and external funding. Note that a joint meeting of the WMA, Energy Council and Recycling Board is planned for September 28 for a facilitated goal setting process. This will be in addition to the regularly scheduled September 8 Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board meeting.

DISCUSSION

Each year our budget and work plans are guided by the strategic plan adopted in 2010. Constraining resources now require us to set priorities within the structure of the plan, so that we are focusing on the areas where we can be most relevant and helpful to our stakeholders and customers, optimizing effectiveness and results. We feel the need to shift towards a more fluid, adaptive strategy.

Staff is seeking a priority framework from the Board that can be used to make decisions when developing budgets for the next two years. Financially, our goal is to match core expenditures with core revenues (with no new fees), and align programmatic work with our goals, strengths, and current external conditions.

At the conclusion of the next two budget cycles, staff will begin discussions with the Board on what strategy structure would best replace the 2010 strategic plan once it reaches its planned 10-year horizon in 2020.

Process Overview

The priority setting process will include conversations with staff, Boards, city staff (TAC and city managers), and input to be requested and/or already provided by stakeholders such as the Northern California Recycling Association, the Measure D committee, and industry representatives. The work will

culminate in November with the Boards approving a budgetary decision making framework. Process elements include:

- Board Presentations – Project updates have been taking place throughout the year and will continue on major activities and current/relevant topics to provide the Board with the background necessary for a thoughtful decision-making process.
- Stakeholder input – Staff will solicit input on the priorities of external stakeholders such as member agencies, haulers and recyclers.
- Internal input and research on broader environment – Staff will assess effectiveness of current projects and identify current directions in solid waste, sustainability and climate change, our Agency’s current role/place within them and potential roles looking forward.
- Board Direction – In the form of a framework of orienting principles to help us navigate budget decisions for the next two years. Should include guidance on areas of emphasis (e.g., “We will emphasize X, even over Y,” when both X and Y are worthy, “good” things to do).

Proposed Priority Setting Timeline

JULY		
July 13	Staff	Process overview, gather initial input
July 27	WMA/EC	Priority setting process/timeline
July 28	TAC	Process overview, gather initial input

AUGUST		
August 11	RB	Priority setting process/timeline
August 17	Staff	Priority setting exercises

SEPTEMBER		
September 1	TAC	Initial strategy preview and input
September 14	Staff	Initial strategy preview and input
September 28	Joint WMA/EC RB	Facilitated goal setting
Dates TBD	Member agencies, industry, other partners	Initiate conversations and gather input

OCTOBER		
Dates TBD	Staff	Develop recommended framework for Board adoption in November

NOVEMBER		
November 10	RB	Adoption of priority framework
November 16	WMA/EC	Adoption of priority framework

RECOMMENDATION

The timeline and process were approved by the Waste Management Authority Board at its July meeting. This item is for information only.



DATE: August 11, 2016

TO: Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board

FROM: Wendy Sommer, Executive Director

BY: Wes Sullens, Program Manager
Miya Kitahara, Program Manager

SUBJECT: Industry trends: Circular Economy and Consumption Based Emissions Inventory

SUMMARY

StopWaste staff has been tracking recent developments in the business and government sectors that emphasize a more systemic approach to materials management and waste reduction. These concepts can be applied to our programs to achieve deeper waste reduction in the future. At the August 11 Planning & Organization Committee/Recycling Board meeting, staff will present information on increasingly accepted concepts including the circular economy and consumption-based greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventories, with the purpose of providing background for the programmatic prioritization the Board will undertake in the fall.

DISCUSSION

Recent trends indicate a readiness in the market and industry for innovative solutions that focus on strategies higher on the materials management hierarchy, such as product redesign, reduce, reuse, and repair. These strategies increase the economic utility and productivity of each unit of material consumed by society and foster systems of circularity beyond recycling.

Circular Economy

The concept of “Circular Economy” is gaining momentum with wide support from the business community and government agencies. In a circular economy, materials are cycled indefinitely throughout our economy at their highest value and utility, resulting in very little waste produced. The goal is to decouple economic growth from resource constraints and unlock the potential of capturing value from materials that are considered “waste” in the current linear economy. Circular economy principles lead to innovative business practices that result in waste and GHG emissions reductions and local economic benefits. The recent entrance of the Ellen MacArthur Foundation into the U.S. earlier this year (through their Circular Economy 100 USA initiative) signals a focused

attention on these concepts in the U.S., and StopWaste is following their progress closely. The Foundation has produced resources to help government agencies foster a circular economy.

Consumption Based GHG Emissions Inventories

To date, GHG emissions inventories have focused on activities that occur within a community's geographic boundary and omitted the emissions related to goods consumed by the community but produced elsewhere. Governments increasingly recognize that this unintentionally promotes outsourcing of production and jobs and hides a significant portion of a community's global emissions footprint. A "Consumption-based Emissions Inventory" (CBEI) attributes all emissions related to goods and services to the end user or consumer. CBEIs more fully reflect the GHG benefits of waste reduction, particularly waste prevention, and allow consumers to make informed consumption decisions. CBEIs have been conducted at national and local scales. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District recently commissioned UC Berkeley to develop a CBEI for every jurisdiction in the Bay Area. The findings highlight the significance of upstream emissions related to food, goods, and housing construction that are not captured in traditional inventories.

Leveraging Trends

Concepts like the circular economy and consumption-based emissions signify the evolution of waste management strategies that take a more systematic look at materials cycles and how to influence change. StopWaste staff will update the Board on these trends so that they can be considered during the upcoming priority setting process.

RECOMMENDATION

This item is for information only.