Roll Call: City Council

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

SCHEDULED MATTER

1. REFUSE 101
   Re: Review of City’s Solid Waste Operation.

2. RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAM
   Re: Consideration of analyzing the program and approving the scheduling of a public hearing on the implementation of a mandatory residential curbside recycling program.

3. CONSIDERATION OF LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES NEGOTIATION WITH GOVERNMENT AND LEGISLATURE REGARDING FUTURE STATE AND CITY BUDGETS
   Re: Discussion of League position, and direction to Council delegate to the League of California Cities meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Porterville Deputy City Clerk, (559) 782-7442. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II]
SUBJECT: REFUSE 101

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Field Services Division

COMMENT: As previously requested by City Council, Public Works Department staff have prepared an informational presentation relating to the City’s Refuse Division and the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund.

Following is an outline of the multimedia presentation that has been prepared for Council's review:

1. Refuse 101 - Overview of Solid Waste Fund Programs
2. Fund 31 - Solid Waste 04/05 Fund Budget
3. Professional Service Expenses
4. Refuse Division Operations
   A. Refuse Fleet
   B. Refuse Staff
   C. Current Refuse Costs
   D. Commercial Bin Service
   E. Roll-Off Service
   F. Residential Service
   G. Street Sweeping
   H. Solid Waste Statistics
5. Graffiti Program
   A. Porterville Sheltered Workshop
   B. Graffiti Action Team
   C. Block Captain Network
6. Waste Reduction Programs
   A. California Integrated Waste Management Act
   B. Disposal/Diversion Tonnages
   C. Current Recycling Programs
      1. Recycle Drop-Off Center
      2. Red/White/Blue Drop Boxes
      3. Residential Greenwaste Collection
      4. Commercial Recycling
      5. School Recycling
      6. Special Events
      7. Recycling Market Development Zone
8. Regional Agency Formation
   a. CWMA Outreach Programs
   b. CWMA Education Programs
   c. CWMA Collection Programs
   d. Diversion Rate

D. Diversion Rate Calculation - Base Year
E. Diversion Rate Calculation - Subsequent Years
F. Adjustment Factors

RECOMMENDATION: None. Item is informational only.
SUBJECT: RESIDENTIAL CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAM

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Field Services Division

COMMENT: In the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) submitted by the City of Porterville to the California Integrated Waste Management Board in April 1992, the City identified waste reduction and recycling programs that could be implemented to assist the City in reaching the waste diversion goals mandated in the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB939). A wide variety of programs were listed in the City’s SRRE in order to allow the City flexibility in implementing programs based on several factors, including economic feasibility, sustainability and potential for increased diversion. In order to minimize increased costs to City residents, the City has historically focused on programs with favorable cost/diversion ratios.

One of the residential recycling programs identified in the City’s SRRE is Curbside Recycling. This type of program involves providing an additional refuse container to each residential customer for collection of household recyclable materials (paper, cardboard, plastic, aluminum, and glass). After collection, materials are processed at a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). Throughout the 1990’s, the cost to implement and maintain a curbside recycling program was very high. In addition, due to the type of material captured in a curbside program, the tonnage of material diverted was much lower than other programs. Due to the City’s distance from a MRF, as well as a substantial “per ton” processing fee, the City chose to implement two alternate residential recycling programs: “Red/White/Blue” recycling drop-boxes, and the construction of a Recycling Drop-Off facility. However, staff have continued to regularly analyze the costs involved with a curbside recycling program in order to ensure compliance with all requirements of our SRRE.

In recent years, the cost of implementing a curbside recycling program has dropped significantly, due in part to market changes as well as increased redemption values for recyclable materials. As a result and in response to recent Council interest in this subject, City staff have completed a preliminary study on implementation of a mandatory curbside recycling program. Additionally, the City has been approached by Sunset Waste Paper with a proposal to implement a 90-day curbside pilot recycling program.

Attached as Exhibit A is a staff report on implementation of a mandatory curbside recycling program. Attached as Exhibit B is the pilot program proposal received from Sunset Waste Paper with an accompanying staff report.
OPTIONS: 1. City Council direct staff to complete a detailed program analysis and schedule a public hearing for consideration of implementing a mandatory residential curbside recycling program.

2. City Council direct staff to contract with Sunset Waste Systems for 90-day pilot curbside recycling program.

3. City Council determines current residential recycling programs meet the requirements of AB939 and the needs of City residents and no curbside recycling program is necessary at this time.

RECOMMENDATION: City Council adopt Option 1 as stated above and direct staff to complete a detailed program analysis and schedule a public hearing for consideration of implementing a mandatory residential curbside recycling program.

ATTACHMENTS: Exhibit A - Staff Report on Curbside Recycling Program Implementation
Exhibit B - Proposal from Sunset Waste Paper w/ Staff Report
EXHIBIT A
IMPLEMENTATION OF MANDATORY CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAM

As indicated in the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), residential curbside recycling of household recyclables is the most effective method of achieving high rates of residential participation in recycling programs and was chosen as one of several program alternatives for the City to implement. However, throughout the last decade, the cost of implementing and maintaining a mandatory curbside recycling program was prohibitively high. This was due to several factors including significant capital purchases (vehicles/equipment), additional personnel, transportation costs, and high processing/tipping fees. Had a curbside recycling program been implemented in the early stages of the City's waste reduction program, a significant cost increase would have been passed on to refuse customers. As a result, the City chose to implement less expensive, voluntary residential programs including Recycling Drop-Boxes and the construction of a permanent Recycling Drop-Off Center. These facilities have raised public awareness about recycling opportunities and met the needs of Porterville residents for 10 years.

In the past few years, market conditions for post consumer recyclables has changed significantly. Due to industry improvements and more automated separation methods, Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF) which formerly charged significant processing fees for accepting recyclables have evolved to a point where they now pay for a source separated waste stream. State Mandated Redemption Values for certain recyclables have increased, which also contributes to a reduction in processing costs. In a continuing effort to meet and exceed AB939 diversion goals, City staff frequently analyze the viability of a curbside recycling program. At this point, preliminary analysis indicates a citywide residential curbside program could be implemented at nominal cost to our residents. Attached as Table A-1 is a summary of the revenue/costs involved with implementing such a program.

To be effective, curbside recycling must be a mandatory component of residential refuse service, as greenwaste collection is currently. The proposed curbside program would provide each residence with an additional 60 gallon refuse container for the collection of household recyclables. The additional container would be a different color (blue) to readily identify it as a recycling container. Recyclables would be picked up every week. The program would require an initial capital outlay for the purchase of the additional containers and miscellaneous equipment. To accommodate additional collection routes, existing vehicles would be reassigned and two additional refuse drivers would be required.

As shown in Table A-1, the City has several options to cost effectively implement a curbside recycling program. Several fee levels have been explored, as well as differing lengths of capital payback. Based on this analysis, staff recommends a proposed recycling fee of $2.00 per month, with a capital payback term of 15 years. This will allow the program to be self-supporting, and allow for adequate funds for capital replacement at the end of its useful life.
Although implementation of a mandatory curbside program will require an increase in fee to the customer, due to the variable sizes of refuse cans available, residents who actively recycle can reduce the size of their refuse container to offset the additional cost of recycling.

Although the City of Porterville, as a member of the Consolidated Waste Management Authority (CWMA), has reached the 50% waste diversion goal mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), CIWMB staff clearly indicates that continued program implementation is vital to the continued success of the CWMA and its member cities. Implementation of a curbside recycling program would result in a minimum of 2,300 additional tons of material diverted from the waste stream, and a 1-2% increase in the diversion rate for the entire CWMA. As a Regional Agency, the CIWMB no longer quantifies disposal tonnages and diversion rates separately for the member cities of the CWMA. However, when the CIWMB approved the City’s base year revision in 1997, a 41% diversion rate was established for the City of Porterville. Based on that board approved generation study and using CIWMB supplied adjustment factors, City staff are able to estimate that Porterville’s unofficial individual diversion rate for 2002 would have been 44%. With the additional diversion resulting from implementation of a curbside recycling program, this number would increase to 48%.
TABLE A-1

MANDATORY CITYWIDE CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAM

Considerations: 1. Requires all residents participate in program
2. Requires increase in residential refuse rates
3. Requires capital expenditures and personnel increase
4. Mixed public perception – positive for environment and convenience, negative due to mandatory nature
5. Provides estimated 85% recovery of material – additional 2,275 tons of material diverted annually.

Operation Assumptions: Addition of two FSWII w/benefits. Tonnage based on estimated 20% of residential refuse being recycled. Capital Assumptions: Purchase of 60 gallon containers in a different color at a cost of $46 each and existing vehicle reassignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of customers</th>
<th>Proposed recycling fee</th>
<th>Revenue from Recycling Fee</th>
<th>Monthly Tons Recycled</th>
<th>Revenue from Recyclables @ 18.50/ton</th>
<th>Monthly Vehicle Costs</th>
<th>Monthly Labor Cost</th>
<th>Monthly Capital Cost</th>
<th># Months for Capital Payback</th>
<th>Monthly Cart Replacement</th>
<th>Total Monthly Program Cost</th>
<th>Total Annual Program Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$29,222.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$29,088.14</td>
<td>$349,057.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$21,036.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$29,222.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$18,570.14</td>
<td>$222,841.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$31,554.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$29,222.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$8,052.14</td>
<td>$96,625.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$14,611.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$14,476.81</td>
<td>$173,721.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$21,036.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$14,611.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,958.81</td>
<td>$47,505.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$31,554.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$14,611.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>($6,559.19)</td>
<td>($78,710.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$1,948.18</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,813.65</td>
<td>$21,763.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$21,036.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$1,948.18</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>($8,704.35)</td>
<td>($104,452.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$31,554.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>$4,131.67</td>
<td>$5,485.31</td>
<td>$7,529.83</td>
<td>$1,948.18</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>($19,222.35)</td>
<td>($230,668.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT B
REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FROM SUNSET WASTE PAPER

On April 28, City staff met with representatives of Sunset Waste Paper to discuss Sunset's proposal for a 90-day pilot curbside recycling program. Enclosed as Attachments B-1 through B-7 are the materials received from Sunset and reviewed by staff for this report.

Attachment B-1 summarizes Sunset's proposal for a 90-day, limited pilot recycling program. The pilot would include 300 households in three separate areas of Porterville. Residents would be provided a small blue recycling wastebasket at no additional cost. Materials would be collected weekly, and a monthly report would be provided indicating quantity of material collected and participation rates. A questionnaire would be distributed to participants and results of that questionnaire would be included with a final program report. Participating residents would be allowed to keep the blue wastebaskets as a "thank you" gift at the end of the project.

Attachment B-2, "Diversion Rates/Central Valley" was presented as a compilation of CIWMB Diversion Rates for jurisdictions throughout the San Joaquin Valley. Sunset Waste Paper staff indicated that this information was compiled from the California Integrated Waste Management Board database and indicated that the City of Porterville trails behind other jurisdictions due to Porterville's lack of a curbside recycling program. As the Consolidated Waste Management Authority is a CIWMB recognized Regional Agency, the CIWMB will not calculate individual diversion rates for the cities, nor will they provide individual disposal tonnages. With this in mind, staff attempted to verify the information Sunset provided. Upon further inquiry, Sunset staff indicated Attachment B-2 was not representative of CIWMB Diversion rates and they were unsure who had compiled the information contained therein. To clarify this issue, staff have included Attachment B-2(a) and B-2(b), which have been printed from the CIWMB database. Attachment B-2(a) is the diversion rate summary for the City of Porterville and illustrates that, beginning in 1997, the City of Porterville is a member of a regional agency and no longer achieves an individual diversion rate. Attachment B-2(b) is the diversion rate summary for the Consolidated Waste Management Authority, which list the Authority’s Board Approved diversion rate for 2000 as 50% and for 2001 as 53%, while Attachment B-2 erroneously lists those rates as 49% and 50%, respectively. For comparison purposes only, based on the City’s 1997 generation study and CIWMB approved adjustment methodology, the City’s unofficial estimated diversion rate for 2002 would have been 44%.

Attachment B-3 is a sample of the questionnaire Sunset would administer to the pilot project participants, and Attachments B-4, B-5, B-6, and B-7 are background and public education material regarding recycling.

The goal of a pilot recycling program is to compile participation and waste stream composition data for use in developing a full-scale program. However, this type of data is widely available based on existing programs statewide and within Tulare County. Implementing a small scale program, in select areas, would less accurately predict
participation/public perception than existing data from surrounding jurisdictions. The smaller containers and manual processing of the pilot proposal may adversely affect public perception and acceptance of a full curbside program. In addition, the limited term of the pilot project could have a negative impact. By providing a free service, encouraging a change in participants’ recycling behavior, then eliminating the program after 90 days, participants’ willingness and enthusiasm towards a full curbside program may be affected.
City of Porterville
Curbside Recycling Pilot Program
Proposal

A. General Program Benefits:
1. Increases Environmental Awareness
2. Community Health and Beautification
3. Increased AB 939 compliance
4. Additional 300 tons of monthly diversion.
5. "Good Faith Effort" awarded by the CIWMB.
6. Preservation of natural resources.
7. Disposal cost reduction
8. Collection cost reduction
9. Burden reduction on equipment
10. Eliminates the need for "drop-off programs"

B. Scope of Work:
1. 90 day period
2. 300 customer survey base
   a. Located in 3 neighborhoods, chosen for different affluence.
3. Utilizing a (1) 24 gallon
   a. Newspaper
   b. Junk mail
   c. Magazines
   d. Catalogs
   e. Telephone books
   f. Cardboard
   g. Chipboard
   h. All narrow necked plastic containers
   i. Aluminum cans
   j. Glass containers
   k. Automotive waste oil
   l. Automotive batteries
5. List of acceptable items.
6. Program Reporting
   a. Weekly set out rates
   b. Weekly material generation.
   c. Monthly consolidated report
7. Program Summary
   a. Program questionnaire
   b. Final report
      i. Questionnaire tallies
      ii. Total weight generated
      iii. Average program participation
8. Program Cost
   a. FREE, no cost program.
   b. Residents will retain recycling bins as a gift for participating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tulare County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinuba</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JPA/CWMA TOTAL, estimated</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures based on estimated tonnage; actual diversion rate with CIWMB is 53%.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fresno County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalinga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firebaugh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Board approved alternative diversion requirement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerman</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingsburg</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(New base year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mendota</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange Cove</strong></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parlier</strong></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reedley</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Joaquin</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>N/A(-3%)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Inaccurate base year data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanger</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seima</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>N/A (37%)</td>
<td>N/A (31%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Due to Compliance Order)

**Merced County Solid Waste Regional Agency (All cities, plus unincorporated)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kern County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvin</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California City</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delano</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A (34%)</td>
<td>N/A (34%)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No data due to Compliance Active Status.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridgecrest</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafter</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehachapi</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasco</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern Incorporated</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Integrated Waste Management Board**

**Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary (Results)**

Advisory!: This online database contains some diversion rates calculated with preliminary data and labeled as such. Preliminary data is subject to change during the Board review process or when a jurisdiction submits updated information. Those diversion rates where the status is labeled "Preliminary Data Under Staff Review," "Biennial Review Not Completed Yet, Preliminary Data," "Biennial Review Not Completed Yet, New Base Year," or "Not Subject to Biennial Review, Newly Incorporated" are not official diversion rates and have not been reviewed by the Board.

**Porterville**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Biennial Review Cycle</th>
<th>Diversion Rate %</th>
<th>Biennial Review Status* (click on status to view detailed data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Board Approved Good Faith Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Board Approved Good Faith Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Member of a Regional Agency, see Regional Agency for data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary** | **Biennial Review Status Definitions**

Last updated: Data updated continuously.

Local Government Central: [http://www.ciwm.ca.gov/LGCentral/](http://www.ciwm.ca.gov/LGCentral/)
Larry Stephens: lstephen@ciwm.ca.gov (916) 341-6241
©1995, 2004 California Integrated Waste Management Board. All rights reserved.
Terms of Use/Privacy

ATTACHMENT B-2(a)
**Integrated Waste Management Board**

**Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary (Results)**

Advisory! This online database contains some diversion rates calculated with preliminary data and labeled as such. Preliminary data is subject to change during the Board review process or when a jurisdiction submits updated information. Those diversion rates where the status is labeled "Preliminary Data Under Staff Review," "Biennial Review Not Completed Yet, Preliminary Data," "Biennial Review Not Completed Yet, New Base Year," or "Not Subject to Biennial Review, Newly Incorporated" are not official diversion rates and have not been reviewed by the Board.

**Consolidated Waste Management Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Biennial Review Cycle</th>
<th>Diversion Rate %</th>
<th>Biennial Review Status* (click on status to view detailed data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Regional Agency formation at a later date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Regional Agency formation at a later date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Board Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Board Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Board Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Board Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Biennial Review Not Completed Yet: Preliminary Data Calculate Diversion Rate: Quick Calculation (using default amounts) Worksheet Calculation (ability to change amounts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Biennial Review Not Completed Yet: Preliminary Data Calculate Diversion Rate: Quick Calculation (using default amounts) Worksheet Calculation (ability to change amounts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary | Biennial Review Status Definitions**

Last updated: Data updated continuously.

---
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©1995, 2004 California Integrated Waste Management Board. All rights reserved.
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"Curbside Recycling Questionnaire"

1. Do you like the idea of having a curbside recycling program?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

2. Were the instructions for the program easy to understand and clearly stated?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

3. Did you find the recycling program easy to use?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

4. Were the items to be recycled in the program what you expected?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

5. Were the containers provided for collecting the recyclables adequate in size and easy to use?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

6. Do you prefer to have the recyclables collected the same day as the trash?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

7. Do you prefer to have the green waste collected the same day as the trash?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

8. Would a different collection day then the pick-up day make any difference to your Participating in the program?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

9. Are you in favor of the city having a city-wide curbside recycling program?
   YES
   NO
   Comments:

10. What suggestions or comments do you have about the pilot curbside recycling program?
    YES
    NO
    Comments:
CIWMB 21st Century Policy Project
Future Search Conference

Issue: AB 939 in the New Millennium

Issue Definition and Scope:
AB 939 established the current organization, structure, and mission of CIWMB in 1989. The enactment of AB 939 resulted from an unprecedented political consensus. Driving factors for that consensus included a national crisis in landfill capacity and broad acceptance of the hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, environmentally sound landfilling and transformation) as the desired approach to solid waste management. Since that time landfill capacity has increased. Regional capacity problems exist, but capacity is no longer considered the statewide crisis it once was. Some local decision makers have generated an on-going cost vs. benefit debate relating to the existing hierarchy, as new approaches come to the forefront. AB 939 has achieved significant progress in waste diversion, program implementation, solid waste planning, and protection of public health and safety and the environment from the operation of landfills and solid waste facilities. However, it is also evident that the remaining effort needed to meet and maintain the year 2000 goals of AB 939 could be monumental for some jurisdictions. What new ideas and approaches are necessary to build upon the progress of AB 939?

Background:
AB 939 not only mandated local jurisdictions to meet numerical diversion goals of 25% by 1995 and 50% by 2000, but also established an integrated framework for program implementation, solid waste planning, and solid waste facility and landfill compliance. Other elements included encouraging resource conservation and considering the effects of waste management operations. The diversion goals and program requirements are implemented through a disposal based reporting system by local jurisdictions under CIWMB regulatory oversight. Facility compliance requirements are implemented under a different approach primarily through local government enforcement agencies. While the regulated community has benefited from the Board’s regulatory reform achievements, the regulatory approach for facility compliance generally remains a "command and control" system emphasizing individual facility permits and separation of air, water, and land media

Issue Questions:

- Should the focus of AB 939 change to promoting sustainability?
- Is the hierarchy still responsive to California’s needs? Is something missing from the hierarchy?
- How will we address environmental justice issues related to the siting of waste operations/facilities?
- Are we measuring the right things? Are they comparable and consistent? Should there be a greater emphasis on advocating program implementation versus relying on percent mandates, accounting, and measurement?
- Are there viable alternatives to percent mandates? Should the basis change to methods that better focus on the top of the solid waste hierarchy?


(overscanned)
• Should the AB 939 approach to transformation be changed?
• Given that there is no sunset clause for AB939, what happens after 2000? What should the CIWMB do for jurisdictions that have achieved the 50% goal?
• How do we encourage jurisdictions to divert waste and explore new waste management approaches when some regional landfill capacity is increasing? In response, how can the State provide incentives for beneficial use of landfill gas and technologies such as bioreactors, reclamation, and postclosure land use to better address the long-term impacts of landfills?
• How can AB 939 better reflect the economic pressures faced by state and local government? And what should those decisions be weighed against?
• How can the CIWMB improve partnerships with local government in implementing AB 939?
• How can CIWMB help local jurisdictions achieve the many outcomes in AB 939, such as: market development, buy recycled, public education, and others.
• Should the CIWMB and Cal/EPA shift from the current command and control facility compliance approach to a more integrated multimedia and environmental management system approach? Do such alternate systems, such as ISO 14000, achieve the required level of environmental protection? If so, how can this be accomplished?
• The waste management infrastructure expanded significantly in response to waste management legislation. If there are changes in the law that alter current waste handling practices, how can current infrastructure investments be protected?
• If "closing the loop" promotes sustainability, should Buy Recycled be added to the hierarchy?

Issues From the Future Search Conference

21st Century Home Page

Last updated: November 01, 2000

Tracey Harper: tharper@ciwmb.ca.gov (916) 341-6292
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Five Reasons Why Residents Should Recycle

- **Saves Natural Resources** - By making products from recycled materials instead of virgin materials, we conserve land and reduce the need to drill oil and to dig for minerals.

- **Saves Energy** - It usually takes less energy to make recycled products; recycled aluminum, for example, takes 95% less energy than new aluminum from bauxite ore.

- **Saves Clean Air and Water** - In most cases, making products from recycled materials creates less air pollution and water pollution than making products from virgin materials.

- **Saves Landfill Space** - When the materials that you recycle go into new products, they don’t go into landfills, so landfill space is conserved.

- **Creates Jobs** - The recycling process creates far more jobs than landfills or incinerators, and recycling is the least expensive long-term waste management method for Visalia.
When Will These Things Decompose?

- Eternity
  - STYROFOAM "Clam Shell": eternity

1,000,000 years
- GLASS BOTTLE: unknown

1,000 years
- PLASTIC JUG: 1 million years

500 years
- DISPOSABLE DIAPERS: 500-600 years
- ALUMINUM CAN: 200-500 years

100 years
- TIN CAN: 80-100 years

50 years
- LEATHER SHOE: 40-50 years

10 years
- WOOD: 10-15 years

1 year
- WOOL SOCK: 1 year
- COTTON RAG: 5 months
- PAPER BAG: 1 month
- BANANA PEEL: 3-4 weeks
"An Effort Today... A Reward Tomorrow."

1-800-706-5779

"Un Esfuerzo Ahora... Una Recompensa Mañana"
AT THE CURB • A LA BANQUETA

By 6:00 A.M. on Your Collection Day • El Día de Recoger Por Las 6:00 A.M.

Soda Bottles • Juice Boxes • Milk Containers
Narrow Necked Plastic Bottles
Glass Bottles and Jars • Tin Cans
Aluminum Cans • Aluminum Foil

Botellas de Refresco • Recipientes de Leche
Latas • Botellas y Jarros de Vidrio
Cajitas de Jugo • Botes de Aluminio
Botellas de Plástico Estrechas
Hojuelas de Aluminio

Junk Mail • Paper • Cereal Boxes • Catalogs
Magazines • Telephone Books
Correo Comercial • Papel • Cajas de Cereal
Catálogos • Revistas • Guías Telefónicas

Newspapers
Cardboard
(Functional)
Periodicos
Cartón
(apachurado)

Waste Oil
Aceite de Auto

Battery
Acumulador

Place Next to Bin on Curb
Ponga Boza Contra la Banqueta