

1 [Resolution For 75% Waste Diversion Goal]

2
3 **Resolution adopting a goal of 75% landfill diversion by the year 2010 and a long term**
4 **goal of zero waste, with the date set once the ~~75~~ 50% diversion goal is met, and**
5 **adopting a policy of promoting the highest and best use of discarded materials and**
6 **only allowing the use of alternative daily cover to be counted as credit toward meeting**
7 **the diversion goals if there are no higher and better uses available, and urging the**
8 **State of California to adopt similar goals.**

9
10 WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 ("Act") requires
11 cities and counties to reduce, reuse and recycle (including composting) solid waste generated
12 in the state to the maximum extent feasible before incineration or landfill disposal of waste to
13 conserve water, energy and other natural resources, and to protect the environment; and,

14 WHEREAS, the California Integrated Waste Management Board's 2001 Strategic Plan
15 has a goal of a "zero-waste," but the Act mandates only that California cities and counties
16 divert 50% from landfills and does not set any subsequent waste reduction goals; and,

17 WHEREAS, the landfill diversion rate increased statewide from 10% to 42% between
18 1989 and 2000, while the amount of waste dumped in landfills only decreased by 13% during
19 that period; and San Francisco's diversion rate increased from 35% to 46% between 1990
20 and 2000 (and is expected to exceed 50% diversion by 2003), while the tonnage from San
21 Francisco disposed in landfills actually increased by over 30%; and,

22 WHEREAS, for every ton of municipal waste landfilled, 71 tons of manufacturing and
23 production waste are disposed of in other ways; and,

1 WHEREAS, disposing of waste in landfills or incinerators endangers public health and
2 the environment by polluting the land, water and air with methane and other greenhouse
3 gases, toxic metals, dioxins, acid gases and toxic ash residue; and,

4 WHEREAS, landfill and incinerator disposal fees do not reflect true costs, because
5 taxpayers pay billions of dollars in tax subsidies for virgin resource material extraction and
6 processing, as well as bear the costs of the subsequent environmental and public health
7 damage; and

8 WHEREAS, waste reduction, reuse and recycling conserve natural resources, reduce
9 pollution and are cheaper than disposal when all costs are considered and create more jobs in
10 local communities; and,

11 WHEREAS, to maximize waste reduction, reuse and recycling, product manufacturers
12 must share responsibility for their product and packaging waste and participate in redesign of
13 the product lifecycle process to ensure that all material can be safely recycled; and,

14 WHEREAS, Alameda County has set a goal of achieving a 75% waste diversion rate
15 by 2010, and several jurisdictions have adopted zero waste as a long term goal, including
16 Santa Cruz and Del Norte Counties in California; Seattle, Washington; Toronto, Canada;
17 Canberra, Australia; New South Wales, Australia and 45% of New Zealand's local
18 governments; and,

19 WHEREAS, under the Waste Disposal Agreement for San Francisco's waste at the
20 Altamont landfill, approximately 7 million tons capacity remained as of January 1, 2001, which
21 is less than 10 years capacity at 2000 disposal levels, and a new landfill contract could
22 significantly increase San Francisco disposal costs; and,

23 WHEREAS, a variety of businesses have adopted zero waste goals or have reduced
24 landfilled waste by more than 80%, with some over 90%, including Amdahl Corporation,
25 Collins & Aikman, Fetzer Winery, Herman Miller Inc., Hewlett Packard, Mad River Brewing,

1 Interface, Inc., Pillsbury, Xerox Corp., San Diego Wild Animal Park, and in San Francisco,
2 restaurants including Jardiniere, Lulu and Scoma's; and,

3 WHEREAS, a zero waste goal can act as a guiding principle to eliminate waste and
4 pollution in resource and materials management by promoting: redesign of manufacture, use,
5 and recycling of materials, extended producer responsibility, valuing the highest and best use
6 of materials, and creating a whole system closed loop material cycling based economy for
7 long term true sustainability; and,

8 WHEREAS, on April 16, 2002, the San Francisco Commission on the Environment
9 adopted a Resolution urging, among other things, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors of
10 the City and County of San Francisco to adopt a goal of 75% landfill diversion by the year
11 2010 and a goal of zero waste by 2020; and,

12 WHEREAS, AB 1647 (1996) allows communities unlimited diversion or recycling credit
13 for covering landfills (called "alternative daily cover" or ADC) with landscape trimmings
14 ("green") material or other "beneficial reuses" at landfills; and,

15 WHEREAS, giving communities diversion credit for putting green material in landfills
16 has contributed to the quadrupling of ADC use at some landfills, with as much as 45% of the
17 material in the landfill now being ADC; and,

18 WHEREAS, the use of ADC in the state has increased from 394,000 tons in 1995 to
19 over 1.7 million tons in 2000, with an additional 2.5 million tons in 2000 used for landfill
20 construction and erosion control; and,

21 WHEREAS, using green material as compost or landscaping mulch is more beneficial
22 than putting it in a landfill, the demand for compost and mulch continues to exceed the supply
23 available, there is excess capacity at composting facilities and there are alternative materials
24 available to cover landfills; and therefore, be it
25

1 RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors adopts a goal for San Francisco of 75%
2 landfill diversion by the year 2010, and a long term goal of zero waste, with the date set once
3 the ~~75~~ 50% diversion goal is met, and will establish a timeline to achieve a goal of zero waste
4 once the ~~75~~ 50% diversion goal is met; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors urges the state legislature to
6 adopt a zero waste goal with an interim goal of 75% by the year 2010; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors adopts a policy of promoting the
8 highest and best use of discarded materials and only allowing the use of alternative daily
9 cover to be counted as credit toward meeting the diversion goals if there are no higher and
10 better uses available, and urges the state to adopt similar policies.



"Harris, Jennine"
<JHarris@CIWMB.ca.gov>

To: "jack.macy@sfgov.org" <jack.macy@sfgov.org>
cc:
Subject: Resolution on 75% Diversion Rate and Zero Waste

09/19/02 11:51 AM

TO: San Francisco City and County, Health and Human Services Committee
FM: Jose Medina, Vice-Chairman, California Integrated Waste Management Board

On behalf of California Integrated Waste Management Board, I would like to thank the Health and Human Services Committee for your invitation to attend the Health and Human Services Committee Meeting today. Unfortunately,

due to prior commitments I am unable to attend today's meeting. However, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Supervisors and the Health and Human Services

Committee for their ongoing commitment to waste diversion in California. Furthermore, I applaud your efforts to increase your diversion goal to 75% by 2010, and implement zero waste thereafter.

It is always encouraging to see local jurisdictions increase the waste diversion goals set by the State. The Waste Board's overall directive is to reduce waste, promote the management of materials for their highest and best use, and protect public health, safety and the environment, while overseeing California landfills.

I am proud to say that by setting the goal of 75% and zero waste respectively, my home City and County of San Francisco have once again, set the example for your colleagues throughout the state. In addition, such actions contribute to the Waste Board's ongoing effort to promote zero waste and sustainability in California. Since the inception of San Francisco's Source Reduction and Recycling Element, the Waste Board has seen San Francisco initiate, implement, then modify and streamline its programs in order to reach the 50% goal set by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB939).

Model programs such as the Fantastic 3, the food scrap collection and co-mingled recycling program that services 26,000 households, as well as the organics collection program serving over 500 businesses are impressive and will

help to encourage other jurisdictions in California. At the forefront of all Waste

Board policy decisions is the belief

that we are stewards of the environment and protectors of our natural resources. In this capacity, the Board's 2001 Strategic Plan includes the promotion of zero waste - as we continue to utilize our natural resources in the most

efficient way possible.

I encourage you to continue in your efforts to implement your vision of zero waste for the County and City of San Francisco and the State of California. As you know, diversion is only one component of a successful state-wide recycling program, therefore I would also like to encourage you to continue to develop markets for those materials diverted from California's landfills, and I encourage you to buy recycled whenever possible.

I would also like to extend my thanks to San Francisco's Board of Supervisors, NorCal Waste Systems, the City's Refuse Collection and Disposal Rate Board, and the Health and Human Services committee for their commitment to waste diversion and zero waste in California. In appreciation and support of your increased diversion goals, and long-term goals of zero waste, I commend the City and County of San Francisco and your dedicated staff for

San Francisco's never-ending commitment to the environment and the vision of a sustainable California. Thank you!