Commercial Sector Diversion Estimates

						1		
	,	terra pur Product	h		, because to gar			
form Disposed (Beuros Tabe Townsque Dals)	Percent Directed Iron System	Terr Drei bed	1	1 scarkUlvested from Sester	Toru Chrystad	Southe Toronto	Latel York Clearted	Backling Chipted Townspo
Valuates Fernandor Combinado	1 325	1 20	7 HS 2,943		1 :	276	4,560 2,61*	1,911 2,945
Page Rags	384			8.07		1 7		ref.
N Profit	**:	1 1	763	1146		222	224	322
- Lab Labor Prove Color Office Prove	100	15	34:1 600	8.5.A	•		27.1 22.0	24.5
Magaztima and Catalogs	5.4	14	n	B.G.A.		115	134	43
Phone Sealed and Directories	ensi	1 7	10		1 7	10		3
Color Marrianouse Paper	8000	1 4	134	. 0.	•	836		136
Remarks Topicals Paper	0.0%	9	7F1	1,23	<u> </u>	1.7	1,840	
Com Ch. o Letter and Contracts	1 10.	7	_ <u></u>	076	1 :	1	120	1
Gryan Chrys Botton and Carboners	500			100		=	22	5"
In: a Gas liste or. Determin	200%			9.0		•1	**	e s
Cuber Cles. Calcook Sector and Cardanana Flat Cless	6.00	:	"	657) 64°	1 2	1,	2	11
RemanderCong., -a Drum	1 66		.195		,	•		
Metale		,	1,810		-	1,000	960	1,000
Troited t wa	1 46.7	•	231	650	•	'''	140	'-1
May Appleaus. Good Lef Flore	1 ::	1 1	*	9-00-1 0-300	1 9	•	- 1	4
Ober Persec	1 724	1 2	559	:6.	1 2		-1	
Bernatus Cata	377%	1	34	88.		31	31	31
Other Han-Perrous	1 600		**	au ∷.	•	∮ ≈		31 192 134
Remember Companie Mital	14	- 9	134	(26)		434	577	131
Dr. 13 "marks			30 21		1 :	1	17	- 7
Cover avelet flations	100-		d	منه	1		1 4	7
Other Enail Concerner Stockens.4		9	11	EL		11	1 1	
1.92	- 5-2	- 3	3,846	<u>ant</u>		3.84	230	3,84
110,921	9.7	1 1	186	0.00	1 7	1 1	187	3.M0
FICPE CONTROL	1785	,	135	0 0073		136		130
Magaritan gos, y Pincy in Carelana ana	0.00	1	182	6.73	•	***		182
Plants Trech Engs Plants Gor., sy and Other Merchandes Bags	10M		49	4.000 f <2	1 3	.		4.0 04
Non-Box Communical and burnshall Participant Fire	24	1	-77	0	1 :			
File Products	00			400			•	-
Other Flui	447	•	-	****	9	997	~	-
Cursile Pie Ce Kerne Rum - nier Compussio Pig g			1,300	1 3L/2	1 2	919 1,30p	7 90 7 pt	91 <i>0</i> 1,202
Other Organic			(6,136	-		9.1	2487	135
David .	000		7140	840		7.46	1,340	7 "43
Le c es and Come Produge and Tennesign	100	•	11.0	•••	•	1,313	' 1	1.30
Province and Desire	A SOC	1	2.15*	8.b		2,107	30 ·	2.107
Bresches and Plantys Manures	1 32	1		20	1 7	1 7	1 7	''''
Texties	8.000	•	147	0.007		367	, ai	11.7
ape .	,900	9	1,000	9,007 0,00	1 1	- 648	1 t2 196	24.4
Astronomy can Organian			144	0.00	1,73	3,010	1/0	1,610
Concrete	0 2	1 7	204	20.	7.7	297	14	297
Arphati Panag	0-24	4		724.47	•		. •	4
Auchall Realing	100	9	1.5	2.45	309	7. 1	4-	- 4
Lumber Oppure Starel	0.00%	2	L=4	231X	2105	\ <u></u>	8,224 866	***
Rock, Bell and Room		1	937	210	301		-	-
Opp ners 8 med Rook, Spi ord Room Roombrid of Companies Investigand <u>nigra</u> books	9%		2,760	32,00%	981	-,000	1,000	2 725
	3		149		1	W	14	149
Paul Vahrda & Essignant Puids Sand 1	10.4	: 1	143	8.00-7	1 :	14	**	147
Ume')	***	1				1 3	. 1	
Close) Paramon			4	8.0"		1 3	1 4	1
Server : Accessore tentante um natura	935			0.00%		1		
Special Worte	F 78	1 3	VIII Al	:ه	! !	LI7	217	1,673
Trigoped Marked Carin	9,000	1	- 7	د د		1 7	. 1	- 4
Mail Name	641	•	1,000	6.00%	1	1,830	191	1.530
T	*25	9	120	0.00%	•	125	14	576
Remode,	- 005	<u></u>	- 2	90.	ļ <u>1</u>	- 1	- 3	- 7
Mary Ranks	767	1 1	3	.40.	1 7	1 ;	. 3	1
TOTAL	625	234	43,915	21"	3,711	41.79	31.765	12,251

APPENDIX D GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS

Single-Family Residential - Short Term Programs - GHG Estimates

5HG Britiscons from Baseline Wasta Managemani (MTCE).

(1,091)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(1,801)

	Tons	Tons	Tons		
Commodity	Fineyaled	Landfilled	Combusted	Tons Composted	Total MTCE
Aluminum Cens		0,08		NA.	
Steel Cana	-	261.0		NA.	
Glaso		0,800		, NA	
HOPE		144.0		N':	
PET .		235.0	•	NA NA	
Corrupated Containers		600,0		N'A	(11
Agazines-bird-class mail		339.0	•	N.	(6)
Newspaper		812.0		NA.	(27
Office Peper		406.0		K/	
Pronebooks		32.0		ry.	(1:
Omensional Lumber		2,200.0	-	NA.	(640
Food Boraps	NA.	6,837.0	-	-	690
Yand Trinerings	NA.	645.0			(8)
Grees	NA	1,094.5			4
Leeves	NA.	1,024.5		-	(200
Branches	NA.	1,0			(
Mound Paper (crimely resident	-	3,002.0		NA.	(55
Atxed Metals	-	718.0		NA.	
Mond Paulics	-	2,421.0		NA.	26
Mixed Organics	NA.	2,951,0		•	3-
Mixed MSW	NA.	0.000	-	NA.	16
Carpet	-	380.0		N)	
Personal Computers	-	104,0		NA.	
Concrete	-	1,809,0	. NA	NA.	16
Fly Auh	-	5.0	NA.	NA.	
Tres		5.0		NA NA	
sphelt Shingles		67.0		N.	
Dryw all		92.0	NA.	K,	
					-

Note: a negative value (i.e., a value in parenth as a) indicates an emission reduction; a positivo
value indiculas an emission increase.

	~					(1,001)	
Commodity	Tons Source Reduced	Tons Recycled	Tons Landillod	Tans Comisusta∉	Tons Composted	Total NITCE	Change (Ait - Base) MTCE
Aluminum Onne		7.0	62.0		NA.	(16)	(17)
Steel Orns		23.0	228.0	-	N:	(10)	(13)
Glace		61.0	647.0		NA NA	1	(5)
HDRE		14.0	130.0	-	NA.	(2)	(3)
PET		23.0	212.0	-	NA.	(5)	10
Corrugated Conteiners	-	67.0	639.0	-	NA.	(148)	(37)
Magazines/hird-class mul		37.0	302.0		NA.	(91)	(24)
New spaper		81.D	731.0		NA.	(309)	(34)
Office Paper		41.0	365.0	•	HA.	(32)	(35)
Phonobooks	-	4.0	28.0		- NA	(12)	(2)
Dimenologal Lumber		-	2,200,0		Nº:	(648)	(2)
Food Scraps	-	NA.	6,153.0		6840	584	(106)
Yard Trimmings	-	NA.	861.0		94.0	(77)	3
Graso		R/	\$85,0		109.5	33	(10)
Learing	-	NA.	985.0		109.5	(186)	11
Brarohes		NA.	0.9		9.1	m	0
Mixed Paper (primarily resident	NA.	3120	2,090,0		NA.	(803)	(241)
Mxed Motels	NA.	72.0	£ 16.0	-	NA.	(71)	(79)
Mand Pleatos	NA.	242.0	2,179,0	-	NA NA	(42)	(67)
Mixed Organics	NA.	NA :	2,555,0	-	208.0	14	(19)
Mixed NSYV	NA.	NA	0.68G	-	N/	16	7.0
Curpet	-	36.0	324.0		NA.	(20)	(24)
Personal Chrisputers	-	10.0	94.0	-	NA.	(5)	(7)
Concrete	NA.	-	1,800.0	NA.	NA.	19	
Ry Ash	NA.	1.0	4.0	NA.	NA.	(0)	(0)
Tires			5.0		NA.	ō	0
Asphall Skingles			67.0	-	NA.	1	0
Dryw all			92,0	NA.	NA.	3	0
						o	0
							0
						0	0
						0	•
						0	0
						0	0
						0	0
						0	0
						0	
						0	
						0	0
						Ö	0
						o	0
							0
							0
							0
						o	- 0
						<u>_</u>	- 6

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(710)

Single-Family Residential - Medium Term Programs – GHG Estimates

CHG Emissions from Baseline Waste Managamam (MTCA)

(1,040)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Managament Scenario (MTCE):

(2,758)

Commedity	Tons Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Tons Combusted	Tens Composted	Total MTCE
Aluminum Cent		62.0		NA.	
Sieel Cana		225.0	-	N-	
Glass	-	547.0		NA	
HOPE	-	130.0		84	
ÆT	-	211.0		NA.	
Corrugated Containers		510.0		N".	(10
Magazine Third-class mail	-	302.0	-	NA.	(8
New ne per		731.0		NA.	[24
Office Paper	-	365.0		NA	
Prone hooks	-	29.0	•	NA.	
Dimensional Lumber		2,200.0		NA.	(64
Food Scraps	NA.	6,153.0			62
Yard Trimmings	NA.	850,0		-	
Grass	N:	985.0			
AAV83	NA.	935.0			(10
Branches.	N:	1.0			
Acced Paper (primarily resident	-	2,691,0	-	NA.	(50
Mixed Motals	-	645.0	-	N	
Mond Pastics		2178.0	-	NA.	
Mixed Organics	H:	2,664.0	-		
Mixed MSV!	NA.	968 0	-	W	
Csrpet		32:0		M:	
Personal Computers		93.0	-	NA.	
Conorete	•	1,609.0	NA.	NA NA	
Ay Ash		5.0	NA.	NA.	
Tires		4.0	-	N'i	
Asphalt Shingles		57.0		NA NA	
Drywal		92.0	NA.	N'.	
			i		
			——	<u> </u>	
			<u> </u>		
			 		
			 		
			 	.	
			 	·	i .
				 	l
				 	
		ļ	ļ	 	

Note: a regultico value (i.e., a value in perentheser) industas en emission reduction; a positivo
. s'ue indicates an omitrion incresse.

Commodity	Tons Source Reduced	Tons Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Tota Combusted	Tons Composted	Total MTCE	Change (Alt - Base) MYCE
Aluminum Cans		9.0	53.0		N.	(21)	(22
Shed Care		11.0	214.0		HA	(3)	(6
Gast		P5.0	482.0		N*.	ő	(6
HOPE		0.0	124.0	-	NA.	(0)	[1
PET	-	31.0	182.0		N'.	m	(10
Corrupated Containers		74.0	438.0		NA.	(148)	(48
Magazinavin'id-class mail		15.0	257.0		Ni	(73)	(10
New apaper		37.0	594.0		NA.	(203)	(10
Office Paper		18.0	347.0	-	NA.	(E)	(1)
Phonebooks		1.0	28,0		NA.	(10)	- (0
Dimonsional Lumber	- -	1.156.0	1,045.0	-	NA.	(1,081)	(435
Food Scrape		N.	2630.0		3,523.0	75	(645
Yard Trimenings		N*	727.0		123.0	(68)	1
Grass	:	NA.	842.0		1/3.0	25	(13
Leoves		NA NA	842.0		143.0	(103)	19
Brasches	- :	- NA	1.0	-	1	(0)	-
Micad Paper (primorily resident		0.000	2,022.0	<u>-</u>	NA.	(1,021)	(517
Mixed Metals	NA.	33 1	815.0		NA NA	(29)	(36
Airod Plastics	N:	137.0	2041.0		NA NA	(16)	(38
Mixed Organitys	NA NA	NA.	2531.0		133.0	22	(9
Name Crigations Named MSW	. NA	NA.	980.0		NA NA	16	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		15,0	308.0		NA NA	(T)	()1
Carpet	<u>-</u>	6.0	88.0	<u>-</u>	NA.	(2)	(3
Personal Computers	- NA	91.0	1,716.0	N\	No.	18	1
Concrete	No.	•	5.0	NA.	N:	0	<u> </u>
Fly Ash		-	40		N'.	0	
Tires		3.0	64.0	-	NA.	- i	1
Asahet Shingles		5.0	57.9	NA.	N.	3	100
Drywel		<u>a.u</u>	07.50	- 100		- 3	
		-	 			- ŏ	
						ŏ	-
			ļ				
							
							l
				<u></u>	-	0	i
			ļ			0	
						0	
		.	Ļ .			0	<u> </u>
	<u></u>	<u> </u>			ļ	0	<u> </u>
		ļ	ļ	ļ	 	0	9
		L			 	c	
						C	
					ļ	c	
							·
			I			<u> </u>	
					L		—
		t				Ó	

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(1,718)

Multi-Family Residential - Short Term Programs - GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Basetine Wasta Management (MTCE):

290)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(743)

Appendix D

	Tons	Tons Landfillad	Tons	Tons Composted	Total MTCE
Commodity	Recycled				
Aluminum Cons		6.0		NA.	
Steel Cans		54.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
Sings		181.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
OPE	-	57.0		, NA	
ध		0.08		NA.	
Corrugated Containers		250.0	<u> </u>	NA.	(4)
Vegazines/third-oless meil	-	64,0		NA.	(1
New apaper	-	170.0	<u>-</u>	NA.	(5
Office Paper		180.0		NA.	
Phonebooks		1.0	<u> </u>	NA.	(
Dimonelonol Lumber		C94.0		NA.	(20
Food Scraps	NA.	1,205.0	-	-	12
Yard Trimminga	N.	6.0	-		
Grass	N's	41.5			
eques	NA	41.5		• .	
Vibord Paper (primarity resident		577.0		N,	[10
Mixed Metals		127.0	-	K/	
Aced Plosfics	•	274.0		NA NA	
Meted Organics	NA.	596.0	•		
Moded MSW	P±1	81.0		NA.	
Cerpet		346.0		NA.	
Personal Computers	-	20	-	NA.	
Concrete		297.0	N's	N's	
Fly Ash	-	7.0	NA.	NA.	
•					
	,				
			1		
				i	
			l	l	
				1	
			1		
					
				.	

Note: a negative value fi.e., a value in parentheses) indicates an emission induction; a positive
veius indicates un amission increase

	·		,				
Commodity	Tons Source Faduced	Tons Recycled	Tona Landfilled	Tons Combinated	Tons Composted	Total NTCE	Change (Alt-Bus) MTCE
Aluminum Cens	1 sauces	20	4.0	-	NA NA	(6)	
Steal Cans	—— <u>:</u>	18.0	35.0		NA.	(8)	(5)
Gios		52.0	107.0		NA NA	(3)	
			38.0				(4)
HDRE PET		19.0 19.0	41.0		N- NA	(.)	(6)
Corrugated Containers		0.18	100.0	-		(5)	(\$3)
	- :	21,0	42.0		NA NA		(13)
Magazhes/third-chos mai		55.0	115.0		NA NA	(25)	(23)
He-v spaper Office Paper		59.0	121.0		N\	(61)	(47)
Phone books		- 33.0	1,0				
Prione scotte	•	90,0	625.0		Nº.	(0)	(28)
	•	NA.	1,086 0			(230)	
Food Sorape	-	NA NA	1,066 0		121.0	103	(19)
Yard Trimmings Gnass	-	NA NA	37.6		40	(0)	(0)
		NA NA	37.5		4.0		1
Leaves Mixed Paper (primarily resident	NA.	189.0	368.0	-		(7)	(1:59)
		169.0 41.0	388.0 88.0	•	NA.	(264)	
Microd Metals	NA.				NA NA	(44)	(46)
Mond Paratics	NA.	88.0	188.0	-	NA.	(22)	(24)
Mixed Organics	NA.	NA.	626.0		70.0	3	(5)
Mxed MSW	HA.	N:	61.0		NA.	1	0
Carpol	-	35.0	311.0		NA NA	(19)	(23)
Personal Computers	- :	1.0	1.0		NA.	(1)	(1)
Concrete	NA.	30.0	287.0	N's	NA NA	3	(0)
Fly Ash	NA.	1.0	6.0	NA.	N's	(0)	(0)
		ļ					- 0
						Ö	٥
						0	
						. 0	
						0	
						0	٥
			ļ			0	
						0	0
			<u> </u>			0	
			<u> </u>			0	0
			ļ			0	
	l	<u> </u>	L			0	0
						•	0
						0	0
						0	- 0
			ļ			٥	
	L					0	
		l	l			0	
			1			٥	- 0
						c	- 0
			 			C	
						С	0

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(454)

3

Multi-Family Residential - Medium Term Programs - GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Sassline Waste Management (MTCE):

(211)

GHG Emissions from Altornative Waste Management Scanario (MTCE)

(226)

Appendix D

F	Tona Recycled	Torra Landfilled	Tone	Tons Composted	Total HTCE
Commodity				NA NA	TOMINIOE
Aluminten Cent	-	4.0	<u> </u>		
Sinel Cans	-	37.0		NA.	
Glase		109.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
HOPE	•	29.0	·	NA NA	
PET		40.0		N'.	
Corregated Containers		100.0	<u> </u>	NA NA	(3
Nagezine : dird-class mel		43.0	<u> </u>	N:	
New spaper		115.0	<u> </u>	NA.	(3
Office Paper	•	121.0	<u> </u>	N/	
Dintensional Lumber		825.0	·	NA.	(18
Food Scraps	NA	1,086.0	· .	-	11
Yard Triamings	NA.	4.0	<u> </u>		
Grapa	Mì	37.5			
Leaves	NA	37.5			
Nixed Poper (pringely recident	-	387.0		NA	C C
Mixed Notale	-	0.08	•	NA NA	
Mored Pleasing		183.0		N1	l
Nixed Organice	N;	827.0		-	
Mixed MSW	NA.	0.10		H's	
Corpet		311,0		NA.	
Personal Computers		1.0		KΛ	
Concrete		268,0	NA.	NA.	
Fly Auh		8.0	N:	NA.	
.,,					
			<u> </u>		
			ļ		
			<u> </u>		

Note: a negative value f, e,, a value in parentheses) indicates an entire indicates an entire or increase.

	Tons Bource Faduced	Tona Recycled	Tone Landfilled	Tons Combasted	Tons Composted	Total MYCE	Change (Alt-Esse) MTC
Commodity Aluminum Cuns	-		4.0		NA NA	1 PORT MI TOE	Date-Esse) m 10
			37.0		NA NA	ő	
Steel Cons_	-		100.0		NA NA	- 0	
ikas .	├	9,0	39.0		NA NA	0	
DPE	<u> </u>	4.0	30.0		NA NA	(1)	
ET amugated Containers		17.0	152.0		NA NA	(63)	(1
			43.0	<u> </u>	NA NA	(9)	
k.; szines/third-class mei	•		115.0		NA NA	(96)	
kurpape:		<u> </u>					
Office Paper			121.0	-	NA.	2	
imonational Lumbor	<u> </u>		825.0	<u>_</u>	NA.	(184)	
ood Screps		NA.	1,055.0	<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	110	
'erd Trimmings		RA.	4.0			(0)	
inst	-	K.	33.5		4.0	1	
pevos	<u>-</u>	, . K:	93.5	· -	4.0	(6)	
fixed Paper (primarily resident	NA NA		397.0		NA NA	[72]	
forced Motaria	NA		E9.0	-	NA NA	1	
txed Flastics	NA	5.0	178.0	<u> </u>	N)	1	
fixed Organics	NA.	HA.	627.5	· ·		7	
Axed MSV?	NA NA	NA.	61.0		N.	1	
arpel	- 1		311.0		NA.	3	
ersonal Computers		<u> </u>	1.0		N.S.		
Concrete	NA NA		2530	NA	NA NA	3	
ly Ash	NA.	<u> </u>	8.8	NA	NA.	0	
						0	
						D	
						0	
						C	
						С	
						C	
						0	
						C	
						C	
						ε	
	i	-				c	
						c	
					1	0	
						0	
					ji	0	
						0	
					 	0	
						- 8	
)
			-		 	0	
					L		
					l		

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(14)

Commercial - Short Term Programs - GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Baseline Waste Management (MTCE):

(4,134)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(9,571)

Appendix D

commodity	Tone Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Tone Combusted	Tons Composied	Total MTCE
Juninum Cans	1 - 1	59.0		NA.	
teel Cans		372.0	-	NA NA	
Zaşıı	 	708.0		NA.	
OPE .	1	225.0	-	NA.	
ET	1 - 1	293.0		NΛ	
Corrugated Containers		4,610.0		K)	(60
Ingestras Trird-class mail	 	330.0		NA.	(3
low speper	1 : 1	547.0		NA.	(18
Office Paper	· ·	1,420,0	!	N3	2
tronebooks		24.0	 	NA.	
Impresional Lumber		9,719,0		NA.	(2,65
ood Scraps	NA.	0,027,0		- "	01
and Triannings	NA.	2,490,0	 		(21
ress	NA.	730.5	 -	-	2
AFVES	NA.	738.5			(12
franches	NA I	435.0			(12
Axed Paper (gaperal)	1 -	5,103.0	-	NA.	(90
Sked Nebris	 	2.128.0	 	NA.	- 2
Axed Pastes	+ 1	5,688.0		NA NA	
Axed Organios	NA.	2,442.0	<u> </u>		
Axed MSY/	N.	2.0	 	R.	
Derpet	1	2950.0	 	N's	
Pers. enal Computers	 	62.0	-	NA NA	
and was computer a	 	4.471.0	NA.	HA.	
	+	91.0	NA NA	NA.	
Ty Ash Trus	+	142.0		N:	
	-	1,372.0		NA.	
sphali Shingles	-		<u> </u>		
hywall		1,031,0	K)	1/8	
	_		<u> </u>		
			<u> </u>		
					
·	ļ				
	1				
~					
	1				

Note: a negative value (i.e., a value in perentheses) indicates on a nission reduction; a positive
value indicates an emission increase.

Commodity	Tons Source Reduced	Tons Recycled	Tons Lendfilled	Tons Combated	Tons Composted	Total MTCE	Change (Alt - Base) MTCE
Commodity Alamaum Cans		21.0	38.0	-	NA.	(51)	(51)
Steel Care		136.0	238.0		NA.	(84)	(88)
Gass		258.0	448.0		NA.	(15)	(22)
HDPE	+	B3.0	145.0		NA.		
PET	! : :	107.0	:88.0	- :	NA.	(15)	(20)
Corrugated Contriners			2,800.0			(30)	(35)
Corregated Contrariers		1,810.0			NA NA	(1.914)	(1,060)
Megazines/Inird-class mail Ma:r speper		120,0 200,0	210.0 347.0		N's	(142)	(77)
Office Pluer					NA.	(269)	(84)
	-	522.0	905.0		N'i	(390)	(416)
Phonebooks	<u> </u>	9.0	15.0		NA NA	(12)	(3)
Dhanelonal Laurber		872.0	8,747.0		NA.	(3,220)	(300)
Food Scraps		NA	8,124.0		903.0	771	(140)
Yerd Trimmings	·	NA.	2,241.0	<u> </u>	240.0	(204)	- 8
Grace	<u> </u>	N:	853 0		73.5	22	(7)
Leeves		N's	663,0		73,5	(120)	10
Brenches		N1	391.0		44.0	(117)	11
Mixed Paper (general) Mixed Metals	NA.	1,663.0	3,240.0		NA.	(2.362)	(1,457)
Miced Metals	HA	777.0	1,351.0		N	(828)	(850)
Mixed Piratics Mixed Organics	NA.	2,079.0	3,609.0	_	NA NA	(518)	(579)
Miced Organics	K.	N-	2,196.0	•	244.0	12	(16)
Mbced 1/3W	N1	NA.	2.0	-	NA NA	0	0
Carpet		295.0	2,655.0		NA.	(162)	(194)
Personal Correctors		23.0	39.0	-	NA.	(14)	(15)
Concrete	NA.	447.0	4,024.0	NA.	N×	42	(0)
Fly Ash	NA.	9.0	82.0	N)	NA.	(1)	(2)
Tires		14.0	` 128.C	_	N:	(0)	(2)
Asphak Shippies	1 .	137,0	1,235 0		NA.	10	(5)
Dryweli	T .	103.0	928.0	NA.	N-	33	(3)
	1						0
							1 3
						ő	1 0
	+					- 0	
							0
							0
	-		-				0
					l		
						0	0
	-					0	۰
						0	0
						0	0
	<u> </u>					0	
						0	D
						0	
						0	
						0	0

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(5,437)

Commercial - Medium Term Programs – GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Baseline Wasta Management (MYCE):

(3,216)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(3,803)

Appendix D

Commodity	Tons Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Combusted	Tona Composted	Total MTCE
Aluminum Cans		37.0		Nona Composited	1000 10102
Alumnuni Cans Stael Cans	•	236.0		NA NA	
	-	44414	- :	NA NA	
Glass	<u> </u>	(16.0			
HOPE	1 -	145.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
ret .		186.0	-	NA NA	
Corrugated Containers		2,800.0		NA.	(34)
Magazinas/third-oless mail	-	209.0	-	NA.	(42
Newspaper	-	347,0	<u> </u>	NA.	
Office Paper	 	908.0	-	NA NA	10
Phonehooks	 	15.0		NA NA	
Dimensional Lumber		8,747.0	<u> </u>	NA.	(2,53)
Food Scraps	NA.	8,124.0	-	•	820
Yard Trimmings	NA.	2,241.0		-	(19
Grass	NA I	502.5		-	24
Larvec	N'	562.5		-	(12
Braches	NA.	802.0		•	(11)
Mxsd Paper (genoral)		3,230.0		NA NA	(578
Mixed Metris	<u> </u>	1,352.0	-	NA.	14
Mxed Plastics		3,612.0		K١	36
Mxed Organics	R/A	2,197.0	•	-	=1
Mixed MSV.	NA.	20	-	W	
Carpet	- 1	2,685.0	-	· NA	20
Personal Computers	1 .	40.0	-	NA.	. 0
Concreto	-	. 023.0	NA.	Ni	4
Fly Ash	-	82.0	NA.	N7	1
Tires		128.0	-	NA.	
Ashhall Shingles		1,235.0	-	N3	13
Dryw oli	-	927.0	NA.	NA.	3
	 				
	 				
	tt				
	 		-		
	 				
	 				
	 				
	-				
					
	L				

Note: a negative value (.e., a value in parentheses) indicates an emir sion reduction; a positive
THURS, A DESIGNA ANDS . D., & ABOR IN PRESENTABORD AND CORDS OF PROSTORS
valu.) indicatos eo emission increase.

	Tons Source	Tona	L	Tons	l		Change
Commedity	Reduced	Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Combusted	Tone Composted	Total MTCE	(Alt-Base) MTCE
Atuminum Cans		6.0	31.0	•	NA.	(14)	(15)
Stool Cene		6.0	Z310		NA.	(0)	(9)
Gass	<u> </u>	54.0	394.0		MA.	0	(5)
HOPE	-	10.0	135.0		NA.	(1)	(Z)
PET		30.0	155,0		N\	<u>(</u> ව	(8)
Corrugated Containare		457.0	2,213.0	-	NA.	(847)	(238)
Megazines/frêd-olass mail	· .	14,0	195.0		NA.	(31)	(9)
New spaper		24.0	323.0	-	NA.	(128)	(10)
Office Paper		62.0	843.0		NA.	(33)	(47)
Phonebooks.	- 1	-	15.0		HA.	(5)	0
Dintentional Lumber		87.0	8,000.0	•	NA.	(2,601)	(33)
Food Scraps		NA.	7,8/3.0		47B.D	743	(74)
Yard Trinerings		NA.	2,196.0		45.0	(189)	1
Grass		NA.	849.5		13.0	25	(1)
Laaves		NA.	549.5		13.0	(121)	2
Branchea		NA.	384.0	•	8.0	(113)	2
Mond Paper (general) Mond Metals	NA.	46.0	3,193.0		NA.	(511)	(99)
Utrad Mateis	N's	13.0	1,339.0		NA.	,,,,,	(14)
Mored Plautics	NA.	56 D	3,657.0		NA.	23	(15)
Mond Organics	NA.	NA.	2.175.0		22.0	24	(1)
Mixed MSW	HA	NA.	2.0		N.		7
Carpet		27.0	2.628.0		N.	10	(18)
Personal Computers			42.0	-	N:	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	189
Concreto	NA.		4023.0	NA.	NA NA	43	1 0
	NO.		82.0	- NA	- MA		
Ry Ask Tree	H.		128.0		l NA		0
	+					1	
Asphalt Shingles			1,235.0		Hi.	13	
Dryw e1	ļ		027.0	Nb/s	.и.	32	0
					_	0	0
						0	0
					ļ	0	0
	ļ					0	0
	1					0	
						a	0
					1	. 0	0
		-			i	0	
						0	0
						0	
						0	0
						0	0
						0	0
	1				ii	o	0
	1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-		0
	tt		i i				- š

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(588)

Commercial - Long Term Programs — GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Baseline Wasto Management (MTCE):

(3,125) GH

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(3,970)

Appendix D

Commodity	Tons Recycled	Tens Landillod	Tona Constructed	Tone Composted	Total MTCE
Aluminum Cons	1	31,0	.	K:	
Steel Cans	1	231.0	-	NA.	
Glass	-	39+.0		N1	
HOPE		136.0	-	NA.	
PET		156.0		N's	
Corrugated Containers		2343.0	· ·	NA.	(49
Lagszhez/frird-olass mell	-	195.0		N.	/3
Hew epaper	1 .	323.0	<u> </u>	MA	(10
Office Paper	- :	846.0	-	NA.	1
Phonebooks	· ·	15.0	-	NA.	
Dimensional Lumber	1 :	8,650,0		N:	(2,54
Food Screen	NA.	7,645,0			77
Yard Trimmings	MA.	2,197,0			(18
Grane	- Ri	549.5	 		2
Laeves	- M	649.5	 	-	(12
Branches	NA.	384.0		-	(15
Mxed Peper (general)		3,193.0	- :	- NA	(55
Mixed Metalo	+	1,336.0		N/A	1
Mond Plast's	+ : :	3,555.0		NA NA	3
Noted Organics	- 	2,170.0			2
			<u> </u>	- NA	
Maded MSW	N.	2.0		No.	
Cherpel	-	2,620,0		NA.	2
Personal Computers Concrete	-	4,023.0			4
			N·.	N-	
Fly Ash	— <u> </u>	82.0	N.	NA.	
Tros		128.0	<u> </u>	N°.	
Asphalt Shingles		1.235.0		NA.	
Drywell	 -	927.0	N/A	K/	
				<u>'</u>	
	<u> </u>		ļ		
	1				
	-				
				ļ	
				l	
			L		
			l		
	7				

i lote: a negative value (i.e., a value in parantheses) indicates an emit sion reduction; a positive
valuo indicates en emission increase.

iommodity	Tona Source Reduced	Tons Recycled	Tone Landilled	Tone Combusted	Tone Composted	Total NTCE	Change (Att - Base) MTCI
Aurinum Cana			31.0		NA.	0	0
teel Carrs	 	-	231,0		HA.	2	- 5
lass			394.0		NA.		
DPE			135.0	-	NA.	1	-
ET	·		159.0		NA.	2	0
orrugaled Contelners			2343.0		NA.	(452)	0
egeriner Jird-class mel	-		195,0		NA.	(39)	-
r / spaper		·	323.0	-	NA.	(100)	0
Mice Paper	.	-	840.0		N/A	16	Ö
honebasks	-		15.0		N:	(5)	
irrensional Lumber	†	2.185.0	8.405.0		NA.	(3,358)	(915
pod Serapa	· ·	NA.	7,545.0		- :	771	6
ard Trimmings	·	NA.	2,197,0			(167)	0
7268	 	NA.	549.6		- :	25	
EIVEL	 	N.	649,5	· ·	· · · · ·	(120)	1
Iranchee	-	NA.	394.0			(112)	0
Exed Paper (general)	NA.		3,193,0		NA.	(5-7)	-
Exad Metals	NA.		1,338.0		NA.	14	
land Pla; Ics	NA.		3,555,0		NA.	35	- 0
bred Organics	NA.	NA.	2,170,0			25	-
Road MSW	NA NA	N.	20		NA.	0	-
arpel		-	2,029.0		NA.	25	i
ensonal Computers			29.0		NA.	- 0	1
oncrete	NA.	1,008,0	3.017.0	NA.	N\	30	(13
ty Ash	NA.		82.0	N's	NA.	1	1.0
ins.		-	128.0		NA.	1	0
sphalt Shingles		300.0	826,0	-	NA.	7	(11)
7,00		232.0	625.0	N's	NA.	25	(0
						o	0
	1					<u>c</u>	9
						G	0
	1						0
	1					c	0
						C	0
	1					c	0
	1					c	-
	1					c	1
						c	0
						c	0
						c	-
	7					c	0
	1		1			c	,
	1					c	<u> </u>
	T i					c	0
						č	

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(845)

Self-Haul - Short Term Programs - GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Sessijne Waste Management (MTCE):

(5,095)

GHG Emissions from Alfornative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(8,454)

Appendix D

Commodity	Tone Recycled	Tone Landfilled	Tone	Tons Composted	Tola: MTCE
Aluminum Cons	, cauyana	40		NA NA	0
Steel Cans	1	19.0	· ·	HA.	0
Ciess	i : :	226.0		HA.	2
HOPE	-	15.0	<u> </u>	NA NA	0
PET	-	15.0		NA NA	D
Corrugated Contriners		981.0	<u> </u>		
Magazines Card-cless mei		69.0		NA Na	(192
	<u> </u>			NA NA	(1-)
Newspeper	-	67.0	<u> </u>		(23)
Office Paper	-	287.0		NA.	5
Dimensional Lumber Food Screps		15,422 0	<u> </u>	NA.	(4,529)
	NA.	302.0	<u> </u>	•	30
Yard Transings	NA.	1,2:7,0			(106)
Grace	NA.	250.0			10
Leavos	NA NA	250.0	· · ·		(47)
Branches	NA NA	1,124.0			(330)
Mixed Paper (general)		1,653.0	•	NA	(203)
Mixed Metals		2.603.0		N÷.	26
Mixed Pestos		3,354.0	-	NA.	36
Mixed Organics	NA.	738.0		•	
Mixed MSW	N/	10.0		NA.	
Сагрея		2,144,0		NA NA	23
Personal Coreputers		193.0		NA.	2
Concrete		14,996,8	Mi	NA NA	159
Asphali Concrets	<u> </u>	1.312.0	NA.	N'.	14
Asphall Shingina		3,655.0		NA.	34
Dry', rell		2.445.0	NA	NA.	61
					0
					0
					0
					0
					0
	!				C
	1				0
	!				ő
					0
	-				0
	1				0
	:				
	:			 	- 0

Commedity	Tons Source Reduced	Tons Sucycled	Tons Landillad	Tons Combusted	Tons Composted	Tota: MTCE	Change (Alt - Br to) MTCE
Aluminum Cens	-		4.0		NA.	0	0
Sicel Cana		2.0	17.5	-	NA.	(1)	(1)
Class		22.0	202.0		NA.	0	(2
HOPE	1 -	20	13.0		NA.	(0)	72
PET	-	20	22.0		N\	toi	(1
Corrugated Containers		0.90	863,0		NA.	(258)	(84
Magazines/third-class mell		7.0	62.0		NA NA	(15)	(4)
Newspaper		7.0	0.00		NA.	(26)	(3
Office Puper	· .	25.0	259.0		NA.	(17)	(22
Omensional Lumber	-	1,542.0	13,880,0		NA.	(5,100)	(581)
Food Screpe	-	, N	272.0	-	30.0	28	(5
Yard Trimmings	·	NA.	1,122.0		125.0	(102)	4
Gresa	· .	N-	230.5	· :	25.5	1,02)	(2)
Leaves		KA	230.6		25.5	(44)	3
Brunches	-	N.S.	1,012.0		112.0	(303)	27
Mixed Paper (general)	NA.	188.0	1,457.0	-	NA NA	(423)	[130]
Mixed Malais	NA.	261,0	2,342,0	-	NA.	(258)	(286)
Mixed Plastics	NA.	335.0	3,019.0	-	NA I	(58)	(83
Mixed Organics	NA.	NA.	864.0		73.0	4	(5)
Lixed MSW	N1	K)	10.0		NA NA		- 0
Carpet	-	214.0	1,030.5	-	NA NA	(118)	(141)
Personal Computers	-	19,8	174,0		N'.	(10)	(12)
Cincrete	NA.	1,500.0	13,495.0	NA.	NA.	140	(19)
Asphalt Ocerete	-	131.0	1,181.0	NA.	N's	10	(4)
- sphak Sh'holes		350.0	3,200.0	-	NA.	25	(13
Dryw all		244.0	2,201.0	N's	NA.	78	(6
						C	
						C	0
						0	0
						- 0	0
						0	0
						o	0
						0	0
	1					0	0
						0	0
						0	0
						0	0
						O	0
						c	-
						0	-
						0	
						0	0
						0	0
						C	0
	1					o o	- 0
						-	0

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(1,360)

Self-Haul - Long Term Programs - GHG Estimates

GHG Emissions from Baseline Waste Management (MTCE):

(4,565)

GHG Emissions from Alternative Waste Management Scenario (MTCE):

(5,151)

Appendix D

	Tons	Tons	Tons		
Commodity	Recycled	Landfilled	Combusted	Tons Composted	Total MTCE
Aluminum Cens		4.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
Ctool Cens		17.0	-	NA.	
Glezz		203.0	<u> </u>	M.V	
HDPE		13.0	-	NA.	
PET		22.0		HA.	
Corrugated Containers		583.0	<u> </u>	NA.	(17)
Magazines frird-class meil		82.0	-	NA.	(1:
Newspaper		80.0	-	NA.	· (2
Office Paper		259.0		NA.	
Dimensional Lumber		13,880.0		NA.	(4,07
Food Scrape	NA.	272.0	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Yard Trimmings	NA.	1,122.0			(9:
Grass	NA.	230.5			!
Loavea	N:	230.5	-		(4)
Branches	N.	1,012.0			(20
Mixed Paper (general)	<u> </u>	1,487.0		N1	(25
Mixed Motale		2,342.0	<u> </u>	NA.	2
Mixed Plastics	· ·	3,019.0	<u> </u>	NA.	3:
Mixed Organics	NA.	80:0	<u> </u>		
Mixed MSW	N's	10.0		NA.	
Carpet		1,930.0	<u> </u>	NA.	21
Personal Computers		174.0	<u> </u>	NA.	
Conorsts	·	13, 176.0	NA.	NA.	14
Aephat Concrete		1,181.0	N's	N's	
Laphait Shingles	-	3,200.0		NA.	3
Drywel		2,201.0	N-	N.	7
***************************************	1				
	1				
			1		
			<u> </u>		
				1	
	l	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	
			<u> </u>		
			L		
			1		
	J		L		l
	T				
			E.		
	1		1		

•	
Note: a negativo value (.e., a value in purentheses) indicatos en emission reduction; a pos	tive
value indicates an emit -i -n increase.	

	Tons Source	Tons		Tons			Change
Commodity	Reduced	Recycled	Tons Landfilled	Combusted	Tons Composted	Total MTCE	(Alt - Base) MTCE
Alumhum Cans			40		NA.	0	0
Steel Care	 	.	17.0		NA.	ő	- 0
Glass			203.0	-	N:	- 2	ŏ
HOPE	-		13.0		NA.	- 5	- 3
PET			22.0		NA NA	- 3	
Corrugated Containers	- :		563.0		NA NA	(173)	
Megazines/third-plass mail	1 -		62.0		NA.	(12)	g
New spaper	 -		60.0		R\	(20)	- 3
Office Paper	 		250.0	-	NA.	Б.	0
Dimensional Lumber	1 -	1,388.0	12,492,0	-	N/	(+,599)	(627)
Food Screpe	!	N	272.0	-		27	,,,,,,
Yard Transings	1 -	NA.	1,122.0			(95)	
Gress	 	N's	230,5			9	8
Leaves	1 :	N3	230.5			(43)	1 0
Branches	-	NA.	1,012.0			(297)	
Mixed Paper (general)	NA.	•	1,487.0		NA.	(264)	0
Mixed Metals	NA.		2,342.0		NA.	25	0
Mixed Pesitos	NA.	-	3,019.0		N's	32	0
Mixed Organics	NA.	N3	590.0	-	74.0	3	(5)
Mixed MSW	N.	NA.	10.0		NA.	0	0
Carpet		-	1,930.0		NA.	20	0
Personal Computers		-	174.0		NA.	2	0
Conorele	N.	1,349,0	12,146.0	NA.	R1	126	(17)
\L shalt Concrete	 	118.0	1,063.0	N3	N÷.	9	(1)
Asphall Shingles	 	320,0	2,880.0		NA.	23	(11)
Dryval	1 .	220.0	1,981,0	NE)	NA.	70	(6)
					.,,,	0	0
	1					0	0
						0	0
						0	0
						0	0
	1					0	0
	 					. 0	0
							0
	1					0	-
	1					0	0
	 					- 0	- 0
	1		T	·		o	- 0
	1						
		l	 	<u> </u>		0	0
			†	i		0	
-				T	-	- 3	i
	1		1				
			1				-
	1		T	i	<u> </u>		-
	-					- 8	-

Total Change in GHG Emissions (MTCE):

(565)

APPENDIX E PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

QUELIC PARTICIPATION

Educate, Workships

The first two Zero Waste workshops were held on February 2, 2012, including a morning workshop focusing on businesses and an evening workshop focusing on residents and the community in general. At these initial workshops, the concept of Zero Waste was introduced and an overview was provided on the City's Zero Waste Goal and the existing programs that contribute to Pasadena's diversion accomplishments. The presentation portion concluded with case studies of businesses and communities that have implemented Zero Waste strategies. The workshops continued with breakout sessions where stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide their thoughts on Zero Waste, the City's efforts, and where they think the City should concentrate in order to reach its Zero Waste goals.

The results of the stakeholder input/brainstorming from these workshops are included in the following pages, organized according to the main areas that were discussed by residents and businesses.

Economics

- Identify the costs and impacts to implementing the Zero Waste Plan
- Provide information on how reducing waste and recycling minimizes costs incurred by a business (at the very least, consider a no-cost alternative as part of the study)
- Explore if the City's general fund can be used to finance social responsibility investments
- Create financial incentives to get to Zero Waste
- Research increasing the cost variance of the Pay-As-You-Throw system to create more incentives
- Minimize or eliminate the financial burden of the plan onto businesses (Note: Any costs should be appropriated
 amongst the user groups. This may mean higher costs for residents, especially when subsidies from the commercial
 sector are removed.)
- Explore incentives to expand recycling market development zones (i.e., program combines recycling with economic
 development to fuel new businesses, expand existing ones, create jobs, and divert waste from landfills)
- Minimize the financial barrier of the franchise fee

City Programs/Management

- Identify how the Zero Waste Plan will be implemented and how the City will provide the personnel and oversight
- Examine ways to encourage construction, recycling, and reuse centers to do business in Pasadena
- Create incentives that encourage businesses to get to Zero Waste
- Provide a list of local recycling centers and green businesses to assist consumers on where to recycle and shop locally and responsibly
- Make information on the City's recycling program website easier to find and provide information on what is recyclable and compostable
- Implement mandatory recycling and composting to get to Zero Waste
- Characterize commercial and residential waste and share the results with the community

Page: 70

Number: 1	Author: Administrator	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 9/29/2014 5:11:53 PM	
How many peo	ple attended these workshops?			
¡Number: 2	Author: Administrator	Subject: Highlight Date	e: 9/25/2014 2:14:45 PM	

- Engage and explore partnerships with other City of Pasadena facilities (i.e., Pasadena Water and Power), colleges, universities, and neighboring cities and mayors
- Expand the recognition program for businesses who are achieving Zero Waste (Green City Awards)
- Research and provide information on Zero Waste best practices nationally and internationally
- Organize a working group made up of professionals, environmentalists and business owners to examine, consider and
 make recommendations on the Zero Waste initiative before any program is considered for implementation (Note: The
 group should be equally made up of representatives from various constituencies.)

Yard Trimmings & Other Compostable Materials

- Eliminate the use of yard trimmings as alternative daily cover (ADC) in landfills as the materials are not being composted
- Strong support for compostable materials collection infrastructure from residents and businesses
- Research opportunities to compost, such as partnering with other communities or investing in an anaerobic digestion facility
- Investigate the viability of a mandate requiring grocery stores to divert outdated or leftover food from the dumpsters
- Consider space needs for food scraps collection, health and cleanliness standards, transportation and staff time to oversee and implement the program

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

- Concern that the cost of EPR is levied onto the consumers
- Research upstream policies for packaging
- Encourage manufacturers of packaging and products to adopt EPR principles (e.g., Avery-Dennison is a Pasadenabased corporation; collaborate with corporation headquarters.)
- Implement more EPR policies, such as a pharmaceutical take-back program

Regulations & Policies

- Ensure regulations are compatible and effective so programs are attainable and viable
- Provide information on Assembly Bill (AB) 341 to address recycling for businesses and multifamily complexes (Note: California Assembly Bill 341(Statutes of 2011) requires all commercial generators with four cubic yards or more of solid waste collection per week and all multifamily buildings with five units or more to recycle.)
- Interest in bans of products like polystyrene or juice boxes
- Align program goals with the Renewable Portfolio Standards and State standards

Educational Outreach

- Share and promote resources available to the community (e.g., Trash 4 Teachers, Repurpose, Free Cycle, etc.)
- Provide information on green washing so educated sustainable purchases can be made (e.g., SF approved.com)

- Support and provide outreach for reuse opportunities
- Start with educating students on recycling, composting, and reuse
- Advertise events, programs, and information through KPCC, local radio, media, newsletters, door-to-door promotions, and Mayor Public Service Announcements
- Use social media including: YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter to share information
- Publish the names of green businesses located within Pasadena to increase recognition
- Promote Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, and Re-purpose
- Use LEED certification as an incentive; currently it is a disincentive and creates hurdles (Note: "LEED" stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, a program of the U.S. Green Building Council.)

General

- Research conversion technologies such as anaerobic digestion or waste-to-energy
- Research alternatives to plastics and 2 tyrofoam 1
- Include reuse as part of the Zero Waste Plan
- Identify interim goals (e.g., 5 years) to reach Zero Waste before 2040
- Remove barriers rather than impose rules
- Ensure that members of the City Council are present in the stakeholder process

The second series of workshops were held on May 24, 2012. Using a format similar to the February workshops, the morning presentation focused on the business sector and the evening workshop was geared towards residents and the community in general. These workshops presented questions and input from the February workshops, details on the types and quantities of materials generated by residents and businesses in Pasadena, and thoughts on potential Zero Waste policies, programs, and infrastructure. The workshops concluded with breakout sessions where attendees were given the opportunity to provide their comments and input on some potential policies, programs, and infrastructure options. The results of the stakeholder input from these workshops are included below, organized according to the main areas that were discussed by residents and businesses.

Economics

- Demonstrate how businesses can achieve cost savings and identify cost-neutral options that increase recycling and compostable materials collection
- Phase-in the program to demonstrate cost neutrality
- Examine creative ways to restructure rates to incentivize recycling and composting (e.g., Pasadena Water and Power solar and energy incentives)
- Create incentives so revenues are generated to fund programs
- Apply for grants to establish and fund programs
- Provide subsidies for pilot projects to demonstrate costs and ease of implementation
- Phase-in program subsidies: first year is full subsidy and wean the second and third years

Page: 72

Number: 1	Author: Administrator	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 9/25/2014 1:44:47 PM	
Has Public Wor	ks conducted this research?			
Number: 2	Author: Administrator	Subject: Highlight Date	: 9/25/2014 1:44:22 PM	

Require or develop financial incentives for higher diversion rate from Material Recovery Facilities (MRFs)

City Programs/Management

- Incentivize diversion for franchised haulers (i.e., fee reduction for recycling more or increase fee on waste disposed in the landfill)
- Create interim goals in the Zero Waste Plan, such as 80 percent by 2020, 85 percent by 2030, and 90 percent by 2040
- Identify synergies between programs, business groups, charities, colleges, environmental organizations, etc.
- Develop a program for food scraps, compostable materials, and reusable items
- Encourage franchised haulers to provide lockable bins to minimize scavenging
- Provide "milk-run" pickups from retail locations, libraries, senior centers, etc. for recyclables or hard to recycle items
- Determine which programs work in other franchised cities and whether those programs would be useful as part of Pasadena's Zero Waste Plan
- Phase-in new programs as infrastructure becomes available
- Implement the Zero Waste Plan through a phased-in approach
- Help organize business and charity mixers to encourage donations and tax write-offs
- Develop multifamily recycling requirements and source separation programs versus haulers "dirty MRFing" the materials (processing mixed waste through a mixed waste Material Recovery Facility)
- Zlace water bottle refill stations throughout the City and parks
- Develop a program to collect aseptic items so they are sent to the right mills

Yard Trimmings & Other Compostable Materials

- · Factor in costs and logistics in developing a commercial composting facility locally or regionally
- · Determine the costs to businesses in establishing a food waste collection program
- · Establish exclusive franchise zones to collect compostable materials
- Host mobile events for chipping and grinding yard trimmings
- Create a permanent mulch give-away program that is free to all Pasadena residents
- Add food scraps to green bin program
- Make recycling and compostable materials collection mandatory for residents
- Plan for a composting facility for City generated yard trimmings

Policy and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

- Establish voluntary take-back programs before making them mandatory
- Work with businesses to incentivize participation in an EPR and take-back program
- Partner with universal waste suppliers to provide clear labeling on how to dispose of items
- Support statewide bans and EPR legislation because Pasadena is not an island
- Develop policy for businesses to require using recyclable and compostable products

Educational Outreach

Neggert Walkener

- Provide information on AB 341 to businesses and multifamily complexes
- Expand outreach and education to neighborhood associations, homeowner associations, Pasadena City College,
 college staff and students, and attendees at City events and meetings
- Focus Zero Waste outreach activities to college and high school students that belong to sustainability clubs
- Research the cost and possibility of using lockable bins to minimize scavenging
- Examine various behavioral change marketing approaches that increase recycling participation
- Brand the Zero Waste program
- Provide residents with more clearly labeled bins that explain what goes in the blue and green bins
- Increase the recycling image of the City by placing clearly labeled recycling bins on City streets and parks
- Provide Information on how to recycle ink toner cartridges, batteries, and fluorescent bulbs
- Publicize/model successful Zero Waste businesses to increase peer pressure
- Delineate what is compostable and recyclable
- Correctly define gypsum as it's not truly 'inert"
- Make school education a higher priority
- Examine all the ways to educate children on recycling at home, school, playgrounds, and parks
- Provide technical assistance for businesses
- Incorporate additional outreach approaches including door-to-door outreach and personal connections
- Develop a program that focuses on positive reinforcement
- Develop competitions to increase participation
- Provide information on AB 341 and make businesses aware that they are in compliance through the franchise agreement
- Direct haulers to provide training and bins for services they provide

Based on the input from the stakeholders at the February and May workshops, the City conducted an analysis of the policies and programs to estimate their diversion potential, greenhouse gas emissions reduction potential, and feasibility of implementation. The preliminary findings and draft plan elements were presented to the stakeholders at an all day workshop and open house held on August 22, 2012. The open house format for this workshop allowed residents, representatives from local businesses, business associations, and other community members to attend at a time convenient for them and enabled one-on-one interface with the project team. Posters displayed in the room presented information on the following draft plan elements:

Guiding Principles - The guiding principles introduced to the workshop attendees were developed by the City and incorporated the City's Zero Waste goals, the City's Green City Action Plan and input from previous stakeholder workshops:

- 1. Develop sustainable policies and programs that are equitable, environmentally responsible, and economically sound
- 2. Maintain Pasadena's position as a leader in innovation and a role model in resource management

- 3. Pursue "upstream" strategies that prevent and reduce waste and encourage the transition from a consuming to a conserving society
- 4. Improve "downstream" reuse and recycling programs to ensure the highest and best use of end-of-life products and materials
- 5. Lead by example at all City operations and City-sponsored events and activities
- 6. Increase the diversion of compostable materials and promote development of local infrastructure

These guiding principles provide a framework for the policies, programs and actions to be implemented as part of the plan.

Policy, Program, and Facility Options -The potential policies, programs, and facilities the City is considering for implementation in the Zero Waste Plan were displayed on a series of posters in the workshop venue. The options were broken out by implementation schedule as follows:

- Short-term
- Short to medium-term
- Medium to long-term

Attendees were able to ask questions and also to provide feedback on the potential options.

Estimated Diversion Potential and Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions - The diversion potential of each of the options was calculated based on the types and quantities of materials disposed and the potential for the option to divert some of the disposed materials from landfilling or transformation. The diversion potential of the options was grouped by the generator type (residential, commercial, and self-haul). In direct relation to the diversion potential of each option is the potential for reducing graenhouse gas emissions. These potential results were also displayed for the stakeholders and they were explained by the project team.

2 takeholder Survey addition to attending the final workshop, interested community members and stakeholders were also given the opportunity to complete a survey on the City's Zero Waste Plan. The Zero Waste survey solicited input on 25 ideas for possible programs, policies, and infrastructure identified during the community workshops. Information about the survey and a link to the survey were posted on the City's website. The input received was incorporated into the plan. The survey input is included at the end of this section.

Page: 75

Number: 1	Author: Administrator	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 9/25/2014 2:18:51 PM
Note that only 4	15 individuals responded to th	e survey.	
Number: 2	Author: Administrator	Subject: Highlight D	ate: 9/25/2014 2:18:15 PM



Overall Survey Results: Zero Waste Survey

Suggest that this not be included in the report due to very small number of respondents.

Text Block:

Imagine a Pasadena 30 years from now that produces no garbage and recycles/reuses all that we throw away. The City of Pasadena invites residents and businesses to help develop the Zero Waste Strategic Plan. Your input is valuable as we move toward the City's ambitious goal to achieve Zero Waste by 2040. In 2006, the Pasadena City Council adopted the United Nations Green Cities declaration and Urban Environmental Accords, which provides the framework for the Green City Action Plan. Achieving Zero Waste by 2040 is one of the Urban Environmental Accord Actions. The Zero Waste Strategic Plan is a first step to reaching this goal. Please provide your input on 23 ideas for possible programs, policies, and infrastructure suggested by businesses and residents during recent community workshops. Please complete the Zero Waste Survey by October 8, 2012. Results of the Zero Waste Survey will be available on the City's Zero Waste webpage on October 22, 2012.

Text Block:

POLICY OPTIONS

Are you in favor of the City adopting a Zero Waste policy that formalizes the

City's commitment to achieving Zero Waste by 2040?

*The Rating Score is th			5 = Strongly Disa	gicc		
The Rating Score is th	2	3 :	4.	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score
*The Rating Score is th	Make a contract		tan Kalanda ayan kerajaran da ke		45	1.5
responses. Show Details	e weighted average c	alculated by dividing t	he sum of all weight	ed ratings by	y the number of t	total
Do you support for the whole Ci		of recycling effo	orts at City fa	cilities to	serv® as a	model
1 = Strongly Agree ,	2 ≃ Agree , 3 = Neu	tral . 4 = Disagree ,	5 = Strongly Disa	gree		
1	2	3 ·	4	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
*The Rating Score is th responses. * Show Details	e weigined average ca	aculated by dividing tr	e sum of all weight	ed ratings by	, the number of t	otal
Private waste ha commercial cust incentive progra 1 = Strongly Agree ,	omers through ms for haulers	out the City. W to increase rec tral , 4 = Disagree ,	ould you sup yeling at the c 5 = Strongly Disa	oort the Gommera	City evaluat ial building: Number of	s? Rating
	<u> </u>	3	4	5	Responses	Score*
*The Rating Score is the responses. > Show Details	e weighted average ca	ticulated by dividing the	ne sum of all weight	ed ratings by	45 the number of to	1.4 otal
Do you support to identify oppor rate structure						
Do you support to identify oppor	tunities to impr	ove recycling a	nd try to inco	orporate	incentives i	nto the
Do you support to identify oppor rate structure	tunities to impr	ove recycling a	nd try to inco	orporate		
Do you support to identify opportrate structure 1 = Strongly Agree,	tunities to impr 2 = Agree . 3 = Neut 2	ove recycling a ral , 4 = Disagree ,	and try to inco 5 = Strongly Disa 4	orporate gree 5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
Do you support to identify oppor rate structure 1 = Strongly Agree ,	tunities to impr 2 = Agree . 3 = Neut 2	ove recycling a ral , 4 = Disagree ,	and try to inco 5 = Strongly Disa 4	orporate gree 5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
Do you support to identify opporrate structure 1 = Strongly Agree, 1 *The Rating Score is the responses.	tunities to impr 2 = Agree . 3 = Neut 2 e weighted average ca	ove recycling a ral, 4 = Disagree, 3 Ilculated by dividing th	and try to inco 5 = Strongly Disa 4 he sum of all weighte	gree 5 ed ratings by	Number of Responses 44 the number of to	Rating Score*

2 Responses Score* 1.9 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total Show Details Do you support the City educating residents about sustainable purchasing practices? 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating 1 2 3 Responses Score* 1.5 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. Show Details Many residents have expressed their concern over scavengers that rummage through trash and recycling containers when they are placed at the curb for collection. Do you support the City increasing enforcement of the anti-scavenging ordinance? 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating Score* 1 Responses 2.6 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. > Show Details Do you support the City targeting specific, hard to recycle materials in the residential and commercial trash (i.e. plastic bags, Styrofoam food packaging) that could be banned from use? 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Rating Number of Responses Score* 1.9 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. Show Details Trash hauled by self-haulers to the landfill is a significant portion of the City's total waste. Do you support the City working to improve accuracy of self-haul waste reporting? Accurate waste reporting will be vital in tracking the City's progress toward achieving Zero Waste. 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating 2 Responses Score* 44 2.0 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total

responses. ▶ Show Details Do you support the City requiring separate recycling bins at apartment and commercial units? 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating Responses Score* 1.4 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. ▶ Show Details Text Block: **PROGRAM OPTIONS** Do you support the City providing a residential food waste recycling program? 1 = Strongly Agree , 2 = Agree , 3 = Neutral , 4 = Disagree , 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating 1 Responses Score* 1.7 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. Show Details Do you support the City pursuing a food waste recycling program for restaurants. supermarkets and other businesses that generate high volume of food scraps? 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating Responses Score* 1.4 *The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses. Show Details Do you support the City pursuing a food waste recycling program at stadiums and other large venues and events? 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree Number of Rating Responses Score* 1.3

*The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total http://survey.constantcontact.com/survey/a07e6fitfakh7jm97lm/results

responses.

Show Details

1 = Strongly	/ Agree 2 = A	Agree 3 = Neutra	I . 4 = Disagree .	5 = Strongly Disag	ree		
, 010	1	2	3	4	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
. In the case of the state of the state of	and the second s		. ,			45	1.6
The Rating Sesponses. Show Det		ghted average calc	ulated by dividing th	ne sum of all weighte	d ratings b	y the number of to	otal
wards p	rogram to	increase the a	awareness of	local green bu	s achie	es through a vements?	izilizer muur turi isa
1 = Strongly	y Agree , 2 = <i>l</i> 1	\gree , 3 = Neutra 2	ıl , 4 = Disagree , 3	5 = Strongly Disag		Number of Responses	Rating Score
		_	<u> </u>				
esponses. Show De	tails	May regarde a very common from the common terms of the common terms of the common terms of the common terms of	ret var end) toon handerledge in grift distribution was in the	ne sum of all weighte	to an algebraic specific published to the server of the se	CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY WASHINGTON	otal
Show De	tails upport the ial custom	City offering ers achieve Z	free technica ero Waste thr	ne sum of all weighte l assistance to rough recyclin 5 = Strongly Disag	busine g/reuse	y the number of to sses to help , and compo	otal sting?
esponses. Show De Show De	tails upport the ial custom	City offering ers achieve Z	free technica ero Waste thr	assistance to	busine g/reuse	y the number of to	sting?
Do you si	tails upport the lial custom y Agree , 2 = /	City offering ers achieve Z Agree , 3 = Neutra 2	free technica ero Waste thr al , 4 = Disagree , 3	l assistance to rough recyclin 5 = Strongly Disa 4	busine g/reuse gree 5	sses to help and compo Number of Responses	sting? Rating Score
Do you sucommerce 1 = Strongly The Rating Stresponses.	upport the lial custom y Agree , 2 = /	City offering ers achieve Z Agree , 3 = Neutra 2	free technica ero Waste thr al , 4 = Disagree , 3	l assistance to ough recyclin 5 = Strongly Disag	busine g/reuse gree 5	sses to help and compo Number of Responses	sting? Rating Score
Do you sucommerce The Rating Stresponses. Show De	upport the lal custom y Agree , 2 = / 1 Score is the we	City offering ers achieve Z Agree , 3 = Neutra 2 ighted average calc	free technica ero Waste thr al ,4 = Disagree , 3 culated by dividing to to help reduc	l assistance to ough recyclin 5 = Strongly Disag 4 ne sum of all weighte	busine g/reuse gree 5 ed ratings b	sses to help and compo Number of Responses	sting? Rating Score
Do you sucommerce The Rating Stesponses. Show De	upport the lal custom y Agree , 2 = / 1 Score is the we	City offering ers achieve Z Agree , 3 = Neutra 2 ighted average calc	free technica ero Waste thr al ,4 = Disagree , 3 culated by dividing to to help reduc	l assistance to rough recyclin 5 = Strongly Disag 4 ne sum of all weighte	busine g/reuse gree 5 ed ratings b	sses to help and compo Number of Responses	sting? Rating Score*

The City require private waste haulers to recycle a minimum of 60 percent of the waste they collect. Do you support the City establishing incentives for hauler's to exceed

recycling requirements?

						Number of	Rating
	1	2	3	4	- 5	Responses	Score
					** ** ** *** **	44	1.
The Rating Sc esponses. Show Deta		ghted average ca	kulated by dividing t	he sum of all weight	ed ratings b	by the number of t	total
		City helping cling awaren	to support sc less?	hool recycling) progra	ms at school	ls to
f = Strongly	Agree , 2 = A	\gree , 3 = Neutr	al , 4 = Disagree ,	5 = Strongly Disa	gree	Number of	Rating
The state of the s	1	2	3	4	5	Responses	Score
			culated by dividing t			45	1.4
o you suphroughou	pport the t the City	City providir ?	ng recycling co	ollection conta	ainers in	public plac	eti de presioni i de de sensione BS
1 = Strongly A	Agree , 2 = A	.gree , 3 = Neutr	al , 4 = Disagree ,	5 = Strongly Disa	gree		
						Number of	Rating
· Annacia etc. A material transportation () (b) (b) - (c)		2	3	4	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
The Deline Co.	To the second se		THE SECOND SECON			Responses 45	Score*
esponses.			3 culated by dividing th			Responses 45	Score*
esponses. Show Deta	ils		THE SECOND SECON			Responses 45	Score*
esponses. Show Detain	ils	ghted average cal	THE CONTROL OF STREET AND A STREET			Responses 45	Score*
esponses. Show Deta Ext Block: NFRASTRUC O you sup craps, yar leighborin	ils: CTURE OPTI Oport the (d trimming cities?	ons City supportings, soiled pa	ing the develo	pment of regi	ed ratings b onal org n partne	Responses 45 y the number of to	Score* 1.5 otal
esponses. Show Deta Ext Block: NFRASTRUC O you sup craps, yar eighborin	ils CTURE OPTI Oport the Good trimming cities? Agree, 2 = A	ons City supportings, soiled pa	ing the develo aper) composi	pment of regi	onal org n partne	Responses 45 y the number of to	Score* 1.5 otal Rating
ext Block: NFRASTRUC O you sup craps, yar eighborin	ils: CTURE OPTI Oport the (d trimming cities?	ons City supportings, soiled pa	ing the develo	pment of regi	ed ratings b onal org n partne	Responses 45 by the number of to ganics (i.e. for ship with Number of Responses	Score*
esponses. Show Deta ext Block: NFRASTRUC Oo you sup craps, yar reighborin I = Strongly A	ils CTURE OPTI Oport the (of trimmin g cities? Agree, 2 = A	city supportings, soiled page , 3 = Neutra	ing the develo aper) composi	pment of regiling facilities is	onal org n partne	Responses 45 y the number of to ganics (i.e. for each point with Number of Responses 43	Score* 1.9 Cod Rating Score*

Recycling facilities generate a certain amount of residual waste material that cannot be
easily recycled. Do you support the City pursuing the development of residual waste
recycling facilities in partnership with neighboring cities?

	1	2	3	4	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
						42	1.
The Rating sesponses. Show De		ghted average calc	ulated by dividing th	ne sum of all weighte	ed ratings b	y the number of to	otal
paints, cl	hemicals, e	-waste) collec	tion program	ent househol within the Ci	ty fimits	lous waste (?	
1 = Strongl	ly Agree , 2 = A	Agree , 3 = Neutra 2	ıl , 4 = Disagree , 3	5 = Strongly Disa	gree 5	Number of Responses	Rating Score*
or and the second second second second				-		44	1.6
The Rating sesponses. Show De		ghted average calo	ulated by dividing th	ne sum of all weighte	ed ratings b	y the number of to	otal
·				edding servica 5 = Strongly Disa		James S. Jersey C. G. Black Opple and C. C.	, menter i establik egipel, makkanalare
	1	2	3	4	5	Number of Responses	Rating Score
ALMANDA - LA COMMUNA PLA MANAGEMENTA	ng pangangan ng pang	and the second s	,			44	2.6
The Rating		ghted average calc	ulated by dividing t	he sum of all weighte	ed ratings b	y the number of t	otal
							
sponses. Show De f you ha mprovin	ve experien	iced construction and	tion projects Demolition (C	do you have a &D) recycling	iny sugg Progra	gestions for m?	especial file to a total desire.
Show De	ve experien	iced construction and l	tion projects Demolition (C	do you have a &D) recycling	iny sugi Progra	m? N	umber o
Show De	ve experien	iced construction and	tion projects Demolition (C	do you have a &D) recycling	iny sugg Progra	m? N	umber o
Show De	ve experien	ced construction and	tion projects Demolition (C	do you have a &D) recycling	ny sugi Progra	m? N	esponses
f you hamprovin	ve experien ig the Cons	nced construction and	Demolition (C	&D) recycling	ny sugi Progra	m? N	esponses
f you hamprovin	ve experien ig the Cons	truction and	Demolition (C	&D) recycling	any sugg Progra	m? N Re	esponses

Personal Information - Optional

Answer	Number of Responses
First Name	20
Last Name	19
Job Title	12
Company Name	12
Work Phone	11
Email Address	18
Address 1	12
City	17
State/Province (US/Canada)	19
Postal Code	20

APPENDIX F OPTIONS EVALUATION

EVALUATION OF POLICY, PROGRAM AND INFRASTRUCTURE OPTIONS

Evaluation francisco

A list of criteria was established to review the policy, program and infrastructure options under consideration by the City. The criteria categories included environmental benefits, impact on services, ability to implement, support of local and state policies, and fiscal impacts. For each category, definitions were established to assist the evaluation of the options. The criteria and definitions are included in **Table F-1**.

Evaluation Criteria

Lance For

A	Environmental Benefits to the Community	Maximum Points
1	Considers the highest and best use of materials	10
2	Reduces greenhouse gas emissions	7
3	Supports new, safe technologies and processes for infrastructure	
4	Protects public health and the environment	
5	Implements sustainable policies and programs	
В	Impact on Services	
1	Improves collection and recycling programs for residents and businesses	T 6
2	Improves opportunities for recycling and proper management of mixed waste	1
3	Improves City operations and City sponsored events	
С	Ability to Implement	
1	Can be implemented using existing, local infrastructure	4
2	Can be implemented using existing services	
D	Support Local and State Policies	
1	Increases diversion to achieve Zero Waste by 2040, in support of the City's Urban Environmental Accords, Action 4	6
2	Expands Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) efforts in support of the City's existing EPR resolution	_
3	Supports 75 percent state-wide recycling goal	
E	Fiscal Impacts	
1	Minimizes impact on customer rates and provides rate equity	T 8
2	Minimizes impact on City's revenue streams	1 *
3	Minimizes contract management and enforcement costs for programs	1
4	Invests in green jobs and economic development	1

Using the criteria, the scoring was conducted by City staff and a ranking of the list of options was established. The results of the scoring and ranking are included at the end of this section. As indicated in the scoring results, Option 3, identification of potential improvements to the franchised hauler system, and Option 23, establishment of a permanent household hazardous waste (HHW) program, both scored considerable lower than the other options. These two options were eliminated from the recommended future programs to be implemented.

	2) LICES I REGRAM AND INFRALTPUSTURE OPTIONS [1]			-					Point Sca	le: Yes":	2; 50	mowhel	t=1; [4o = 9; Ni	of Applic	abta - N	A							
\neg	CATEGORY	A. Environmental Benefits to the Community B., Impa			impact o	ect on Sarvices C. Ability to Implement			Support Local and State Mendah			C. Flacel Impacts												
	Critaria	A1	AZ	AJ	м	AB	Subflotal	B1	82	93 3ut	interior.	-12	ĊZ	Bublotsi	<u> </u>	8	<u>D3</u>	Euktotal	P	<u>67</u>	0	EA	10000	TOTAL
	POLILIEE						!	!		!_	_					_						_		لــــا
	Adopt Zero Wasts putcy that establishes the City - commitment to achieving Z.V t.; 2040	2.0	:.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	18.0	2.0	20	2.0	8.0	11	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4,0	1.0	-14	1.0	2.0	9.0	34,0
2	Expand .nets reduction, reuse, and scoyding at all CP* faulities, to establish consistent -est) reduction, recycling and composting programs to serve as a model for the -hole City.	2,0	2,0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.0	2.7	2.	4,8	20	2.0	2.0	6.0	0,0	0.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	34,0
3	iderfify potertial improvements to the franchise v aste hauter fee system streamline admirt itering the program without act "tracky impacting rate payers or at .vice providers	0,0	9.0	:0	9.0	9.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.0	20	4.0	0.0	ᅃ	0.0	مه	مه	. 0	امه	2.0	2.0	€.0
7	Evaluate the C&D diversion requirements for haufers and covered projects to improve constitutions and diversion of polytrides	2.0	2.0	2.0	2,0	2.0	19,0	۰.۰	2.0	2.0	6.0	2.3	2.0	40	20	0,0	2.0	4.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	20	26	26.0
-	Contracting and incorporate incentive a Into the rate attractine and incorporate it is improve recycling and incorporate incentive a Into the rate attractine	2,0	2,0	27	2,0	2,0	10,0	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.0	2,0	2.0	4,0	2.0	0,0	2.0	مه	2,0	2,0	2.0	2.0	E.0	32,0
╗	responny and producer take-back requirements of products and packaging and educate consumers on evaluable purchasing practices	2.0	a	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	:.0	2.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	20	4,0	ه	2.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	20	8.0	34.0
7	Enhance reforcement of the crising and-scaverging policy in order to reduce lose of recyclables and potentially inch eas the revenue conceptor from the recyclables - slected custoded.	2,0	11	1.0	2.0	1.0	7.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	۰,۰	4.0	۵,	10	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	8,0	23.0
	Target specific materials in the disposed '- aste stream that could be barre d from sele, distribution or disposal	2.)	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	2,0	٠.	4,0	2,0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2,0	8,0	2.0	2 2	2.0	2,0	2,5	34.0
•	Partner 1.1th neighboring jurisdictions to improve the recursey of self-hauf : sets reporting.	1.0	2.0	2.0	i_0	20	ė. 0	2.0	2.0	0,0	4,0	:-0	2.0	4.0	عر:	مه	2.0	40	0.0	2.0	20	Q.D	4.0	26.0
	implement a mondatory source separated commercial recycling policy for all commercial and multifamily deparators	2.0	2.0	2.0	20	20	10,0	1.0	2.0	2,0	5,0	2.0	2.0	4.0	≥0	1,0	2,0	5.0	2.0	2.0	مه	2,0	4.0	30.0
٦	PROGRAMS																	i						
11	Implement a pilot recident al food scrape recycling program for potential CI^; wide Implementation	2.0	2.0	٠.0	2,0	2.0	14,0	20	2.0	2.0	6.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2,0	2.0	2.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	Q.B	2.0	2.0	36.0
	implement a pilot food scraps recycling program for restaurants, supermerkets and other	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	23	10.0	20	2.0	1.0	6,0	LO	1 7	2.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	8.0	40	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	25.0
44	out nesses that generate high volume of food screpe for potential City is de Implementation implement mandatory food in eater to spaling program at stadiums and other large venturis and currents.	2,0	2,0	2.0	2.0	1.0	10.6	60	2.0	مه	2.0	20	2.0	4.8	7,0	و:.	2.0	6,0	0,0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	24,0
-4	c eras incret so educational outreach on - aste reduction and recycling and establish a regular schedule for updates, circulation, and announcements	2.0	20	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	40	2,0	2,0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2,0	€,0	2.0	2.0	:_0	2,0	8,0	14.0
15	Expand the visibility of local green businesses to increase the area reviews of their achievements	2.0	2.0	7.0	2.0	2.0	19.0	20	2.0	0.0	40	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	8,0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	8.0	12.0
	Offer fire technical perletance to businesses to help them achie to Zoro *\ sate through rouse, recreating, and composting	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10,0	2.0	2,0	0,0	4.6	0	2,0	40	2.0	-0	2.0	4,0	20	م	2,0	2.0	••	12.0
17	Assist residents to reduce their junk mail by promoting the delization of the books on the City's rebeller	2	2.0	2.0	2.0	23	14,0	2.0	2.0	2.0	6,0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	€.0	2.0	2.0	2,0	2.0	8.0	340
18	Establish incentives for hauler that exceed reor . Ing requirements	1:	2,0	17	1,0	2,0	8,0	2.0	2 1	0.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	1,0	QII	1.0	2.0	9,0	٠,	0.0	2.0	20	30.0
19	Provide school ret_raing proj. ome at Panhdems United School District compuss	2 :	2.0	1.0	2,0	2.0	3.0	20	2.0	مه	4.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	عه	20	0.0	2.0	4.0	23,0
20	Provide racycling in public places throughout the Cit,	2:	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	9.6	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.6	1.	1,0	2,0	2.0	2 2	2,0	4.0	Q.P	2.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	27,0
-i	NFPASTRUCTURE	1																						
	Support the development of regional organic : _moversing facilities through pertnerships …th relighboring cities	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	2.3	2.0	20	0,0	0.0	Q.O	2.0	0.0	2,0	4.0	0.0	2.0	2,0	2,0	0,0	26.0
22	Pursus the development of residual*sste processing facilities through partnerships · -ith neighboring citi. s	2.0	2.:	:.0	2.0	2.0	10,0	2,0	2.5	2.0	6,3	Q:	:.o	0.6	2.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	6.0	26.0
22	Establish a permenont household hazarcoussste collection program, elther through a permenont facili, :: .ithin the City, or a curbalde collection program	0.0	2,6	2,0	2,6	2,0	8,0	a v	27	2.0	4.0	O.C	.0	0.0	8	0,0	0.0	مه	0,0	۱۵	0.0	2.0	2.0	14.0

Page: 86

Number: 1	Author: Administrator	Subject: Sticky Note	Date: 9/29/2014 5:13:16 PM								
Shouldn't PFFBC be on the list of policies, programs, and infrastructure options?											
Number: 2	Author: Administrator	Subject: Highlight Date	e: 9/25/2014 2:21:42 PM								