



Staff Report

UPDATE REGARDING VARIOUS SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Honorable Mayor and Council Members:

Summary

This report provides the City Council with updated information on various issues related to solid waste. The report is an informational report and touches upon:

- a) NorCal/Recology Franchise Agreement Contract Negotiations
- b) January 1, 2010 Customer Service Questionnaire
- c) Grand Jury Report on SBWMA
- d) July 23rd SBWMA Board Meeting
- e) Single- vs. Dual-Stream Recycling
- f) Food Waste Program
- g) Solid Waste Rates

No City Council action is required.

Background

The City of Belmont is one of twelve member agencies in the South Bayside Waste Management Authority (SBWMA). In addition to Belmont, the other member agencies are the cities of Atherton, Burlingame, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos and San Mateo along with the County of San Mateo and the West Bay Sanitary District. A unique aspect of this twelve-member joint powers agency is the fact that the Board of Directors is composed of City staff representatives rather than elected officials. The City of Belmont has been quite vocal in recent years about changing this, most recently in May when the City Council again approved a resolution calling for a change to the Joint Powers Agency agreement to allow member agencies to appoint elected officials to the Board of Directors.

The City conducts an annual solid waste customer rate-setting process to establish garbage rates the franchisee, Allied, can charge its customers. The most recent Proposition 218 rate hearing and rate adoption occurred June 23rd.

The current collection provider – Allied Waste (formerly BFI) – franchise is due to expire December 31, 2010. SBWMA recently completed a two-year request for proposals process in which NorCal/Recology was selected as the new garbage collection provider effective January 1,

2011. The City of Belmont participated in this process, but separately and in parallel, conducted its own independent request-for-proposal process. After two proposals were received (Allied and NorCal), the City Council Infrastructure Committee conducted several public meetings in which the two proposers, Allied and NorCal, were given the opportunity to present their proposals. The two proposers were subjected to rigorous questioning by the Council Infrastructure Committee members, and their proposals were exhaustively analyzed by the City's garbage consultant, HDR-Brown Vence. NorCal was recommended by the Council Infrastructure Committee to the City Council as the preferred provider. NorCal was the low cost provider in the City of Belmont competitive procurement process. Additional public discussions by the entire City Council were conducted and NorCal/Recology was finally approved by the City Council of the City of Belmont as the new franchisee beginning January 1, 2011.

Discussion

NorCal/Recology Franchise Agreement Contract Negotiations

City staff and consultants have initiated contract negotiations with the company. A draft agreement for City Council consideration is anticipated in early September 2009. Jack Crist, Marc Zafferano, Kathleen Kane, Karen Borrmann, Thomas Fil and our Solid Waste Consultant, Michael Brown, are the City negotiating team. We will also involve Attorney Michael Colantuono. Currently, we are studying the SBWMA model contract developed by the SBWMA staff, but are also considering sample contracts used by other non-SBWMA cities as well.

City staff has held meetings with SBWMA staff as well as NorCal/Recology. In the meeting with SBWMA, we had in attendance the attorney responsible for primary drafting of the SBWMA model contract, Attorney Ray McDevitt, as well as SBWMA staff. City Staff has held one formal meeting with Recology/NorCal represented by Mr. Mario Puccinelli, Vice President and General Manager, Mr. Mark Arsenault, General Manager, and Mr. Gino Gasparini, Business Development. Following is the timetable to bring the new franchise agreement forward to the City Council:

- July 1st – Discussion at July Infrastructure Committee meeting
- July 28 – Status Report to City Council
- August 5th – Discussion at August Infrastructure Committee meeting
- August 7th through end of August – Staff negotiates with NorCal/Recology
- September 8th – City Council Discussion and Direction on Draft Franchise Agreement
- September 22 – City Council Approval of Franchise Agreement

NorCal/Recology has informed City staff that the company needs to place the order for the collection trucks by September 30, 2009 in order to have them delivered in October of 2010, two months before the start up of new service. A key area of focus during these franchise negotiations will be the customer rate-setting process and the so called “deficit account.”

January 1, 2010 Customer Service Questionnaire

Attachment A was reviewed with the City Council Infrastructure Committee in June. It represents the City staff response to a SBWMA questionnaire related to start up of the new franchise collection service with NorCal/Recology. The questionnaire contains customer collection service policy choices that need to be made before the new franchise startup January 1, 2011. These choices are:

- Default can size and colors of 32-gallon/black (solid waste), 64-gallon/blue (recyclables) and 96-gallon/green (organic materials/yard waste). These are the can sizes NorCal will order and deliver to customers unless they request alternate sizes. Specimen sample cans can be seen in the lobby of City Hall.
- Providing a list of all municipal locations for service to the City departments and events.
- Universal rollout of recycling for multi-family units.
- Universal rollout for commercial recycling.
- Frequency of customer billing (quarterly for residential and monthly for commercial).
- Handling of delinquent accounts (termination of service after 60 days).
- Recycling performance incentives for the contractor.
- Call forwarding to the City for calls unrelated to solid waste service.

Decisions such as these will be included in the franchise agreement currently being negotiated.

Grand Jury Report on SBWMA

The Grand Jury report was received last week and it made the headlines of both free papers. The Executive Committee of the SBWMA Board has prepared an SBWMA response. The SBWMA response to the Grand Jury was be discussed at the SBWMA Board meeting of July 23rd. I forwarded an electronic copy of the SBWMA draft response to the City Council on July 17th. I will give the City Council a verbal report at our July 28th City Council meeting.

Each of the twelve member agencies are also expected to respond to the Grand Jury Report with comments. Our deadline to send our response comments is October 8. Staff will draft a City response for Council consideration and put it on the Council agenda the first meeting in September. Significant findings, conclusions and recommendations covered in the Grand Jury Report are:

- a) Reconsider the pending contracts with NorCal (Recology) and South Bay Recyclery (SBR).
- b) Amend the Joint Powers Agreement to include elected officials on the Board.
- c) Several process matters in the RFP processes, including company background checks by the SBWMA consultant, were substandard.
- d) The SBWMA Executive Director's conduct during the process was criticized.
- e) Company background checks by the SBWMA consultant were substandard.

July 23rd SBWMA Board Meeting

There were four very important items on the SBWMA Board agenda last Thursday. They were:

- Considering approval of the SBWMA formal response to the Grand Jury Report; and
- Final approval of the sale of bonds to finance the Shoreway facility improvements; and
- Award of the Shoreway facility construction contract to S.J. Amoroso in the amount of \$16.2 mil; and
- Approval of the Shoreway Operations Agreement with South Bay Recycling.

SBWMA's Formal Response to the Grand Jury Report

As noted above, an electronic copy of this report was previously transmitted to the City Council. I will give a verbal report July 28th during the Item 8 section of the Council agenda on what actions were taken by the SBWMA Board of Directors. The SBWMA staff report indicates:

- The Agency Executive Committee and legal council “does not believe it would be appropriate, nor legally advisable, to go back to square one of the RFP process.”
- The Agency will take the Grand Jury recommendations under consideration on future RFP processes.
- Any JPA amendment to add elected officials is the sole jurisdiction of the member agencies and not the SBWMA Board.
- The SBWMA Executive committee “noted disagreement in whole or in part with many of the findings and attempted to explain the correct facts and workings of the RFP process in its response.”
- The Executive Committee indicated “it became apparent that it should also respond to correct the record being made by the Grand Jury Report in its background section, primarily as it discussed the RFP process.

SBWMA Bond Financing Plan/Award of Shoreway Facility Construction Contract

Governing bodies of ten (10) entities have now approved the bond finance plan; Belmont will cast its SBWMA Board vote as a “no” on the financing plan to reflect your Council vote. The award of the construction contract is another matter. Approving this contract to the lowest responsible bidder for the construction contract will save the member agencies approximately \$ 9 million from the engineer’s estimate (bid expires July 24). I will report on this item Tuesday night during the Item 8 discussion.

SBWMA Approval of the Shoreway Operations Agreement with South Bay Recycling

I will report on this item Tuesday night during the Item 8 discussion.

Selection of NorCal (Recology) as the Recommended Collection Vendor

To date, ten (10) agencies have approved the NorCal/Recology recommendation,

Regarding the Collection RFP process, Belmont did its own parallel RFP process and we know from our consultant analysis NorCal was the low cost provider. Belmont's basis for this conclusion was conceptual application of the rates each company proposed to its Belmont-specific customer data base and then deriving the total revenue yield for both Allied and NorCal. Belmont customers would have been paying substantially more money to Allied under the Allied cost proposal as compared to the NorCal proposal. There was no "reasonableness factor" applied. The conclusion was based on hard data analysis and public testimony in the City's public meetings.

Single- vs. Dual-Stream Recycling

The current official policy position of the Belmont City Council, adopted when NorCal/Recology's collection system proposal was approved and reaffirmed when the Shoreway facility master plan was approved is "single-stream recycling." At this time, all cities in the twelve-member SBWMA JPA are supportive of single-stream recycling. During the discussion by the City Council on the Shoreway facility bond financing plan, two City Council Members indicated they were rethinking the issue of single- vs. dual- stream recycling. This is another opportunity to discuss the issue, although time is running out for debate.

Collection vehicles and toters need to be ordered by NorCal/Recology in the next two months. If the City Council majority wants to reconsider this policy direction, it can do so, but it will mean an additional customer rate increase of somewhere between 13-15 percent more on the customer rates. Attachment B is a short analysis provided by NorCal/Recology of the incremental additional cost we would incur from NorCal/Recology should we elect the dual stream recycle collection system. If Belmont goes to dual stream, it will require special trucks and toters, both of which are more expensive than single-stream. The matter was discussed in general by the Council Infrastructure Committee at its last meeting, but no recommendation was made. Attachment B indicates the dual-stream vehicles and toters, which would be unique to Belmont only, would require rate increases sufficient to raise additional revenue in the amount of \$742,000 in the first year and \$ 662,000 thereafter. On a \$ 5 million rate base, that means a rate increase in the range of 13-15 percent. These estimates could go higher if the SBWMA Shoreway processing costs are higher due to our uniquely different loads.

I asked the SBWMA staff to provide their feedback on the question of dual- vs. single- stream recycling. In an email dated July 5th, Kevin McCarthy discussed a study done in 2002, the findings of which affirmed that single-stream collection does lower collection costs, but the value per ton of the finished output was slightly less. Seven years later, the market place has changed dramatically. Today, Mr. McCarthy says "the bottom line is that converting from dual-stream collection to single-stream collection in the SBWMA service area will result in the following:

- Lower collection costs
- Lower Shoreway processing costs
- No impact on the value of commodities sold
- Much higher collected volumes estimated at 30 percent increase, even after

accounting for a few percentage point increase in residue levels at the facility.

Mr. McCarthy goes on to say it is his belief that Belmont has made the rational choice of single-stream recycling.

Absent affirmative direction to the contrary from the Council majority, staff will continue to negotiate a single-stream collection franchise agreement with NorCal/Recology.

Food Waste Program

A few residents have emailed the City of Belmont requesting that we consider the Food Waste program the City of San Carlos is piloting along with San Mateo. Following is a sampling:

"I am a proud resident of Belmont for just over a year now. I would like to request that, like our neighboring city of San Carlos, we implement a food scraps and yard trimmings recycling program in our city too. I live in a small apartment without a personal yard and with a balcony that is too small to support a home-composting program. I shop weekly at our local Farmer's Market (which I love!) but I find myself throwing away the food scraps that are generated. I think such a program would fit well with Belmont's 'green' identity, and I hope the city council will look into starting such a program."

Here is how the San Carlos pilot Food Scraps and Yard Trimmings Program for single-family dwellings only works:

San Carlos residents in single-family homes will be able to put food scraps in their green Yard Trimmings cart for composting starting the week of March 9, 2009. Examples of food scraps include fruit, vegetables, coffee grounds, meat and bones, pizza boxes and food-soiled paper, paper cups, and paper plates. The additional monthly charge for this service is **\$ 2.66 per customer per month**.

Residents simply have to place their food scraps in their new kitchen pail, which will be delivered to homes the week of March 2, 2009, then empty its contents into the green Yard Trimmings cart. The food scraps and yard trimmings will now be picked up **weekly** on the resident's regular garbage collection day. (Recyclables will still be collected every other week.)

What is accepted in the Food Scraps program?

The following items are accepted in the program:

- Food scraps • Egg shells • Coffee filters and tea bags
- Coffee grounds • pizza boxes • Bread, cereal and pasta
- Meat, poultry and bones • Paper grocery bags • Dairy
- Fruits • Paper towels and napkins
- Vegetables • Paper cups and plates

There are no changes to your Yard Trimmings program. You can continue to put grass clippings, leaves and branches (less than 2 inches in diameter and less than 4 feet long), and untreated, clean lumber (no nails) in the cart.

What is not accepted in the Food Scraps & Yard Trimmings program?

- Plastics (including bags) • Pet Waste • Concrete
- Recyclables (cans/bottles, clean paper) • Dirt • Hazardous waste
- Garbage • Rocks

What staff is telling people for now is when we go to weekly yard waste pickup in January 2011 the service will be available to all Belmont residents at no extra charge.

Solid Waste Rates

The City of Belmont completed a Proposition 218 rate hearing process last month. The newly adopted customer rates can be found on the City's website.

General Plan/Vision Statement

The changes planned for the next generation of solid waste collection and processing in Belmont will significantly increase solid waste landfill diversion. New optical scanning technology at the renovated Shoreway recycling coupled with a more convenient recycling collection system will result in higher recycling percentages and a lower carbon footprint in Belmont.

Fiscal Impact

In 2011, the first year of the new solid waste collection franchise, the total revenue from Belmont residential and commercial customers is projected to be \$ 5.4 million. Over the 10-year life of the franchise, total revenue approximates \$62 million. 44 percent of this revenue comes from residential customers and the balance comes from commercial customers.

Public Contact

Posting - On the City's website as well as the official bulletin board

Outreach - At the request of Vice Mayor Wozniak, invited local residents who have previously spoken to the City Council on the issue of dual- vs. single-stream recycling.

Recommendation

This is an informational report. No action is requested

Attachments

- January 1, 2010 Customer Service Questionnaire
- Recology of San Mateo County - Operational Impacts of a Dual-Stream System for the City of Belmont

Respectfully submitted,



Jack Crist
City Manager

Staff Contact

Jack Crist, City Manager
650-595-7408
jcrist@belmont.gov

ATTACHMENT A

cmtemp

From: Jack Crist
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 4:51 PM
To: 'Cliff Feldman'
Cc: City Council + City Clerk; SMT; Marc Zafferano; John Violet; cmtemp
Subject: RE: Model Collection Services Franchise Agreement for review
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Cliff:

Here is the staff response to your questionnaire. I intend to put this on the City Council agenda to validate it. Be advised that City staff and consultants would like to meet with Mr. Ray McDevitt, the attorney that drafted this document. City Attorney Marc Zafferano will be contacting him. You may want to sit in on the meeting also. Carol Tompkins of my office will be making the arrangements. She will contact you next week.

Jack

SURVEY

ITEM ONE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CART SIZES

SBWMA and Norcal both recommend that the default cart sizes be as follows:

Solid Waste:	32 gallons
Recyclables:	64 gallons
Organic Materials:	96 gallons

Do you agree?

YES NO **ITEM TWO: COLLECTION SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED TO YOUR AGENCIES' FACILITIES**

The Contract requires Norcal to provide collection of solid waste, recyclables, and organic materials to "Agency Facilities." These include fixed structures (e.g., buildings), non-fixed structures (e.g., parks) and public street litter/recycling containers. **Attachment B** to the Contract will be a list of each facility that is to be served showing location, number and size of containers, and frequency of

collection. This list will also include all of your street litter/recycling cans.

Has your agency submitted this list to SBWMA? YES NO

(If you answered "no," when will the list be provided? _____)

ITEM THREE: UNIVERSAL ROLL OUT FOR MULTI-FAMILY RECYCLING

Does your agency want this (optional) program to be implemented at the start of the new contract?

YES NO

ITEM FOUR: UNIVERSAL ROLL OUT FOR COMMERCIAL RECYCLING

Does your agency want this (optional) program to be implemented at the start of the new contract?

YES NO

ITEM FIVE: IDENTIFICATION OF AGENCY-SPONSORED EVENTS

The Contract requires Norcal to provide, at no cost, collection services for large events that are sponsored by an agency.

The events that your agency currently sponsors for which you want collection service provided at no cost must be listed on what will be **Attachment C** to the Contract. The events on this list will receive a full scope of service by the contractor including setting up and servicing all "recycling stations" inside the event and delivering and removing all carts, bins and drop boxes necessary to consolidate materials generated at the event.

Does your agency sponsor events for which you want solid waste, recycling and organic materials collection service provided at no cost?

YES NO

If "yes," have you submitted a list of them to SBWMA?

YES NO

(If you answered "no," when will the list be provided? _____)

ITEM NINE: CUSTOMER BILLING

1. Does your agency want Norcal to bill all customers? YES NO

2. Does your agency want Norcal to bill some, but not all customers? YES NO

3. If you answered "Yes" to Question 2, please identify the customer class or type of service you want the Contractor to be responsible for billing:

4. Time frame and frequency of billing

Residential: Quarterly in advance? YES NO

If you answered "No," what time frame/frequency? *Monthly* _____

Commercial: Monthly in arrears? YES NO

If you answered "No," what time frame/frequency? _____

Any other special details we should be aware of related to billing?

ITEM TEN: DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS

The Contract provides two options for the Contractor dealing with delinquent customers.

The options are described in detail in the April 3 chart. Option 1 allows service termination 60 days after the bill becomes delinquent. Option 2 limits enforcement to late fees. Norcal prefers Option 1.

Which option does your agency prefer? OPTION 1 OPTION 2

ITEM ELEVEN: CART COLORS

The standard color palette is:

Solid Waste: Black

Recycling: Blue

Organic Materials: Green

Is your agency satisfied with the standard colors? YES NO

ITEM TWELVE: PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES

An important element in the Contract (and in that with the operator of Shoreway) is a program of incentives and disincentives that includes contamination levels in recyclables and organics delivered to Shoreway.

Attachment I to the new Contract implements this program. Agencies can include the program or not, but cannot include only the disincentives part which include critical performance standards related to contamination of materials delivered to Shoreway, that, if omitted, may drive up costs to process materials.

Does your agency want to include the performance incentives and disincentives in Attachment I? YES NO

ITEM THIRTEEN: PRE-PROGRAMMED CALL TRANSFER

The draft Contract provides that Norcal will forward calls that relate to Agency issues other than solid waste/recycling directly to an Agency phone line. There is no cost for this service.

Does your agency want this service? YES NO

* * * * *

Please fill in the name of your agency and the contact person for us to call if we have any questions.

City of Belmont _____
NAME OF AGENCY

CONTACT PERSON

Name: Jack Crist _____

Phone: 650-595-7410_____

Email: jcrist@belmont.gov_____

From: Cliff Feldman [<mailto:cfeldman@rethinkwaste.org>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2009 4:12 PM
To: Jack Crist
Subject: FW: Model Collection Services Franchise Agreement for review

Jack,

Good afternoon.

I just wanted to provide a friendly reminder that the survey is due today. Also, Jeannine in our office is scheduling individual meetings during July 9-22 and we hope to get yours scheduled to keep the Franchise Agreement on track.

Thanks,

Cliff

Cliff Feldman
Recycling Program Manager
South Bayside Waste Management Authority
cfeldman@rethinkwaste.org
ph: 650.802.3502
fax: 650.802.3501
www.RethinkWaste.org



From: Cliff Feldman [<mailto:cfeldman@rethinkwaste.org>]

6/29/2009

Sent: Sunday, June 07, 2009 11:26 PM

To: 'Alvin James'; 'Anthony Docto (A)'; Jack Crist; 'Brian Moura '; 'Mark Weiss (A)'; 'Nekaya Nachmann'; 'Brian Ponty'; 'Allison Freeman (A)'; 'Dianne Dryer'; ksteffens@menlopark.org; 'Jim Hardy (A)'; 'Ray Towne'; 'Laura Galli (A)'; 'Jim Porter'; 'Joe LaMariana (A)'; 'Martha DeBry'; 'John Simonetti'; 'Larry Patterson'; Roxanne Murray (RMurray@cityofsanmateo.org)

Cc: Kevin McCarthy; Cathy Hidalgo; Jeannene Minnix; Monica Devincenzi; Ray E. McDevitt; Bob Lanzone (RLanzone@adcl.com); 'Jerry Gruber'; 'Kathy Hughes Anderson (A)'; 'Eileen Wilkerson'; Nantell, Jim; 'Jesus Nava'

Subject: Model Collection Services Franchise Agreement for review

Good morning Board Members:

Attached are a cover memo, survey and the Model Collection Services Franchise Agreement (including numerous attachments to the Agreement that were not included in the last version shared with you in April). Please read the cover memo closely as it directs your attention to an important survey that requires your timely input (by June 22). If you have not done so already, we encourage you to share these documents with key Agency staff such as your City Attorney.

The schedule put forth in the memo states that we plan to convene individual meetings over the next month with each Agency and we will schedule these meetings in the next few days.

The attached documents are provided in 'pdf' format (with the exception of the survey) and the Word source files are available upon request.

Please don't hesitate to give me a call if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Cliff

Cliff Feldman
Recycling Program Manager
South Bayside Waste Management Authority
cfeldman@rethinkwaste.org
ph: 650.802.3502
fax: 650.802.3501
www.RethinkWaste.org



Recology San Mateo County
Operational Impacts of a Dual Stream System for the City of Belmont

The following are cost estimates to take into account while considering implementation of a dual stream/split cart system along with the benefits of a single stream system.

<p>1. Truck Cost Differential</p>
<p>The change to a dual stream/split cart system will require the purchase of four (4) Split body collection vehicles. The cost differential is \$55,000 more per unit than the single body collection vehicles proposed for the collection of single stream carts. This totals an additional \$22,000 annually over a ten (10) year period.</p>
<p>2. Decrease in Employee Productivity and Routing Economies of Scale</p>
<p>Since the City of Belmont is the only city evaluating residential split cart recycling, the estimated annual increase in collection cost for this service is \$575,000 per year. The increase in cost is due to additional recycling routes required as a result of lower payload of split body collection vehicles and the loss of routing efficiencies as surrounding cities will be utilizing single body trucks for residential recycling.</p>
<p>3. Cart Cost Differential</p>
<p>Cart costs are higher as split carts cost an average of \$49.00 more per unit than the regular cart proposed to be used in the single stream program. This equates to an additional \$400,000.</p>
<p>4. Increase in Outreach and Marketing Costs</p>
<p>Public Education materials being developed by the SBWMA and Recology are for a Single-Stream Recycling Program. If the City of Belmont chooses a dual stream/split cart program, there will be additional costs associated with the development, design and production of separate Pub Ed materials. Pub Ed material produced by Recology, which include an annual residential service brochure, commercial service brochure and twice-annual commercial recycling notices would cost the City of Belmont \$25,000 annually.</p> <p>Cart hangers developed separately for the City of Belmont would cost approximately \$15,000. In addition, the free "How to Recycle" DVD that Recology is providing to the Member Agencies is for a Single-Stream Recycling Program and would not be applicable to the residents and businesses of Belmont. A DVD produced for the dual stream/split cart program would cost the City of Belmont approximately \$65,000. Additional costs would be incurred for Pub Ed/Outreach materials produced by the SBWMA for the rollout and implementation of new services.</p>

Recology San Mateo County
Operational Impacts of a Dual Stream System for the City of Belmont

5. Estimated Annual Cost Impact of Dual Stream

- \$ 22,000 – Increased Truck Costs
- \$ 575,000 – Decrease in Productivity
- \$ 40,000 – Increased Cart Costs
- \$ 25,000 – Marketing and Outreach
- \$ 80,000 – Marketing and Outreach (Year one costs)

\$662,000 - Estimated Total Annual Cost (not including Year one costs)

6. Additional Benefits of Single Stream System

- No sorting required, which makes the program much easier for customers to use, thus increasing participation and recycling volumes. Studies have shown that single-stream recycling can achieve a recycling increase of 10 to 40%. In San Bruno, we achieved an increase of 25% when we switched from weekly dual stream (tubs) recycling to weekly single-stream (cart) recycling.
- Ability to use standardized fleet for solid waste recyclables thereby resulting in the need for fewer backup trucks
- Discourages scavenging (more difficult to extract targeted CRV materials)
- Dual stream carts do not provide enough capacity for separated materials. This encourages customers to toss excess commodities into the waste cart or placed in wrong side of cart.
- According to Resource Recycling, an industry trade magazine, 85% of jurisdictions in California have chosen a Single-Stream Recycling program