



4

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS
SOLID WASTE DIVISION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

1231 I STREET
SUITE 103
SACRAMENTO, CA
95814-2933

916-449-5757

February 14, 1989

Transportation and Community Development/
Budget and Finance Committees
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: PILOT CURBSIDE RECYCLING PROGRAM STATUS REPORT FOR INFORMATION ONLY

SUMMARY

This report provides information on the pilot curbside recycling program which has been conducted by the Sacramento Local Conservation Corps (SLCC) since March, 1988. Data is provided on participation rates, quantity of material recycled, and market prices for materials. Also, conclusions drawn from the pilot program and policy issues to consider are described. No specific action is recommended at this time. The pilot program is expected to continue and may expand depending on availability of State funding. Information developed during the pilot program will be used to evaluate curbside recycling as a potential element in a City recycling action plan currently in preparation by the cooperative efforts of the City/County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), City staff, and County staff working on a parallel project.

BACKGROUND

In late 1987, the Sacramento Local Conservation Corps (SLCC) proposed to conduct curbside recycling of glass, newsprint, cardboard, and aluminum for about 2,000 single family residences in areas served by the 90 gallon can automated garbage collection system. The SLCC requested the City provide \$20,000 to match other funding to initiate the program. In Resolution 88-043 adopted on January 12, 1988 the City Council authorized City Manager to execute Agreement No. 87158 with the SLCC for the proposed curbside recycling program.

In March, 1988, curbside collection of recyclable materials began in several neighborhoods. Over the months that followed, the service areas were expanded and modified in response to program experience. Currently, about 5,000 homes are being served by the program.

In October, 1988, the SLCC applied for additional State funding to double the program. At that time the City Council approved an additional \$10,000 payment in Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement (approved in Resolution 88-867 on October 11, 1988). Payment of the \$10,000 is still pending the award of the State grant to SLCC.

On December 23, 1988 the SLCC submitted to the City a summary report (copy attached) in accordance with the Agreement. According to the summary report, the quantity of material recycled from March 21, 1988 through December 23, 1988 was:

Glass	48,040 lbs
Newsprint	165,020
Aluminum	2,316
Plastic (PET)	545
Magazines	2,300
TOTAL	218,221 lbs or 109 tons

Also, according to the summary report, household weekly participation rates varied from a low of 0% to a high of 13.11%.

FINANCIAL DATA

This report does not recommend the expenditure of additional funds at this time. To date, the City has contributed \$20,000 to the SLCC towards the pilot program expenses. In addition, the City has committed another \$10,000 to expand the program contingent on SLCC receiving additional grant funds from the State for the expansion.

As noted in the general conclusions of the SLCC report, none of the existing service areas are self supporting with revenues received from the sale of recyclables. Only a few service areas may become self supporting over time even with reduced scavenging, favorable market conditions, ongoing public relations campaigns to improve and maintain participation levels. Implementation of a City wide curbside program would require some form of financial support.

POLICY MATTERS

There are several policy issues which are relevant to the pilot curbside recycling program. Although no specific action is recommended at this time, these policy issues should be considered when reviewing curbside recycling.

The City Council on July 25, 1988, adopted Resolution No. 88-673 which establishes a goal of recycling at least 20% of the solid waste generated within the City of Sacramento. In the same Resolution, the Council directed the City/County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) to develop a proposed action plan to meet the 20% goal and to describe the proposed action plan in a report to the Council by June 1, 1989. Curbside recycling is one among many recycling possibilities which could contribute toward meeting the goal. This pilot program will have to be reviewed by SWAC as a part of preparing a proposed action plan. It should be noted that the County has taken the lead (as mandated by State law in the context of the County Solid Waste Management Plan) in developing County wide recycling programs in cooperation with the incorporated cities. The County is currently securing the services of a consultant to conduct County wide waste characterization studies, market analyses for recyclable materials, analyses of existing recycling activities throughout the County, and to prepare a menu of options for recycling that would meet the stated goals. The final report of the consultant will include comments on curbside recycling and will be of great value to the City in creating our own recycling action plan. One significant problem with the pilot program has been

an anti-scavenging ordinance (May 10, 1988, Ordinance No.88-032). Based on its experience with the pilot program, the SLCC has recommended a stronger anti-scavenging ordinance along with funding for an aggressive enforcement program. If curbside recycling is to be an element of a City recycling action plan, the scavenging problem will have to be addressed again.

One of the conclusions reached by SLCC is that the success of curbside recycling varies with neighborhood characteristics, specifically demographics. In some neighborhoods, the SLCC recommends buy-back centers as a more cost effective means of recycling. However, as a policy matter, it may not be acceptable to provide differing levels of service to different neighborhoods even when supported by valid research and actual experience.

Even if curbside recycling is not a major element of a City recycling action plan, the work of the SLCC in providing job training to young adults and the possibility of continued State funding, may make the program desirable to maintain at some level. From a more general perspective, it could be stated that the proposed workforce for future curbside recycling programs may raise policy issues other than recycling.


MBE/WBE

The services of the Sacramento Local Conservation Corps are for a pilot program and are taking advantage of State funding obtained by SLCC. Therefore, there was no competitive bidding process and no WBE/MBE impacts.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the committees forward this report to City Council to file for information.

Respectfully submitted,




DAVID A. PELSER
Solid Waste Division Manager

Approved:



MELVIN H. JOHNSON
Director of Public Works

Approved for Information:


SOLON WISHAM, JR.
Assistant City Manager

Contact Person to
Answer Questions:

February 14, 1989
All Districts

DAVID A. PELSER, SOLID WASTE DIVISION MANAGER
449-2043



**Sacramento Local
Conservation Corps**

December 23, 1988

David Pelser, Manager
Department of Public Works
Solid Waste Division
City of Sacramento
1231 I Street, Suite 103
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Pelser:

The Sacramento Local Conservation Corps has provided the City of Sacramento with a series of reports relating to our curbside recycling program. This report updates those statistics we are obligated to provide the City in a final compilation.

This compilation includes a report on the volume of materials handled, vendor prices at the time of sale and participation rates on our routes. This report also contains some general conclusions and observations based on the operation of our pilot. We ask that you contact us if you require clarification of any information herein.

Sincerely,

Gary Van Dorst
Executive Director

GVD/dry

RECEIVED
DEC 27 1988

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
SC

STATISTICS

ROUTE	AVE. # PICK-UPS	AVE. PERCENTAGE
-------	-----------------	-----------------

Week: March 21-24

47, Monday	34	5.66%
38, Tuesday	6	1.05%
57, Tuesday	12	2.13%
57, Wednesday	20	3.44%
47, Thursday	7	3.50%

Week: March 28 - 31

47, Monday	24	4.00%
57, Monday	12	2.02%
38, Tuesday	7	1.22%
57, Tuesday	23	4.08%
57, Wednesday	15	2.58%
47, Thursday	6	3.00%

Week: April 4 - 7

47, Monday	32	5.33%
57, Monday	16	2.69%
38, Tuesday	18	3.15%
57, Tuesday	5	.08%
57, Wednesday	11	1.89%
61, Wednesday	5	.08%
47, Thursday	4	2.00%

Week: April 11 - 14

47, Monday	26	4.56%
57, Monday	14	2.36%
38, Tuesday	26	4.55%
57, Tuesday	10	1.77%
57, Wednesday	18	3.09%
61, Wednesday	4	.007%
47, Thursday	5	2.00%

4

STATISTICS

ROUTE	AVE. # PICK-UPS**	WEEKLY %	MONTHLY % April 18-May 12
-------	-------------------	----------	------------------------------

Week: April 18-21*

47, Monday	16	2.80%	29.29%
57, Monday	12	2.02%	24.50%
38, Tuesday	22	3.85%	20.84%
57, Tuesday	8	1.42%	10.12%
57, Wednesday	7	1.20%	10.96%
61, Wednesday	3	.52%	2.45%
47, Thursday	3	1.50%	2.55%

Week: April 25-28

47, Monday	25	4.38%
57, Monday	7	1.18%
38, Tuesday	26	4.55%
57, Tuesday	19	3.37%
57, Wednesday	10	1.72%
61, Wednesday	3	.52%
47, Thursday	12	6.00%

Week: May 2-5

47, Monday	24	4.21%
57, Monday	5	.84%
38, Tuesday	18	3.03%
57, Tuesday	7	1.20%
57, Wednesday	13	2.23%
61, Wednesday	2	.35%
47, Thursday	9	4.50%

Week: May 9-12

47, Monday	27	4.73%
57, Monday	12	2.02%
38, Tuesday	19	3.32%
57, Tuesday	5	.88%
57, Wednesday	13	2.23%
61, Wednesday	2	.35%
47, Thursday	7	3.50%

MONTHLY
April 18-May 12

ROUTE	AVE. # PICK-UPS	WEEKLY %
-------	-----------------	----------

Week: May 16-19

47, Monday	23	4.03%
57, Monday	10	1.68%
38, Tuesday	17	2.97%
57, Tuesday	9	1.59%
57, Wednesday	12	2.06%
61, Wednesday	2	.35%
47, Thursday	8	4.00%

Week: May 23-26

47, Monday	52	9.12%
57, Monday	3	.50%
38, Tuesday	17	2.97%
57, Tuesday	9	1.59%
57, Wednesday	10	1.72%
61, Wednesday	2	.35%
47, Thursday	12	6.00%

Week: May 30-June 2

47, Monday	33	5.78%
57, Monday	HOLIDAY	
38, Tuesday	23	4.02%
57, Tuesday	5	.80%
57, Wednesday	20	3.44%
61, Wednesday	4	.70%
47, Thursday	18	9.00%

* Inclement weather related to lower participation rates.
 ** Includes drop-off from Cosumnes River College which we regard as insignificant.

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE	Av. # Pick-ups*	Weekly%	Monthly % 6/6-7/7
-------	-----------------	---------	----------------------

Week: June 6-9

47 Mon.	64	11.2%	40.70%
57 Mon.	2	.33%	7.08%
38 Tues.	36	6.00%	23.64%
57 Tues.	30	5.25%	17.58%
18 Tues.	4	.71%	23.50%
57 Wed.	17	2.92%	14.62%
61 Wed.	1	.17%	1.40%
47 Thurs.	27	4.50%	33.00%
18 Thurs.	7	3.50%	12.50%

Week: June 13-16

47 Mon.	58	10.17%	
57 Mon.	3	.50%	
38 Tues.	30	5.25%	
57 Tues.	5	.85%	
18 Tues.	36	6.00%	
57 Wed.	24	4.13%	
61 Wed.	3	.52%	
47 Thurs.	10	5.00%	
18 Thurs.	12	2.00%	

Week: June 20-23

47 Mon.	33	5.78%	
57 Mon.	20	3.37%	
38 Tues.	25	4.37%	
57 Tues.	25	4.38%	
18 Tues.	30	5.00%	
57 Wed.	12	2.06%	
61 Weds.	1	.17%	
47 Thurs.	14	7.00%	
18 Thurs.	22	3.66%	

Week: June 27-30

47 Mon.	45	7.89%	
57 Mon.	10	1.68%	
38 Tues.	21	3.67%	
57 Tues.	21	3.73%	
18 Tues.	35	5.83%	
57 Wed.	17	2.92%	
61 Wed.	3	.52%	
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%	
18 Thurs.	18	3.00%	

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE	AV. # PICK-UPS	WEEKLY %	MONTHLY%
-------	----------------	----------	----------

Week: July 11 - 15

47 Mon.	27	4.73%	
57 Mon.	11	1.85%	
38 Tues.	21	3.67%	
57 Tues.	12	2.13%	
18 Tues.	20	3.33%	
57 Wed.	17	2.92%	
61 Wed.	2	.35%	
47 Thurs.	4	2.00%	
18 Thurs.	13	2.16%	

Week: July 18 - 22

47 Mon.	34	5.96%	
57 Mon.	7	1.18%	
38 Tues.	16	2.80%	
57 Tues.	11	1.95%	
18 Tues.	31	5.16%	
57 Wed.	13	2.23%	
61 Wed.	3	.52%	
47 Thurs.	6	3.00%	
18 Thurs.	17	2.83%	
39 Fri.	31	5.67%	

Week: July 25 - 29

47 Mon.	30	5.26%	
57 Mon.	20	3.37%	
38 Tues.	17	2.97%	
57 Tues.	16	2.84%	
18 Tues.	21	3.50%	
57 Wed.	14	2.40%	
61 Wed.	1	.17%	
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%	
18 Thurs.	20	3.33%	
39 Fri.	24	4.39%	

Week: August 1 - 5

47 Mon.	29	5.08%	
57 Mon.	10	1.68%	
38 Tues.	22	3.85%	
57 Tues.	8	1.42%	
18 Tues.	21	3.50%	
57 Wed.			
61 Wed.			
47 Thurs.			
18 Thurs.			
39 Fri.			

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE	AV. # PICK-UPS	WEEKLY %	MONTHLY %
-------	----------------	----------	-----------

Week: August 3 - 5

57 Wed.	5	.86%	
61 Wed.	0	0	
47 Thurs.	4	2.00%	
18 Thurs.	10	1.66%	
39 Fri.	12	2.19%	

Week: August 8 - 12

47 Mon.	28	4.91%	
57 Mon.	5	.84%	
18 Tues.	11	2.01%	
38 Tues.	15	2.82%	
57 Tues.	13	2.30%	
57 Wed.	9	1.54%	
61 Wed.	1	N/A	
18 Thurs.	9	1.50%	
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%	
39 Fri.	18	3.29%	

Week: August 15 - 19

47 Mon.	45	7.89%	
57 Mon.	11	1.85%	
18 Tues.	26	4.75%	
38 Tues.	14	2.45%	
57 Tues.	9	1.51%	
57 Wed.	8	1.37%	
61 Wed.	1	N/A	
18 Thurs.	11	1.83%	
47 Thurs.	11	5.50%	
39 Fri.	8	1.46%	

Week: August 22 - 26

47 Mon.	29	5.08%	
57 Mon.	8	1.34%	
18 Tues.	15	2.74%	
38 Tues.	16	2.80%	
57 Tues.	11	1.95%	
57 Wed.	8	1.37%	
61 Wed.	0	N/A	
18 Thurs.	21	3.50%	
47 Thurs.	7	3.50%	
39 Fri.	22	4.02%	

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

<u>ROUTE</u>	<u>AV. # PICK-UPS</u>	<u>WEEKLY %</u>	<u>MONTHLY %</u>
<u>Week: August 29 - September 2</u>			
47 Mon.	44	7.71%	
57 Mon.	3	.50%	
18 Tues.	17	3.10%	
38 Tues.	11	1.92%	
57 Tues.	17	3.01%	
57 Wed.	3	.51%	
61 Wed.	0	N/A	
18 Thurs.	22	3.60%	(Locked in community canvassed on 8/27/88)
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%	
39 Fri.	14	2.56%	
<u>Week: September 5 - 9</u>			
47 Mon.	28	4.91%	
57 Mon.	2	.33%	
18 Tues.	20	3.65%	
38 Tues.	16	2.80%	
57 Tues.	11	1.95%	
57 Wed.	3	.51%	
61 Wed.	0	N/A	
18 Thurs.	18	3.00%	
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%	
39 Fri.	54	9.89%	(Canvassed on 9/3/88)

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE	AVG. # PICK-UPS	WEEKLY %	MONTHLY %
-------	-----------------	----------	-----------

Week: Sept. 12 - 16

47 Mon.	28	4.91%	
57 Mon.	7	1.18%	
18 Tues.	19	3.47%	
38 Tues.	13	2.27%	
57 Tues.	6	1.06%	
57 Wed.	6	1.03%	
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A	
18 Thurs.	26	4.34%	
47 Thurs.	7	3.5%	
39 Fri.	45	8.34%	

Week: Sept. 19 - 23

47 Mon.	22	3.85%	
57 Mon.	7	1.18%	
18 Tues.	14	2.73%	
38 Tues.	10	1.75%	
57 Tues.	18	3.19%	Canvassed on 9/17/88
57 Wed.	7	1.2%	
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A	
18 Thurs.	21	3.5%	
47 Thurs.	6	3%	
39 Fri.	36	6.67%	

Week: Sept. 26 - 30

47 Mon.	19	3.3%	
57 Mon.	12	2.02%	
18 Tues.	7	1.36%	
38 Tues.	14	2.45%	
57 Tues.	16	2.84%	
57 Wed.	7	1.2%	
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A	
18 Thurs.	33	5.69%	Canvassed on 9/24/88
47 Thurs.	10	5%	
39 Fri.	42	7.79%	

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE	AVG. # PICK-UPS	WEEKLY %	MONTHLY %
-------	-----------------	----------	-----------

Week: Oct. 3 - 7

47 Mon.	22	3.85%	
57 Mon.	6	1.01%	
18 Tues.	18	3.52%	
38 Tues.	9	1.57%	
57 Tues.	14	2.48%	
57 Wed.	4	.68%	
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A	
18 Thurs.	24	4.14%	
47 Thurs.	7	3.5%	
39 Fri.	49	9.09%	

Week: Oct. 10 - 14

47 Mon.	22	3.85%	
57 Mon.	7	1.18%	
18 Tues.	36	7.04%	
38 Tues.	13	2.27%	
57 Tues.	0	0	
57 Wed.	5	.86%	
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A	
18 Thurs.	27	4.66%	
47 Thurs.	7	3.5%	
39 Fri.	29	5.38%	(rained this date)

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE AVG. # PICK-UPS WEEKLY % MONTHLY%

Week: Oct. 17 - 21

47 Mon.	27	4.73%
57 Mon.	4	.67%
18 Tues.	17	3.32%
38 Tues.	15	2.62%
57 Tues.	5	.88%
57 Wed.	3	.51%
61 Wed.	1	N/A
18 Thurs.	23	3.97%
47 Thurs.	7	3.5%
39 Fri.	37	6.86%

Week: Oct. 24 - 28

47 Mon.	26	4.56%
57 Mon.	4	.67%
18 Tues.	6	1.17%
38 Tues.	12	2.1%
57 Tues.	12	2.13%
57 Wed.	5	.86%
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A
18 Thurs.	26	4.49%
47 Thurs.	6	3%
39 Fri.	37	6.86%

Week: Oct. 31 - Nov. 4

47 Mon.	21	3.68%
57 Mon.	3	.5%
18 Tues.	12	2.34%
38 Tues.	20	3.5%
57 Tues.	9	1.59%
57 Wed.	5	.86% (theft?)
61 Wed.	N/A	N/A
18 Thurs.	17	2.93%
47 Thurs.	3	1.5%
39 Fri.	24	4.45%

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

<u>ROUTE</u>	<u>AVG. # PICK-UPS</u>	<u>WEEKLY %</u>
--------------	------------------------	-----------------

Week: Nov. 7 - 11

47 Mon.	19	3.33%
57 Mon.	1	.16% (theft?)
18 Tues.	19	3.71%
38 Tues.	11	1.92%
57 Tues.	8	1.42%
57 Wed.	3	.51%
61 Wed.	1	N/A
18 Thurs.	12	2.07%
47 Thurs.	4	2%
39 Fri.	30	5.56%

Week: Nov. 14 - 18

47 Mon.	18	3.15%
57 Mon.	0	N/A
18 Tues.	11	2.15%
38 Tues.	6	1.05%
57 Tues.	6	1.06%
57 Wed.	9	1.54%
61 Wed.	0	N/A
18 Thurs.	12	2.07%
47 Thurs.	5	2.5%
39 Fri.	27	5%

Week: Nov. 21 - 25

47 Mon.	29	5.08%
57 Mon.	1	.16%
18 Tues.	4	.78%
38 Tues.	4	.70% (rainy weather)
57 Tues.	9	1.59%
57 Wed.	1	.17% (rainy weather)
61 Wed.	0	N/A
18 Thurs.	10	1.73% (Thanksgiving Day)
47 Thurs.	4	2.0%
39 Fri.	11	2.04% (Thanksgiving Weekend)

PARTICIPATION RATES

<u>ROUTE</u>	<u>AVG. # PICK-UPS</u>	<u>WEEKLY %</u>
--------------	------------------------	-----------------

Week: Nov. 28 -Dec. 2

47 Mon.	28	4.91%
57 Mon.	1	.16%
18 Tues.	20	3.91%
38 Tues.	13	2.27%
57 Tues.	6	1.06%
57 Wed.	9	1.54%
61 Wed.	1	N/A
18 Thurs.	25	4.31%
47 Thurs.	6	3.00%
39 Fri.	31	5.75%

Week: Dec. 5 - 9

47 Mon.	23	4.03%
57 Mon.	2	.33%
18 Tues.	19	3.71%
38 Tues.	7	1.23%
57 Tues.	7	1.24%
57 Wed.	5	.88%
61 Wed.	0	N/A
18 Thurs.	17	2.93%
47 Thurs.	5	2.50%
39 Fri.	32	5.93%

Week: Dec. 12 - 16

47 Mon.	20	3.51%
57 Mon.	3	.51%
18 Tues.	67	13.11% (canvassed previous weekend)
38 Tues.	20	3.50%
57 Tues.	4	.71%
57 Wed.	17	2.93%
18 Thurs.	15	2.59%
47 Thurs.	7	3.50%
39 Fri.	33	6.12%

4

PARTICIPATION RATES

ROUTE AVG. # PICK-UPS WEEKLY %

Week: Dec. 19 - 23

47 Mon.	7	.34% (heavy rain)
57 Mon.	2	1.23%
18 Tues.	35	6.84%
38 Tues.	5	.87%
57 Tues.	6	1.06%
57 Wed.	4	.69%
18 Thurs.	8	1.38% (rain)
47 Thurs.	8	4.00%
39 Fri.	28	5.19%

VOLUME

Total Weight for the period March 21 to April 14 is estimated as follows:

<u>RECYCLED MATERIAL</u>	<u>TOTAL WEIGHT</u>	<u>EXPLANATION</u>
Glass	6000 lbs.	Total weight of full glass containers weigh 3200 lbs. As of 4/14/88, we have filled glass containers twice and estimate that 7% of glass was "drop-off"
Newsprint	7 tons	Total weight of full newsprint container is 7.96 tons. Collection from curbside has filled 95% of container.
Aluminum	174 lbs.	By scale weight
Plastic	5 lbs.	By scale weight

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

<u>MATERIALS</u>	<u>PRICE</u>
Glass	\$100/ton
Newsprint	\$53/ton
Aluminum	.85¢/lbs.
Plastic	.28¢/lbs.

VOLUME

* Total weight for the period April 18 to June 2 is estimated as follows:

<u>RECYCLED MATERIAL</u>	<u>TOTAL WEIGHT</u>
Glass	9,270 pounds
Newsprint	16 tons
Aluminum	250 pounds
Plastic	80 pounds

<u>AVERAGE DAILY PICK-UPS</u>	<u>** TOTAL WEIGHT</u>
Glass	195 pounds
Newsprint	270 pounds
Aluminum	5 pounds
Plastic	2 pounds

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

Glass	\$100/ton
Newsprint	\$ 45/ton
Aluminum	\$.85/lb
Plastic	\$.28/lb

* Includes drop-off from Cosumnes River College Recycling Center which we regard as insignificant

**Average total weight for approximately 1200 residents

VOLUME

* Total Weight for the period June 6 to July 7 is estimated as follows:

<u>RECYCLED MATERIAL</u>	<u>*TOTAL WEIGHT</u>
Glass	6,765 lbs.
Newsprint	10 tons
Aluminum	288 lbs.
Plastic	90 lbs.

<u>AVERAGE DAILY PICK UPS</u>	<u>**TOTAL WEIGHT</u>
Glass	338 lbs.
Newsprint	1000 lbs.
Aluminum	14 lbs.
Plastic	5 lbs.

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

Glass	\$100/ton
Newsprint	\$ 50/ton
Aluminum	\$.85/lb.
Plastic	\$.28/lb.

* Includes drop-off at Cosumnes River College Recycling Center which we regard as insignificant.

** Average total weight for approximately 1200 single family residences

Note: Average pick=30.73 lbs.

VOLUME

Weight for Period July 8-September 9, 1988:

<u>RECYCLED MATERIAL</u>	<u>TOTAL WEIGHT</u>
Glass	6795 lbs. (3.39 tons)
Newsprint	30880 lbs. (15.44 tons)
Aluminum	302.05 lbs.
Plastic	200 lbs.
Magazines	880 lbs. (.44 tons)

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

Newspaper	\$ 48.00/ton
Aluminum	92¢/lbs.
Glass	\$140.00/ton (\$30/ton hauling charge)
Plastic	24.6¢/lbs.
Magazines	\$ 30.00/ton

*Average lbs. per pick-up (Total weight divided by total pick-ups)
53.64 lbs. (including drop-off at CRC Recycling Center)

VOLUME

4

Weight for Period 9/10/88-10/14/88:

<u>Recycled Material</u>	<u>Total Weight</u>
Glass	7940 lbs. (3.97 tons)
Newsprint	18,580 lbs. (9.29 tons)
Aluminum	356.05 lbs.
Plastic	Stockpiled for this period
Magazines	Stockpiled for this period

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

Newspaper	\$30/ton
Aluminum	97¢/lb.
Glass	\$140.00/ton (\$30/ton hauling charge)
Plastic	\$24.6/lb
Magazines	\$30.00/ton

Average lbs. per pick-up (total weight divided by total pick-ups)
equals 35.5 lbs. (including drop-off at CRC Recycling Center)

VOLUME

Weight for Period 10/17/88-12/23/88:

<u>Recycled Material</u>	<u>Total Weight</u>
Glass	11,270 lbs. (5.64 tons)
Newsprint	49,560 (24.78 tons)
Aluminum	936.4 lbs.
Plastic (PET)	170 lbs.
Magazines	<u>1420 lbs. (.71 tons)</u>
TOTAL VOLUME FROM CURBSIDE	63,356.40 lbs. (31.68 tons)

Current rates for recycled materials are as follows:

Newspaper	\$30/ton
Aluminum	\$.92/lb
Glass	\$140/ton (\$30/ton)
Plastic (PET)	\$24.6¢/lb.
Magazines	\$25/ton

Average lbs. per pick-up (total weight divided by total pick-ups for period equals 52.45 lbs. (including drop-off at CRC)

General Conclusions and Observations

1. The SLCC has made an attempt to quantify the degree of scavenging on its routes. However, we have been unable to allocate the manpower sufficient to formulate truly sound conclusions in regard to the above. Notwithstanding this consideration, our efforts have yielded some observations.
 - a. Scavenging is inconsistent. It appears to be contingent upon both weather and vendor prices.
 - b. Although difficult to quantify, we are of the belief that the scrap value of a material has an affect on the degree of scavenging. Since the value of a ton of newspaper print has gone down significantly (i.e. from roughly \$48/ton to \$30/ton to us and less for private parties), we have greatly increased the volume of newspaper print we handle. However, there are other variables at work with respect to this phenomenon.
 - c. A second variable which could be used to explain the recent sharp increase in volume of several of our routes is the weather. It may be that inclement weather has actually increased our recorded participation rates and volume on certain routes by discouraging scavenging which occurs in the wee hours of the morning.
 - d. A third variable is the natural increase in participation rates due to continued operation of the program and canvassing to solicit participation.
 - e. Whatever is done to expand the curbside program in Sacramento will be subject to a serious challenge from scavengers which we suspect actually decrease participation. When a scavenger steals the container we provide a participant, that participant is not rewarded by the return of the container for participation the next week. In several instances, scavenging of those businesses we recycle has resulted in discontinued service of same. In no instance has a private party stepped in to provide that service where scavenging caused us to pull out.
 - f. Scavenging can be as high as 66% which we have documented on certain routes in past periodic reports. We find ourselves running routes in the Valley Hi area where there is sometimes only one pick-up on a route that started with 20 pick-ups each week. Scavenging can completely devastate a route in certain neighborhoods. This may be a pattern unique to certain neighborhoods and areas since this is not a problem shared by several other programs such as El Cerrito, Santa Barbara, etc.
 - g. In conjunction with the City of Sacramento, the enactment of a local anti-scavenging ordinance is important but difficult for us to know the impact of. In those rare instances where we are able to obtain a license number, the Solid Waste Division sent out threatening letters to referencing this ordinance. If the City of Sacramento were to greatly increase its curbside service on a citywide basis, we believe it would be necessary to allocate monies for the purpose of enforcing this ordinance. We would also recommend a stricter ordinance and advise the City of Sacramento that there are monies available through the State Division of Conservation for the purpose of enforcing nuisance abatement codes such as littering and recycling.

- 4
2. Participation rates have dropped to very low levels on some of our routes and have recently risen to post encouraging statistics on other routes. We attribute this to several considerations. We believe that those routes posting very low participation rates are probably subject to regular scavenging and that these are routes with reasonably low rates to begin with. We attribute the higher rates to our canvassing efforts in conjunction with the demographic make-up of those same neighborhoods.

We reify the above generalization with the reminder that we suspended our coverage of Meadowview after averaging one pick-up each week for three months. We also remind you that our Town Meeting in Meadowview produced one couple with a mailer going out to almost 600 single family residences. Demographics are the key to planning a successful curbside program and inherent within this recommendation is the notion that it will never be cost effective to provide curbside service on a citywide basis. This is to say, those neighborhoods with the right demographic make-up supported by valid research should be targeted for curbside service and those neighborhoods not so targeted should be serviced by buy-back centers.

3. The SLCC has not produced the kind of participation which will pay for a curbside program. We believe that such participation rates may be possible in certain neighborhoods with the proper marketing (i.e. canvassing, development of block leader programs and resident participation, etc.). However, we believe that it is also realistic to conclude that such participation rates cannot be achieved overnight. It takes time to build routes. It has taken some successful programs such as Marin's years to succeed and that the City of Sacramento must be prepared to risk a sizable investment to establish any kind of comprehensive citywide program. We believe that some of our routes have the potential for being self-supporting at some point but that that will take more time.

SLCC Subsequent Activity and Recommendations

1. The City of Sacramento will soon be hiring a Waste Reduction Coordinator. We recommend that the SLCC work closely with that Coordinator to provide them the information they will need to plan a comprehensive program for the City under the supervision of the Manager of the Solid Waste Division.
2. The SLCC will continue providing service to approximately 5,000 residences and has proposed expanding that service to 10000 residences with a DOR grant recently proffered to the State. We strongly suggest that those refuse routes in the South area which we anticipate expanding to be chosen to roughly imitate the same demographic attributes as exhibited by our more successful routes. Demographic statistics which we are especially referring to concern the degree of owner occupancy, level of income and level of educational attainment, turn-over of houses in the neighborhood, age, etc.

- 4
3. The SLCC has proposed to set up a crew under funding by the Dept. of Conservation which will initially recycle newspaper print and beverage containers for several State office buildings. The SLCC has also proposed to recycle businesses in the Midtown, downtown and South areas under State funding. This would be an expansion of the several businesses we are already recycling.
 4. The SLCC has also proposed for State funding an automated data collection system which will make possible a precise study correlating demographics with curbside participation rates. We recommend that the City of Sacramento take advantage of this unique opportunity to break new ground by participating in a study which will make possible the accurate prediction of curbside participation rates.
 5. The SLCC predicts that some of its rates will continue to grow in participation. We predict that the limited expansion of our curbside routes implemented in the context of demographic considerations will assure increased success on the new routes. We predict that a more comprehensive program implemented following the Automated Data Collection System Study proposed to the State would allow the establishment of only those routes predisposed toward successful participation.
 6. The SLCC anticipates being able to bring thousands of dollars in grant monies to supplement funding for City of Sacramento recycling activities including but not limited to the recycling of businesses and apartment complexes, the recycling of State office buildings, the recycling of single family residences, canvassing of residences and businesses, etc. We have a commitment to recycling in this community and we have the capability of getting the job done.