

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

## Agenda

### Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Update

**Date:** Wednesday, September 4, 2019

**Time:** 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

**Location:** 400 County Center, 1st Floor, Sheriff's Criminal Justice Training Room,  
Redwood City, CA

1. Public comment for items not on the agenda
2. Approval of minutes of August 23, 2019 meeting                      Action
3. Continued discussion of the review of the CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element  
Discussion
4. Approval of Ad Hoc Committee Letters of Findings for C/CAG Board Approval  
(Gordon Tong – Resource Conservation Program Manager, County of San Mateo)  
Information/Discussion/Action

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of the CIWMP Ad hoc Committee's meetings will be posted on the public announcement kiosk at the plaza located at 455/400 County Center, Redwood City, CA and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov> and on the County Office of Sustainability website at: <https://www.smcustainability.org/waste-reduction/reduce-reuse-recycle/>

**PUBLIC RECORDS:** Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records

are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker. Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Eun-Soo Lim at 650-599-1498 / [eulim@smcgov.org](mailto:eulim@smcgov.org) at least five working days prior to the meeting date.

*If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact Ad Hoc Committee Staff: Eun-Soo Lim (650) 599-1498 / [eulim@smcgov.org](mailto:eulim@smcgov.org)*

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

## Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

### Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Update

**Date:** Friday, August 23, 2019

**Attendees:** Committee Members: Lillian Clark, Tammy Del Bene, Monica Devincenzi, Charles Ice, Christine Kohl-Zaugg (Vice Chair), Rebecca Lucky, Barbra Mathewson, Roxanne Murray, Adam Rak, Ann Schneider (Chair), Vicki Sherman, Stephen Stolte, Gordon Tong

Alternate Committee Members: Leilani Ramos

Others in attendance: Julia Au, Prabhjot Khangura, Eun-Soo Lim (staff)

**Not in attendance:** Committee Members: Joe La Mariana, Stephen Stolte

**Location:** 455 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City (Conference Room 402)

**Call to Order:** 10:05 AM

#### 1. Introductions

Each attendee introduced themselves.

#### 2. Election of vice chair

Christine Kohl-Zaugg was elected as the Ad Hoc Committee Vice Chair unanimously (nominated by Chair Schneider).

#### 3. Public comment for items not on the agenda

No public comment was provided to the committee.

#### 4. Approval of minutes of August 9, 2019 meeting

Ms. Devincenzi moved and Ms. Clark seconded approval of the August 9, 2019 meeting

minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

## **5. Review of CIWMP Household Hazardous Waste Element**

Committee Member Charles Ice (Environmental Health Program Supervisor, County of San Mateo) provided an overview of the Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) and provided findings of the review of the element.

The County's Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) program is a very mature program that includes HHW collection events, a permanent collection facility at Tower Road (by appointment only), a Very Small Quantity Generator (VSQG) Program, an HHQ giveaway program, retail take back program, and door-to-door collection for those with limited mobility. The HHW program also provides services to cities for their abandoned waste and provides support for statewide product stewardship initiatives. The HHW characterization team identifies unknown materials discovered by first responders. Recently, new initiatives have included a new appointment system, digital improvements for paperwork, Smarter Sorting for donations, and additional education campaigns (e.g., Healthy Nail Salons, marine flare collection, etc.)

Mr. Ice concluded by saying that the element is still adequate, and improvements are a part of the process and can be done without updating the HHWE. He stated that the CIWMP is designed to illustrate the process rather than being descriptive of all the programs. He recommended that the committee find that there is no need to update the HHWE.

Chair Schneider commented that thrift stores are an important aspect of reducing waste. Ms. Sherman agreed and said that there is a lot of e-waste in Redwood City. Mr. Tong commented that the County holds quarterly e-waste collection events and that the County works with Goodwill, who reuses select operational items as much as possible.

Chair Schneider suggested that since there are many cities in the county with questions about the HHW program, this may be indicative of missing information/gaps in the HHWE. Ms. Clark mentioned that PCBs, universal wastes, and asbestos are not addressed. Mr. Ice replied that the HHWE is designed to be a plan and not a cookbook that has every ingredient listed. He stated that the County's Environmental Health (EH) Service Department is constantly evaluating programs and needs flexibility to implement programs.

Ms. Mathewson commented that sharps are a problem because there is no place to dispose of them on the coast. Mr. Ice replied that sharps are a physical hazard and medical waste, not a hazardous waste. He stated that there is pending new legislation (SB 212) that would address sharps.

Ms. Del Bene asked if smoke alarms and propane tanks are accepted. Mr. Ice replied that a current EH program takes large propane tanks (up to 5 gallons) and by appointment only. He mentioned that there is also a program called "Refuel Your Fun" coordinated by the Office of Sustainability (OOS).

Chair Schneider commented that elected officials is usually unaware of the details of existing programs and asked how the County ensures that non-South Bayside Waste Management Agency (SBWMA) cities receive information about HHW. Mr. Ice replied that EH does not make a distinction between SBWMA cities and non-SBWMA cities and does outreach accordingly throughout the entire county. Ms. Devincenzi commented that cities participate in a countywide recycling meeting coordinated by the OOS to discuss updates to solid waste programs in the county. Haulers, cities, and other relevant waste management staff attend those meetings. Mr. Rak agreed that there may be a disconnect between SBWMA and non-SBWMA cities in terms of outreach.

Chair Schneider asked what the process is for the next committee meeting. Mr. Tong replied that the current meeting is to gather input from the committee to write up a final letter for the C/CAG Board, for approval by the committee at the next committee meeting.

Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg asked what the monitoring and review cycle was for HHW programs. Mr. Ice replied that the process is detailed in the element.

Chair Schneider asked how the HHWEs were evaluated to be accurate. Mr. Ice replied that the Electronic Annual Reports (EARs) are analyzed in collaboration with partners.

Ms. Del Bene commented that the HHW program has grown considerably over the years and much more services are being offered now within the county. To her, it seems that the HHWE and the existing system are working.

Chair Schneider asked how legislation around HHWE had changed and mentioned that there is a lot of sharps and human waste in northern county areas. Mr. Ice replied that that sharps and human waste are not HHW. Mr. Tong replied that staff will look into which category sharps fall under within the CIWMP and include the information in the summary of findings.

Ms. Clark commented that she believes the HHWE needs to be amended in part because universal waste is not discussed in the document. Mr. Ice replied that the HHWE includes universal waste because it is a category of HHW. Ms. Del Bene agreed with Ms. Clark in that she doesn't know if universal waste was a category when the HHWE was developed. Ms. Au suggested keeping things broad in the HHWE since people generally do not understand what universal waste is; it is only relevant that the city/County staff understand the distinctions for program development and implementation. Chair Schneider mentioned that she would like to explore changes and see a list of relevant state laws and regulations around HHW since the development of the HHWE.

Ms. Sherman asked if an update of the HHWE would lead to a process improvement for existing HHW programs in the county. If it does not, she recommended not updating the HHWE. Ms. Devincenzi agreed that if city staff has a good understand of what universal waste is and how to implement relevant programs, the current HHWE is sufficient. Ms. Murray stated that the HHWE is sufficient, but more education may be needed throughout the county around HHW and existing programs.

Mr. Rak asked where medicine waste disposal fits in the CWIMP. Chair Schneider stated that there appears to be a desire to study and discuss this in more detail at the next meeting.

## **6. Review of CIWMP Source Reduction and Recycling Elements**

Committee Member Gordon Tong (Resource Conservation Program Manager at County of San Mateo), and Eun-Soo Lim (Committee staff) provided an overview of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and provided findings of the review of the element.

Staff have identified significant differences between the programs around source reduction, recycling, composting, special waste, and education & public information implemented by county jurisdictions via review of the EARs and those programs outlined in the SRREs. While numerous programs that were selected in the SRREs for implementation currently still exist in many of the jurisdictions today, there are also various new programs that have been implemented that were not captured in the SRREs. Additionally, some programs have been discontinued since the development of the SRREs. Notable differences included:

- The countywide schools program
- Source-separated organics composting programs
- New organics processing facilities
- The County's edible food recovery program
- The new Sustainability Academy (education and outreach program around the 4Rs and other sustainability topics)

In addition to the programs outlined in the five main components of the SRREs discussed above (source reduction, recycling, composting, special waste, and education & public information), there are also sections around market conditions, monitoring & evaluation, funding mechanisms, and disposal capacity.

Based on these findings, Mr. Tong and Ms. Lim recommended that the SRREs be updated with the information summarized above as well as other information that may need to be revised.

Ms. Clark commented that food packaging policy is missing from the matrix that compares the programs that were listed in the SRREs and the programs that are currently in place today. Mr. Tong replied that many programs are missing and that the objective of this effort was to do a high-level scan of the element to determine if there were sufficient new programs to warrant a revision to the CIWMP's SRREs. Chair Schneider agreed that Millbrae has had variable can rates for a long time.

Ms. Murray commented that the EARs only include new programs, so there could be historical information that is missing from the EARs. Ms. Del Bene agreed that more programs need to be listed. Ms. Clark mentioned that the matrix is a good tool to let cities know what programs are still being implemented. Chair Schneider mentioned that the matrix does not include Millbrae's Fats, Oils, and Greases program.

Ms. Clark asked if there is public input in the CIWMP revision process. Mr. Tong replied that there will be plenty of opportunities for public input in the process, if the next step is to revise/update the CIWMP.

Chair Schneider also suggested tree pruning also be included in the CIWMP, if it is not already in the Plan.

Mr. Rak suggested updating the matrix before it goes to the C/CAG board. Ms. Del Bene suggested adding abandoned waste and litter. Ms. Lucky suggested looking at why abandoned waste and litter are problems in some cities but not others. Chair Schneider suggested looking into legacy wastes. Ms. Clark suggested looking into construction and demolition waste. Mr. Rak suggested looking into market development domestically due to the China situation.

Chair Schneider stated that there is no mention of Extended Producer Responsibility in the SRRE. Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg suggested the inclusion of the circular economy and Design for the Environment. Ms. Murray suggested including changing the mindset around source reduction. Vice Chair Kohl-Zaugg suggested looking into e-waste and traceability and transparency. Ms. Clark replied that the County has already adopted an ordinance around e-waste and its traceability and transparency a couple of years ago. Chair Schneider suggested discussing compost as a component of carbon sequestration.

## **7. Discussion on update of CIWMP from different stakeholders' perspectives and other recommendations by committee**

The Committee made the below additional recommendations for inclusion in the letter to the C/CAG Board regarding updates to the CWIMP:

- Construction and demolition requirements that align with California Green Building Standards Code
- Strategies for reviving the recycling markets
- Utilization and promotion of compost as an effective method for carbon sequestration
- Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households
- Product stewardship/extended product responsibility strategies and programs to promote circular economy
- Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging
- Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste
- Strategies for promoting and increasing organics composting capacity within the county
- Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination.
- Strategies around abandoned waste, litter, and legacy waste

8. **Set the next Committee meeting date:** Wednesday, September 4, 2019, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at 400 County Center, 1st Floor, Sheriff's Criminal Justice Training Room, Redwood City

**Adjourn:** 12:00 PM

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** September 4, 2019  
**To:** Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Study Ad Hoc Committee  
**From:** Gordon Tong, Committee Member  
**Subject:** Approval of Ad Hoc Committee Letters of Findings for C/CAG Board Approval  
(For further information contact Gordon Tong at 650-363-4159)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Approve version 1 of the letters of findings to CalRecycle and the County of San Mateo.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

N/A

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Based on discussions at previous meetings with the CIWMP Study Ad Hoc Committee, staff have drafted four Letters of Findings from C/CAG to CalRecycle and the County of San Mateo for the committee's approval. Upon approval, two letters will be submitted to the C/CAG Board of Directors as the committee's recommendation for submittal to CalRecycle and the County, respectively.

In previous committee meetings, direction was given to staff to draft letters recommending changes to the Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs), the countywide Siting Element (HHWEs), and the Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFEs). However, it was unclear what the direction was for the Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs). As a result, staff have prepared two versions of the letters to CalRecycle and the County for the committee's consideration.

Version 1 of the letters recommend revisions to all elements with the exception of the Household Hazardous Waste Elements, whereas Version 2 of the letters recommend a revision to the HHWEs.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. C/CAG Letter to CalRecycle, Version 1
2. C/CAG Letter to County of San Mateo, Version 1
3. C/CAG Letter to CalRecycle, Version 2
4. C/CAG Letter to County of San Mateo, Version 2

## C/CAG

### CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco •  
Woodside*

October 10, 2019

Emily Webb  
State of California  
Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery  
P.O. Box 4025 MS 9A  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Webb:

This letter is to inform you that the City and County Association of Governments (C/CAG), as the Local Task Force (LTF) to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), has reviewed the elements of the existing Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) documents to determine if they are still relevant and appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction programs in San Mateo County and to identify any elements that may need revision.

Based on our review, we find that some of the original planning documents of the CIWMP are no longer adequate in serving as appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction and diversion programs in San Mateo County. Below is a detailed summary of our review:

1. The Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) do not accurately reflect the changes that have taken place in the solid waste industry and recycling markets as well as in the waste reduction and diversion programs developed and implemented by the jurisdictions within the past 20 years since the development of the CIWMP. Some major changes include: the establishment of a countywide schools program focusing on education around the 4Rs; new source-separated curbside organics collection programs; new organic processing facilities; a new edible food recovery program; a county-run academy focused on providing sustainability and solid waste classes and programming to county residents; and significant changes to global recycling markets.
2. The Household Hazardous Waste Elements are still adequate and do not require any revisions at this time.

3. In the countywide Siting Element (SE), the information on operational landfills in the county is outdated. Specifically, the countywide SE lists two active landfills in the county, when in fact, there is currently only one landfill that remains active. The capacity for waste disposal at the current active landfill is also outdated and needs to be updated.
4. The non-disposal facilities listed in the countywide Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) do not accurately represent the existing list of facilities that are currently being utilized by jurisdictions. Several non-disposal facilities have closed, and new facilities are being utilized since the last update of the NDFE (2010).

Additionally, the committee also offers the following recommendations to the County for inclusion in any future revision of the CIWMP:

- Construction and demolition requirements that align with California Green Buildings Standards Code
- Strategies for reviving the recycling markets
- Utilization and promotion of compost as an effective method for carbon sequestration
- Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households
- Product stewardship/extended product responsibility strategies and programs to promote the circular economy
- Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging
- Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste
- Strategies for promoting and increasing organics composting capacity within the county
- Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination
- Strategies around abandoned waste, litter, and legacy waste

As the LTF, we request that the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability complete the Five-Year Review Report to C/CAG and to CalRecycle and determine if the revisions summarized above are necessary.

Sincerely,

Maryann Moise Derwin, Chair  
City and County Association of Governments

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco •  
Woodside*

October 10, 2019

Jim Eggemeyer  
County of San Mateo  
Office of Sustainability  
455 County Center, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mr. Eggemeyer:

This letter is to inform you that the City and County Association of Governments (C/CAG), as the Local Task Force (LTF) to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), has reviewed the elements of the existing Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) documents to determine if they are still relevant and appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction programs in San Mateo County and to identify any elements that may need revision.

Based on our review, we find that the original planning documents of the CIWMP are no longer adequate in serving as appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction and diversion programs in San Mateo County. Below is a detailed summary of our review:

1. The Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) do not accurately reflect the changes that have taken place in the solid waste industry and recycling markets as well as in the waste reduction and diversion programs developed and implemented by the jurisdictions within the past 20 years since the development of the CIWMP. Some major changes include: the establishment of a countywide schools program focusing on education around the 4Rs; new source-separated curbside organics collection programs; new organic processing facilities; a new edible food recovery program; a county-run academy focused on providing sustainability and solid waste classes and programming to county residents; and significant changes to global recycling markets.
2. The Household Hazardous Waste Elements are still adequate and do not require any revisions at this time.

3. In the countywide Siting Element (SE), the information on operational landfills in the county is outdated. Specifically, the countywide SE lists two active landfills in the county, when in fact, there is currently only one landfill that remains active. The capacity for waste disposal at the current active landfill is also outdated and needs to be updated.
4. The non-disposal facilities listed in the countywide Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) do not accurately represent the existing list of facilities that are currently being utilized by jurisdictions. Several non-disposal facilities have closed, and new facilities are being utilized since the last update of the NDFE (2010).

Additionally, the committee also offers the following recommendations to the County for inclusion in any future revision of the CIWMP:

- Construction and demolition requirements that align with California Green Buildings Standards Code
- Strategies for reviving the recycling markets
- Utilization and promotion of compost as an effective method for carbon sequestration
- Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households
- Product stewardship/extended product responsibility strategies and programs to promote the circular economy
- Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging
- Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste
- Strategies for promoting and increasing organics composting capacity within the county
- Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination
- Strategies around abandoned waste, litter, and legacy waste

As the LTF, we request that the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability staff complete the Five-Year Review Report to C/CAG and to CalRecycle and determine if the revisions summarized above are necessary.

Sincerely,

Maryann Moise Derwin, Chair  
City and County Association of Governments

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco •  
Woodside*

October 10, 2019

Emily Webb  
State of California  
Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery  
P.O. Box 4025 MS 9A  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Webb:

This letter is to inform you that the City and County Association of Governments (C/CAG), as the Local Task Force (LTF) to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), has reviewed the elements of the existing Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) documents to determine if they are still relevant and appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction programs in San Mateo County and to identify any elements that may need revision.

Based on our review, we find that the original planning documents of the CIWMP are no longer adequate in serving as appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction and diversion programs in San Mateo County. Below is a detailed summary of our review:

1. The Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) do not accurately reflect the changes that have taken place in the solid waste industry and recycling markets as well as in the waste reduction and diversion programs developed and implemented by the jurisdictions within the past 20 years since the development of the CIWMP. Some major changes include: the establishment of a countywide schools program focusing on education around the 4Rs; new source-separated curbside organics collection programs; new organic processing facilities; a new edible food recovery program; a county-run academy focused on providing sustainability and solid waste classes and programming to county residents; and significant changes to global recycling markets.
2. In the Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs), the listed programs do not include new and updated programs that specifically deal with universal and electronic waste.

3. In the countywide Siting Element (SE), the information on operational landfills in the county is outdated. Specifically, the countywide SE lists two active landfills in the county, when in fact, there is currently only one landfill that remains active. The capacity for waste disposal at the current active landfill is also outdated and needs to be updated.
4. The non-disposal facilities listed in the countywide Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) do not accurately represent the existing list of facilities that are currently being utilized by jurisdictions. Several non-disposal facilities have closed, and new facilities are being utilized since the last update of the NDFE (2010).

Additionally, the committee also offers the following recommendations to the County for inclusion in any future revision of the CIWMP:

- Construction and demolition requirements that align with California Green Buildings Standards Code
- Strategies for reviving the recycling markets
- Utilization and promotion of compost as an effective method for carbon sequestration
- Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households
- Product stewardship/extended product responsibility strategies and programs to promote the circular economy
- Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging
- Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste
- Strategies for promoting and increasing organics composting capacity within the county
- Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination
- Strategies around abandoned waste, litter, and legacy waste

As the LTF, we request that the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability complete the Five-Year Review Report to C/CAG and to CalRecycle and determine if the revisions summarized above are necessary.

Sincerely,

Maryann Moise Derwin, Chair  
City and County Association of Governments

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco •  
Woodside*

October 10, 2019

Jim Eggemeyer  
County of San Mateo  
Office of Sustainability  
455 County Center, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mr. Eggemeyer:

This letter is to inform you that the City and County Association of Governments (C/CAG), as the Local Task Force (LTF) to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), has reviewed the elements of the existing Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) documents to determine if they are still relevant and appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction programs in San Mateo County and to identify any elements that may need revision.

Based on our review, we find that the original planning documents of the CIWMP are no longer adequate in serving as appropriate tools for guiding waste reduction and diversion programs in San Mateo County. Below is a detailed summary of our review:

1. The Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) do not accurately reflect the changes that have taken place in the solid waste industry and recycling markets as well as in the waste reduction and diversion programs developed and implemented by the jurisdictions within the past 20 years since the development of the CIWMP. Some major changes include: the establishment of a countywide schools program focusing on education around the 4Rs; new source-separated curbside organics collection programs; new organic processing facilities; a new edible food recovery program; a county-run academy focused on providing sustainability and solid waste classes and programming to county residents; and significant changes to global recycling markets.
2. In the Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs), the listed programs do not include new and updated programs that specifically deal with universal and electronic waste.

3. In the countywide Siting Element (SE), the information on operational landfills in the county is outdated. Specifically, the countywide SE lists two active landfills in the county, when in fact, there is currently only one landfill that remains active. The capacity for waste disposal at the current active landfill is also outdated and needs to be updated.
4. The non-disposal facilities listed in the countywide Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) do not accurately represent the existing list of facilities that are currently being utilized by jurisdictions. Several non-disposal facilities have closed, and new facilities are being utilized since the last update of the NDFE (2010).

Additionally, the committee also offers the following recommendations to the County for inclusion in any future revision of the CIWMP:

- Construction and demolition requirements that align with California Green Buildings Standards Code
- Strategies for reviving the recycling markets
- Utilization and promotion of compost as an effective method for carbon sequestration
- Management of proper sharps disposal, including those generated from households
- Product stewardship/extended product responsibility strategies and programs to promote the circular economy
- Strategies and programs for addressing food and beverage packaging
- Re-emphasis of the importance of source reduction and organics composting in diverting waste
- Strategies for promoting and increasing organics composting capacity within the county
- Strategies to help understand the post-usage fate of electronic waste, specifically around how they are disposed of and how they are handled at their final destination
- Strategies around abandoned waste, litter, and legacy waste

As the LTF, we request that the County of San Mateo Office of Sustainability staff complete the Five-Year Review Report to C/CAG and to CalRecycle and determine if the revisions summarized above are necessary.

Sincerely,

Maryann Moise Derwin, Chair  
City and County Association of Governments