



City of Cambridge

Communication #3

IN CITY COUNCIL

April 3, 2000

COUNCILLOR DAVIS

- WHEREAS:** Solid waste management costs of Massachusetts cities and towns have been increasing and have been taking an increasing share of the municipal government budget that could be better used for education, public safety, and other local needs; and
- WHEREAS:** Reduction of the generation of solid waste would benefit Massachusetts cities and towns by reducing the amount of waste that has to be managed, as well as reducing the widespread adverse health effects resulting from the incineration or landfilling of solid waste; and
- WHEREAS:** A report prepared for the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in 1999 by the Tellus Institute concluded that Massachusetts could reduce the generation of solid waste by at least 1,800,000 tons, or about 20%; and
- WHEREAS:** Recognition is growing across the United States that the costs of collecting, recycling, and disposing of waste materials is an unfunded mandate put on the cities and towns by the producers of toxic or non-recyclable products and packaging, who should bear this financial responsibility for collection of used products through Extended Producer Responsibility programs; and
- WHEREAS:** Numerous studies have confirmed that reprocessing of recyclable materials creates jobs and provides a stimulus to the state economy, and these economic benefits are lost when recyclable materials are landfilled or incinerated; and
- WHEREAS:** The statewide economic and environmental benefits to be gained from increased recycling justify increased financial support from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for municipal recycling programs; and
- WHEREAS:** The DEP is currently preparing the Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan for the years 2000-2010, which will set forth the state plans for managing solid waste for the next ten years; now therefore be it
- RESOLVED:** That the Cambridge City Council hereby call upon Governor A. Paul Cellucci, Environmental Affairs Secretary Robert Duran, DEP Commissioner Lauren Liss, and the Massachusetts Municipal Association to support including in the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* the following:

1. Aggressive waste reduction with the goal of reducing waste generation by 20% or more in Massachusetts by the year 2010 to reduce or eliminate the need for more landfills or incinerators and to reduce local solid waste management costs; and
2. Increased state funding for local recycling programs, with the goal of increasing the overall state recycling rate to more than 50%; and
3. A commitment to pursue Extended Producer Responsibility programs that will require manufacturers to take financial responsibility for the collection of used products to take this unfunded mandate off the cities and towns.

In City Council April 3, 2000.

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Attest:- D. Margaret Drury, City Clerk.

A true copy;

ATTEST:-

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "D. Margaret Drury". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "D" at the beginning.

D. Margaret Drury
City Clerk

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE RECYCLING AND TO REDUCE WASTE GENERATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas, solid waste management costs of Massachusetts cities and towns have been increasing and have been taking an increasing share of the municipal government budget that could be better used for education, public safety, and other local needs; and

Whereas, reduction of the generation of solid waste would benefit Massachusetts cities and towns by reducing the amount of waste that has to be managed, as well as reducing the widespread adverse health effects resulting from the incineration or landfilling of solid waste; and

Whereas, a report prepared for the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in 1999 by the Tellus Institute concluded that Massachusetts could reduce the generation of solid waste by at least 1,800,000 tons, or about 20%; and

Whereas, recognition is growing across the United States that the costs of collecting, recycling, and disposing of waste materials is an unfunded mandate put on the cities and towns by the producers of toxic or non-recyclable products and packaging, who should bear this financial responsibility for collection of used products through Extended Producer Responsibility programs; and

Whereas, numerous studies have confirmed that reprocessing of recyclable materials creates jobs and provides a stimulus to the state economy, and these economic benefits are lost when recyclable materials are landfilled or incinerated, and

Whereas, the statewide economic and environmental benefits to be gained from increased recycling justify increased financial support from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for municipal recycling programs; and

Whereas, the DEP is currently preparing the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* for the years 2000-2010, which will set forth the state plans for managing solid waste for the next ten years; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the _____ hereby call upon Governor A. Paul Cellucci, Environmental Affairs Secretary Robert Durand, DEP Commissioner Lauren Liss, and the Massachusetts Municipal Association to support including in the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* the following:

1. Aggressive waste reduction with the goal of reducing waste generation by 20% or more in Massachusetts by the year 2010 to reduce or eliminate the need for more landfills or incinerators and to reduce local solid waste management costs; *and*
2. Increased state funding for local recycling programs, with the goal of increasing the overall state recycling rate to more than 50%; *and*
3. A commitment to pursue Extended Producer Responsibility programs that will require manufacturers to take financial responsibility for the collection of used products to take this unfunded mandate off the cities and towns.



MASS COALITION to REDUCE WASTE

c/o Clean Water Action
76 Summer St. 3rd Flr.
Boston, MA 02110
Phone 617- 423-4661
Fax 617- 423-4870

March 16, 2000

Dear Municipal Official:

Right now the Cellucci Administration is working on the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* which will determine the state policy on solid waste management for the next ten years. Because solid waste costs significantly impact municipal budgets, the decisions made in this Master Plan will have major consequences for the operation of local governments across Massachusetts for this coming decade.

Enclosed, for your consideration, is a Resolution which will send a message to the Cellucci Administration to take the necessary steps in the *Solid Waste Master Plan*. These steps include three critical measures that will help communities to better control solid waste management costs: waste reduction, increased state funding for local recycling programs, and a commitment to pursue Extended Producer Responsibility programs.

The surest way for your community to reduce the costs for waste disposal is to reduce waste. The most efficient way is to transfer solid waste management costs from the cities and towns to the party who is responsible for the design of the product - **the producer**. This has already been done in over two dozen countries by implementing a program called Extended Producer Responsibility. Recognition has been growing across the United States that the costs of collecting, recycling, and disposing of waste materials *is a different kind of 'unfunded mandate'* put on the cities and towns by the producers of toxic or non-recyclable products and packaging, who should bear this financial responsibility for collection of used products (See the enclosed summary of our report on Extended Producer Responsibility).

This resolution has been adopted by the local governments of the following municipalities:

Town of Acton	City of Lowell
Town of Carlisle	Town of Sherborn
Town of Cohasset	City of Somerville
Town of Concord	Town of Webster
Town of Falmouth	Town of Westport
Town of Lexington	City of Haverhill

The Massachusetts Coalition to Reduce Waste, which consists of over 45 citizen groups across the state, is the organizing force behind this resolution campaign.

We urge your Board of Selectmen, Town Council, Select Council, Board of Aldermen, or City Council to send this important message to the Cellucci Administration by adopting this resolution. Since the draft *Solid Waste Master Plan* may be released in April, action on the resolution would be most effective if taken before the end of April.

We would be happy to attend any local meeting to present this resolution and answer any questions you may have. Please call John McNabb or Tiffany Skogstrom at 617-423-4661.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John K. McNabb, Jr." in a cursive style.

John K. McNabb, Jr.
Solid Waste Policy Director
Clean Water Action/Massachusetts Coalition to Reduce Waste

Enclosures

PS. - Please retype the resolution on your official stationery, have it signed by members of your Board, send the original to Governor Cellucci at the State House, Room 360, Boston, MA 02133 and send a copy to the Coalition at 76 Summer Street, Boston, MA 02110. Thank you.

Extended Producer Responsibility

Putting Responsibility Where it Belongs

Recommendations for the Massachusetts
"Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan"

For a copy of this report, contact

Massachusetts Coalition to Reduce Waste
c/o Clean Water Action
76 Summer Street, Room 330
Boston, MA 02110
(phone) 617-423-4661 (fax) 617-423-4870
bostoncwa@cleanwater.org

**Massachusetts Coalition to Reduce Waste
Clean Water Fund
Clean Water Action Alliance**

December 27, 1999

By John McNabb, Clean Water Fund

EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY

The solid waste problem has led many government policy makers and business leaders in the United States and across the world to become increasingly interested in Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). This is an emerging concept which shifts the responsibility and costs for disposal or recycling of products from the local government and taxpayer to the manufacturers of those products.

EPR is an emerging idea for pollution prevention that could play a substantial role in reducing the solid waste management costs of the cities and towns in Massachusetts while helping reduce toxic contamination of the environment. EPR deserves to be included as an important component of the state's new *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan*, which is intended to plan for our solid waste management needs for the next decade, from 2000-2010.

EPR has been fully embraced as a concept in over two dozen industrialized countries. EPR programs for various products are in operation in *Germany, Belgium, Japan, Austria, British Columbia, Sweden, the Netherlands, Norway, Taiwan, and Switzerland*. The U.S. lags behind on this system that will increase the resource efficiency of the economy. Many corporations will have to comply with EPR policies for their products in other countries, but not in the U.S. market.

Some solid examples of where this theory has been put into practice include advanced disposal fees and industry take back programs. Advanced disposal fees are charges to producers for the cost of disposal which is in turn offered as a refund for consumers or local governments to handle the waste in a certain way. Many countries also mandate industry 'take-back' programs that require manufacturers to provide free end-of-life care for their products through licensed handlers. For example, many countries mandate the take back of electronic goods. More facts about EPR include:

- EPR is really a "market-based" approach which builds the post-consumer stage of products into a company's bottom line. It is then up to the company to determine how products should be designed or what materials they should be made from. The objective is to send the correct economic signals and leave the industry free to innovate. EPR gives a competitive advantage to less wasteful, more economically recyclable products.
- EPR internalizes "end of life" management costs into the costs of producing products. This provides incentives for manufacturers to think differently about the resources and materials used in the products, so that the recycling, reuse and toxicity are considered at the product design stage.
- EPR "closes the loop" of the product life cycle so the producers who are ultimately responsible for designing the product get their products back and then assume full responsibility for the full life cycle costs for the product.

For more information and for a copy of the report "Extended Producer Responsibility: Putting Responsibility Where It Belongs" by Clean Water Fund, contact: Clean Water Fund at 617-423-4661 or bostoncwa@cleanwater.org.

Eliminating Waste Through PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY

A Project of the GrassRoots Recycling Network

THE ISSUE

Waste disposal is a major burden on taxpayers and local governments, costing \$40 billion a year in the U.S. Decisions by product manufacturers, over which taxpayers and local governments have no control, represent an *unfunded mandate*. Municipal waste management has become a subsidy that has encouraged the proliferation of throw-away products and packaging.

As long as municipalities continue to assume responsibility for discarded products and packaging, producers are sheltered from the true cost of their waste. When producers are required to take full responsibility for the ultimate disposal of their products and packaging, a creative force is unleashed that finds ways to eliminate waste. There is suddenly an economic incentive to design for recycling and re-use, rather than disposal as waste.

In recent years, over two dozen countries have introduced Producer Responsibility programs and policies. The U.S. lags behind because wealthy corporations in the United States are fighting the introduction of such policies. It is taxpayers and local government who pay the price.

How We Got Here

Our current system of municipal garbage collection was designed for the turn-of-the-Century world -- a world where manufactured products and packaging made up only 7% of household trash.¹ Today, manufactured products and packaging make up three-quarters of what is called 'municipal solid waste'.² We live in a Disposable Society where 80 percent of what we buy gets thrown away after a single use.³ Local communities are spending billions of dollars each year cleaning up after the Disposable Society -- dollars that could be spent on schools, libraries and other community services.

Municipalities Don't Design Products

Even though local communities are responsible for collecting garbage, they have little control over factors that affect the cost of providing the service. They have no control over the design of products and packaging. They must deal with waste at the "back end of the pipe," with no way to influence what flows into the front end.



GrassRoots Recycling Network

P.O. Box 49283, Athens, GA 30604-9283 • Email: zerowaste@grrn.org
Tel: 706-613-7121 • Fax: 706-613-7123 • Website: <http://www.grrn.org>

SUCCESS STORIES

Deposit Systems For Beverage Containers

Ten U.S. states and eight of Canada's ten provinces have "bottle bills" requiring deposit-return programs for beverage containers. Deposit-return programs have much *higher recycling rates* than municipal recycling programs because of the economic incentive to recycle offered to the consumer who gets money back for the containers. Over 75% of deposit-return cans and bottles sold in "bottle-bill" states are recycled, compared with 25% in states where the only recycling available is community programs.¹ In some cases, deposit-return programs have resulted in *improved packaging design*. In Canada, domestically produced beer is sold in standardized bottles and 97% of the bottles come back to the producer to be refilled (unlike American and imported glass beer bottles, which are landfilled after one use or recycled into lower-value products like fiberglass insulation).

Take-Back Programs For Toxics

One of the most costly waste materials for local communities to handle is toxic household chemicals like paints, thinners, pesticides, fuels and medicines. In Canada's western province of British Columbia, Product Stewardship laws now require producers to take these products back for recycling or safe disposal. Millions of gallons of these toxic chemicals are being collected at industry-funded depots at no cost to the local communities – and the cost drives producers to keep toxic leftovers to a minimum!

Recycled Content In Newspapers

In the late 1980s, many communities started collecting newspapers for recycling but found that there were not enough markets for the paper because few mills were making recycled newsprint and publishers were not buying it. When newspaper publishers were required – or pledged voluntarily – to use paper with recycled content, the problem turned around. Paper makers re-tooled for recycling to meet the publishers' needs, started buying large quantities of recycled newspapers – and now paper recyclers can count on stable markets for their used paper.

A NEW APPROACH FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Our current system of municipal garbage collection was designed for the 19th Century world. The Producer Responsibility approach tells producers that they can no longer count on local communities to dispose of their products. The cost of waste, when shifted to producers, becomes a powerful economic incentive to *avoid* waste at the source. In this way, Producer Responsibility harnesses economic forces to achieve environmental goals, setting our consumer society down a new, more environmentally sustainable course.

¹ Rudolph Hering and Samuel A. Greeley, "The Collection and Disposal of Municipal Waste," *The Municipal Journal and Engineer*, New York, 1908, p.22.

² Franklin Associates, Ltd., *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States: 1997 Update* (Washington: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1998) p. 7.

³ Paul Hawken, "Natural Capitalism", *Mother Jones*, March/April 1997, p.53

⁴ Tellus Institute, Boston MA



c/o Clean Water Action

76 Summer St. 3rd Flr.

Boston, MA 02110

Phone 617- 423-4661

Fax 617- 423-4870

Acton Citizens for Environmental Safety (ACES)

Andover Recycling Committee

Alternatives for Community & Environment

AMC Boston Conservation Committee

Boston Neighborhood Recycling Coaliton

C-10 Research & Education Foundation

Campaign to Clean Up Brayton Point

Citizens Against Trash Transfers

Citizen's Environmental Laboratory

Citizens for Clean Environment

Citizens for Environmental Protection

Citizens for Lexington Conservation

Clean Water Fund

Episcopal Diocese of MA - Committee on Faith

Falmouth Solid Waste Action Committee

Green Decade

Green Futures

Hands Across the River

Haverhill Environmental League

Keep Lowell Beautiful

Lawrence Environmental Action Group

Lawrence Environmental Justice Council

Northbridge Chapter of Alliance for Democracy

Massachusetts League of Women Voters

MASSPIRG

Massachusetts Green Party

Merrimack Valley Project

Merrimack Valley Residents for the Environment

Merrimack Valley People for Peace

Merrimack Valley People for the Environment

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Recycling Initiative Campaign

Regional Environmental Council

Reuseit

Sacred Heart Neighborhood Improvement Group

SAFE

Salem Power Plant Health Link

Saugus Action Volunteers for the Environment

Somerville Environmental & Recycling Volunteers

South Shore Recycling Cooperative

Tewksbury Recycling Committee

Toxics Action Center

Watchdogs for an Environmentally Safe Town

Webster Recycling Commission

Westfield Grassroots Coalition

Westport River Watershed Alliance

Consent Communication #3

69 5

A communication was received from
the Mass Coalition to Reduce Waste
relative to the Beyond 2000 Solid
Waste Master Plan.

5-69

In City Council April 3, 2000

PLACED ON FILE