

A narrative summary of the key best practices for the Zero Waste plans of Seattle, Austin, Boulder County, and Oakland follows. Each plan is in various stages of implementation, and though the methods for each locality vary to a degree, there are some basic commonalities from which Cleveland could reference when developing its vision of a Zero Waste plan.

Authority

In each of the aforementioned cities the local government has taken the lead in establishing goals of Zero Waste. (Note: In Boulder, while the city of Boulder has developed its own city master plan, it is the County of Boulder that has taken the lead).

In general, local authorities have passed resolutions establishing either (1) **guidelines** from which a Zero Waste plans will be developed or (2) **task forces** as an intermediary to the development of Zero Waste plans.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Goals and Implementation

Briefly, goals are predicated on waste diversion along both upstream (i.e., before product use and/or collection) and downstream (i.e., after product use and/or collection) means. Goal methods for each of the four localities can be broken down into the following categories:

1. Resource conservation (e.g., recycling, re-use)
2. Economic development (e.g., green jobs, disposal fees as subsidies to spur green entrepreneurial growth), and
3. Relationship building (e.g., partnering public/private and private/private organizations to facilitate change).

Implementation of these methods varies sufficiently from site to site given the various stages of development within each city's Zero Waste plan. Nonetheless, three commonalities in implementation include: legislation, advocacy, and support.

- Legislative: A legislative effort is underway in each of these cities, and in a few cases there is legislation already in place. Seattle, for example, has recently added mandatory organic waste diversion to its mandatory recycling policies for both residential and business sites. That said, this is perhaps the exception rather than the rule as the majority of the legislative policies are still in the works. Nonetheless, mandatory policies (*either in place or in development*) for each of the four sites include: **Extended Producer Responsibility, the banning of problem products, the requirement of certain institutions to divert organic waste, mandatory recycling, and the requirement for all new construction to have space for composting and recycling.**
- Advocacy: In each city there is a concerted effort to advocate and/or inform the population about the benefits of waste diversion as a compliment to more punitive measures. Such advocate measures include educating citizens about the benefits of on-site composting, encouraging a more limited consumption of products so as

Formatted: Highlight

to reduce waste, and in general warning citizenry about the high social costs associated with consumption and subsequent landfill disposal.

- Support: For each city there is also a wide range of activities designed to facilitate the practice of Zero Waste behaviors. The main activities singled out included: providing neighborhoods with both traditional and non-traditional recycling centers, facilitating the diversion of construction/building materials from work sites, and establishing both public/private and private/private relationships so as to spur green business growth.