

FW: garbage and recycling rate increase

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 5/24/2022 9:27 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 9:25 AM
To: sklandscape <sklandscape@comcast.net>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: RE: garbage and recycling rate increase

Hi Scott,

Thank you for your comments. We will submit to the clerk for official public comment.

Best,

Lou
District 6 Team

From: sklandscape [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 7:26 AM
To: District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: garbage and recycling rate increase

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

This letter is being submitted in response to the quest of raising garbage and recycling rates for our city and as a council member representing my district I wanted to directly submit this to you.

[REDACTED]
San Jose CA 95128
[REDACTED]

This letter is being written in protest of the proposed rate increase for the Residential Garbage and Recycling Services to take effect July 1, 2022

- 1) As you noted in your mailer, the last time rates went up were only one year ago.
- 2) There is no stated time frame that this increase is to cover. It seems most likely that you are going to do this again next year.
- 3) Our production of waste in this household is so low that at least half of the year we are not even putting cans out every week of every month. So no matter how much we cut back on garbage and "recyclables" we are constantly being told we have to pay more.

- 4) The recycle program is really a scam to just fund another government bureaucracy. All of the limited number of items you are collecting have already been paid for by the consumer. That alone should fund the collection effort.
- 5) If you ever went to the dump, you would see how ineffective your recycling program really is. There are literally mountains of product that could and should be recycled.
- 6) There are far too many products that you do not consider as recyclable. That is because you are again only going after what the public has already paid for when they purchase product.
- 7) There is a complete disconnect on your part of understanding the concept of treating product (recyclables). For you to think that the average household is going to clean every single plastic item before putting into the container is so far fetched. It would be so much more practical to put the recyclables into a giant tub and agitate together to clean rather than expecting every single person in every single household to wash that stuff singly. Think of how much clean water that uses in comparison to a giant tub using recycled water that you are having a tough time figuring out how to use.
- 8) When you first started this program, the public was told that this would decrease the the impact on the landfills. Those that we have are still going to reach capacity sooner than later, regardless of you extending the capacity limits. What is really the problem here is that you are bringing too many people into an area that has limited amount of capacity and natural resources.
- 9) Your yard trimming program really is just subsidizing the the unlicensed gardner. You are also charging for the modified product when the public purchases the mulches and composts you are producing from this collection.
- 10) You do not state what the increased costs incurred by the contractors are.
- 11) Although you do not state it, most know that the IBT Local is siphoning money off of this program in the form of collecting dues from union members. That money is then spent on the union function which also includes massive amount of political donations and press. We do not need unionized public servants. We don't need to be subsidizing union political views. Your system and our country already have the highest level of human resource benefits and protections listed in laws. We do not need to have those protected by these laws being in a union which siphons off the public by the constant tax and rate increases.
- 12) When one drives all across town, it is seen that the smallest portion of the public opts to use the oil recycling program. This can't be a gigantic expense of the recycling program.
- 13) With all of the innovation, technology and manpower available here, you still somehow have a problem sorting materials from the bins. This is directly related to the limited amount of items you deem recyclable.
- 14) There needs to be a dicussion about packaging. Your program should be able to provide input in how we can reduce consumption and waste by taking an in depth approach to reducing the incredible amount of packaging for the simplest item. We need discussion and direction with manufacturing to use materials that are recyclable in the form of; foam peanuts, styrafoam, expanded cell foam, plastics bonded to paper and foil and the myriad forms of plastic bags.
- 15) If you were able to see the contradiction of sending our recyclables half way across the world to process, you would find a way of processing these items here in our region and reducing costs and employing more of our residents.

These are virtually the same points I made the last time you asked for public input on the rate changes, yet apparently you ignored common sense. Your position in the community is only to fund your bureaucracy and overly burdensome government structure while perpetuating your job and supporting unions. You are basing all of your edicts on an ignorant public which you have done a great job of creating.

Scott Korbay

San jose, CA 95128