

Statewide Commission on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling

Draft Meeting Notes

Date: September 16, 2020

Time: 8:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Present:

17 – Commissioners Bouchard, Cadena, Davis, Dell, Donlevy, Ferrante, Kalpakoff, Lapis, Medrano, Oseguera, Potashner, Sanborn, Schneider, Skye, Toyoda, Valle, and Ward.

Absent:

None

List of Participants:

- John Bouchard (John B.) – Teamsters 350, Principle Officer
- Deborah Cadena (Deborah C.)– Kern County Recycling, RMDZ Administrator
- John Davis (John D.) – Mojave Desert and Mountain Recycling Authority, Zone Administrator
- Jan Dell (Jan D.) – The Last Beach Cleanup, Founder
- Jeff Donlevy (Jeff D.) - Ming's Recycling, General Manager
- Laura Ferrante (Laura F.) – Waste Alternatives, Owner
- Joseph Kalpakoff (Joseph K.) – Mid Valley Disposal, CEO
- Nick Lapis (Nick L.) – Californians Against Waste, Director of Advocacy
- Manuel Medrano (Manuel M.) – City of Chula Vista, Environmental Services Manager
- Alex Oseguera (Alex O.) – Waste Management, Director of Government Affairs
- Eric Potashner (Eric P.) – Recology, Senior Director of Strategic Affairs
- Heidi Sanborn (Heidi S.) – National Stewardship Action Council, Executive Director
- Ann Schneider (Ann S.)– City of Millbrae, Vice Mayor

- Coby Skye (Coby S.) – Los Angeles County Public Works, Assistant Deputy Director
- Sara Toyoda (Sara T.) – City of Indio, Environmental Programs Coordinator
- Richard Valle (Richard V.) – Tri-CED Community Recycling, CEO
- Tedd Ward (Tedd W.) – Del Norte Solid Waste Management, Director

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order, Roll Call, and Establishment of Quorum

Chair Heidi S. called to order the Commission Meeting and called roll. Commissioner Lapis was absent. A quorum was established. John D. provided an update on Agenda Item 9, which will be moved to a future meeting.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment Review - Items Not on the Agenda

Public Comments (for complete text of comments, see Appendix I):

- Veronica Pardo – referred to the Organics Committee
- Miriam Gordon – referred to Labeling and Media Committee
- Kreigh Hampel – Recycling Committee
- Michael Gross (1) – referred to Market Development Committee
- Michael Gross (2) – referred to Market Development Committee
- Julie Muir – referred to Market Development Committee
- Daniel Velasquez – no referral made

Nick L. joined during this agenda item.

Agenda Item 3: Discussion and Response to Previous Public Comments

The Labeling and Media Committee has not met since last Commission meeting and has no new updates. The Recycling Commission is waiting to hear back from the Carton Council. The Market Development Committee is meeting on Monday and will continue on carpet comments. The Organics Committee has been addressing compostable packaging comments.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 4: Review and Potential Approval of Meeting Notes

Tedd W. requested the September 2, 2020 notes be updated to reflect that Ann S. was designated to work on non-organics source reduction with Tedd W. With edits made, Tedd W. motioned to approve the meeting notes and Coby S. seconded. The meeting notes were unanimously approved.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 5: Discussion of Received Expanded Public Proposals

No new public proposals were discussed. Tedd W. and Heidi S. will work together to provide a consolidated list of referrals.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 6: Committee Reports

Jan D., Chair of the Labeling and Media Committee, provided an update. No new meetings have occurred since the last Commission Meeting. The Committee will be starting policy recommendation discussions.

Jeff D, Chair of the Recycling Committee, provided an update of the meeting on September 11. The Committee hosted presentations by Paul Bahou from Global Plastics and Susan Collins from Container Recycling Institute. Jeff D. provided a summary on the Committee's "What is Recyclable?" List. Ann S. expressed concerns regarding what could be accepted by small versus large jurisdictions and dual versus single stream. The Commissioners discussed how preliminary policy recommendations should be shared with the Commission. The Recycling Committee added an item to the policy recommendation list called "plastic recycling and policy."

John D. provided a summary of the next Market Development Committee Meeting. The Committee added a policy recommendation list for "C&D, carpet, asphalt shingles, wallboard."

Eric P. provided a summary of the previous Organics Committee Meeting that was held on September 4, 2020 and a summary of the upcoming meeting on September 21, 2020. The Committee will discuss policy recommendations and bring those to the next Commission meeting.

Public Comments (for complete text of comments, see Appendix I):

- Nicole Quinonez
- Tim Shestek
- Bruce Magnani

Agenda Item 7: Discussion of Scheduling and Process for Reporting Recommendations

Tedd W. provided guidance to commissioners and committee chairs on reporting recommendations and the timeline for reporting. He shared an outline of the policy recommendation report and requested that assignments be made to commissioners for specific sections of the report.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 8: Update on Legislation

Mindy McIntyre from CalRecycle's Legislative and External Affairs Office provided an update on questions from Commissioners regarding AB 3163 (Salas).

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 9: Presentation and Discussion on Basel Convention

The Commission was unable to secure a speaker for this agenda item, thus this item will be moved to a future meeting.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 10: Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Chair Heidi S. provided a summary of items for future meetings including policy discussions and the Basel Convention.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 11: Meeting Summary and Closing

Chair Heidi S. provided closing remarks and adjourned the meeting early at 11:24 am.

Public Comments: None

Appendix I:

Veronica Pardo

The passage of SB 1383 (Lara, 2016) set an ambitious goal to divert the vast majority of California's organic waste from landfills by 2025 and significantly reduce methane emissions. Beginning January 1, 2022, cities and counties must collect and recycle organic waste from all residential and commercial generators, ultimately requiring over 160 new or expanded anaerobic digestion and compost facilities across California. It is estimated SB 1383 implementation and infrastructure development will cost upwards of \$10 billion by 2030 to achieve. Preceding the COVID-19 pandemic, jurisdictions faced substantial financial, regulatory, and regional barriers in meeting SB 1383 programmatic expectations. Now with continued uncertainty regarding the extended fiscal impacts of the COVID-19 national emergency, communities are even more constrained in their ability to meet California's organic waste reduction requirements. While initially a

considerable cost, the cumulative economic, public health, and climate benefits associated with recovering organic waste will ultimately exceed the cost of the investments required, and will provide permanent green jobs at a time when California is experiencing extraordinary job loss and economic recovery needs. Achieving this will require harmonization across state and local agencies to overcome the barriers we face in building our essential organic waste management infrastructure. Ultimately, meeting our organic waste reduction mandate will require a long-term, comprehensive policy framework that provides financial support and a coordinated, cross-agency strategy to develop the infrastructure and programs required. In order to achieve our GHG reduction goals, create permanent jobs, and ensure California's leadership in organic waste management, California needs to prioritize and incentivize organic waste management. Below are recommended solutions we request the California Air Resources Board and the Legislature consider for a comprehensive organic waste diversion policy framework:

- Coordinated cross-agency strategy to bolster our organic waste diversion system
- Long-term statewide funding to support diversion programs, including an appropriate landfill tip fee increase
- Development of coordinated and streamlined permitting for new or expanded facilities
- Regulatory certainty that investments will not become stranded assets in the future, especially as it pertains to renewable biogas use
- Robust state procurement program of organic waste products to drive organic management development and markets, including RNG utilization
- Tax credits and incentives to encourage more private investment for infrastructure as well as honor the early investment of private entities who supported state efforts for early compliance with recycling mandates

With these solutions, California can meet our GHG reduction and organic waste diversion goals, as well as provide a roadmap for the rest of the nation on how organic waste mitigation can provide significant economic, public health and environmental benefits. Please see our SB 1383 Organic Waste Reduction White Paper for more information:

<https://www.resourcecoalition.org/uploads/pdf/regulatory-affairs/SB1383OrganicWasteWhitePaper08-24-20.pdf>

Miriam Gordon

FROM UPSTREAM - Miriam Gordon- Policy Director Reduce unnecessary single-use in food service by: 1) requiring all take-out and delivery in food service to provide an opt-in for customers to request specific accessories offered by the restaurant (napkins, straws, condiments, etc. - UPSTREAM has a model policy 2) Bring reusables into take-out food via delivery and customer pick-up by charging for meals in single-use packaging and mandating that food service operators provide a reusable alternative so consumers can avoid the charge. UPSTREAM has a model policy. 3) Institute a 25 cent cups charge for disposable take-out cups- like the cities of Berkeley, Arcata, Santa Cruz, San Anselmo, Fairfax. Require that a cheaper reusable option be provided to the customer to avoid the charge. 4) Same as above but for food containers. As Arcata did. 5) Require that on-site dining food service only be in reusables- as enacted by Berkeley, Arcata, San Anselmo, Fairfax. 6) EPR for packaging and plastic should have a source reduction component that mandates a % of packaging used in retail be in reusables. 7) Adopt an overall waste generation reduction mandate that achieves a % reduction of waste

generated by a certain date- in each category of materials- plastic, paper, metal, wood. SF has a 15% waste generation reduction target by 2030.

Kreigh Hampel

Dear Commissioners, On April 16, 2020 the City of Burbank closed public access to Buy-back and Drop-off services at the Burbank Recycle Center (BRC) in response to the Covid outbreaks and under the Governors Executive order N-54-20 dated March 3, 2020. The geometry of the BRC makes it difficult to run a safe public program during COVID. From June 30 through July 2 the BRC attempted to open its public drop off. After 20 hours of public access, workers began testing positive for COVID and BRC was closed to the public July 2nd. Through July a total of 16 recycling workers tested positive and a total of 27 were quarantined with symptoms, close contact, or positive tests. The Governor's Emergency Executive Orders N-54-20 and N-70-20 provided relief for CRV Redemption Centers under COVID restrictions. On August 21st the Executive Orders expired. CalRecycle notified us that we must reopen CRV Buy-back or forfeit our RC Certification. The Burbank Recycle Center is now faced with a decision to reopen the CRV Buy-back during an active pandemic or forfeit it's AB 2020 (RC) certificate. If the Certificate is forfeited, recertification can take 1-6 months. For safety reasons we would like to keep the Buy-back closed until "dine in" is allowed in Los Angeles County without forfeiting our RC Certificate. We request the Commission's Recycling Committee to help bring flexibility to CRV Redemption Centers during this global pandemic. Our priority is the safety of the public and our employees.

Michael Gross (1)

As of January 1, 2017, California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requires the diversion of at least 65% of Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste from building projects. Municipalities in California have found C&D diversion ordinances to be effective at diverting this material from landfill. Because of this, the recycling markets for C&D materials are expected to grow. Asphalt shingles are one C&D material whose recycling can be greatly improved upon in California. Roofing materials comprises 3% of our waste stream and are usually received as a source separated load, fairly clean unlike lots of our C&D waste streams. Recycling asphalt shingles offers both environmental and economic benefits, including landfill airspace savings, energy savings, carbon footprint reduction, and job creation. Less energy is required to produce asphalt and aggregate from RAS than from virgin materials. Similarly, the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with reduced energy use during manufacturing, transportation, and extraction of virgin materials, lessens the carbon footprint associated with these materials. Asphalt shingle recycling facilities use mechanical processing equipment – and people, offering the opportunity for job creation. These facilities also produce a greater economic benefit for homeowners, contractors and haulers because tipping fees at asphalt shingle recycling facilities is usually less than at landfills. By far, the most common use for recycled asphalt shingles (RAS) is in the manufacture of hot mix asphalt (HMA). This prevalence is partly because the addition of RAS to HMA can offset the input of virgin asphalt binder due to its asphalt concrete content. Numerous states permit the use of RAS in HMA production. For instance, the Texas Department of Transportation allows the use of up to 5% of

RAS to asphalt pavement in the manufacturing of HMA. After 10 years, Caltrans has developed specifications for the use of RAS to HMA. However, to date, no projects in California have been designed or completed. Caltrans expects the RAS producer or contractor to convince the local Caltrans Regional Engineer that they need to do an RAS pilot project. Caltrans officials will not spec a pilot project from Sacramento. Why can't CalRecycle work with Caltrans to develop a pilot project in Sacramento that could use RAS to show the rest of CalTrans engineers and local city/county road engineers that this material, when used correctly, would have numerous advantages over using virgin products.

Michael Gross (2)

Can CalRecycle work with the wallboard producers in California to require post-consumer content of at least 20% by 2023.

Julie Muir

We need more of this information for CA and its regions so there is more common knowledge out there. In regards to the [press release](#) forwarded by email.

Daniel Velasquez

Early this week, countries discussed the new restrictions regarding plastic waste export as agreed in the Amendments to Annexes II, VIII, and IX to the Basel Convention. The Convention regulates the controlling transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and their disposal. Although the US is not part of the Convention, countries where California exports plastic waste are. Among them Malaysia 20%, Hong Kong 15%, Thailand 14%, Vietnam 9%. These amendments will take effect on January 1, 2021, and aim to clarify the scope of control under the Convention for other types of plastic waste and mixtures of plastic waste and their specific conditions. Plastic waste export must be destined for separate recycling of each material and in an environmentally sound manner, and almost free from contamination. Chemical Recycling is an opportunity to take this contaminated plastic waste and use it as a feedstock to create new plastics, low sulfur fuels, and gas to create green energy.

Nicole Quinonez

It was stated changing product labels is an easy fix. While changing the art/content of a label can be changed in a reasonable amount of time, to change the form of the label-shrink sleeve to an adhesive for example, means changing the manufacturing process-new machines, retooling, for that portion of the manufacturing line. It takes years and a lot of investment. As for the purpose of the shrink sleeve, for many products there is a function to the shrink sleeve. Many cleaning products for example, will degrade quickly when exposed to the light, so bottles used to be opaque colors in order to prevent the degradation. As previously discussed, colored plastic is also not desirable, so companies moved to clear plastic with a shrink sleeve with a goal to increase recycling of the container- if the shrink sleeve is removed. To portray the change as purely a marketing only decision is not 100% accurate.

Tim Shestek

There was a comment made that if a product manufacturer's package is currently on the "red" list, it could provide an incentive for those manufacturers to come to the table to see how domestic markets could be created to move that package to the "green" list. If a technology allows for those materials to be converted back into new feedstock such as resin pellets and creates a new domestic market, the Commission should be considering these types of new ideas and innovative approaches.

Bruce A Magnani

Polypropylene, metals (aluminum), PET Thermoform, etc. are all recyclable. This list should be more inclusive, and we should be encouraging and growing recycling markets, not making decisions that will hinder or impede growing markets. The commission should be careful in how they move forward in how they speak to emerging recycling markets.