

Statewide Commission on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling Draft Meeting Notes

Date: February 3, 2021

Time: 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Present:

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

Absent:

None

Agenda:

Agenda Item 1: 9:00 am (5 min) Call to Order, Roll Call, and Establishment of Quorum

Chair Sanborn welcomed the commissioners, took roll, and established a quorum.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 2: 9:05 am (5 min) Review and Potential Approval of Meeting Notes

Commissioner Ward moved to approve the meeting notes, Commissioner Toyoda seconded the motion, and the Commission approved the notes.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 3: 9:10 am (10 min) Public Comment Review - Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments on items not on the agenda.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 4: 9:20 am (15 min) Consideration of Urgency Recommendation Letter on CRV Convenience

Chair Sanborn announced the second reading of the Commission's letter on CRV Convenience Zones. Commissioner Lapis suggested adding tiered processing payments to the recommendations and asked Commissioner Donlevy to respond to his email because this issue was not agenized at the Recycling Committee Meeting. Com. Donlevy believes tiered payments is a good idea for a longer-term fix which requires

legislation and a fix in the formula. Commissioner Donlevy asked how tiered payments would help open more centers in underserved areas. Commissioner Lapis suggested that it would help provide funding to the lower volume sites. Commissioner Donlevy believes that money would be much faster to implement to increase opening of new centers than going through the process of changing the bottle bill formula in law.

Commissioner Valle emphasized the urgency of the recommendation and a desire to discuss tiered processing structures at the Recycling Committee meeting to discuss transportation and capacity for baling and sorting and other issues.

Commissioner Schneider supported sending the letter out now and emphasized the point that she spoke with Assemblymember Ting and he was unaware of the concern to open new redemption centers.

Commissioner Ward suggested changing the Processing Payments from 25% up to 35% for recycling centers in rural and underserved areas.

Commissioner Skye proposed that the amendments to documents should be allowed to only be reviewed once, instead of the two-time review set in place for Commission policies.

Commissioner Lapis was unsure how the tiered payments he was requesting would impact curbside programs.

Commissioner Jeff Donlevy committed to have a more robust discussion on the details on tiered payments at an upcoming Recycling Committee meeting.

Commissioner Skye moved to approve the document with the amendments discussed and tracked on the letter live and Commissioner Ward seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lapis did not approve the motion. Commissioner Skye recommended additional wording in the 6th point of the letter. With the amendments Commissioner Lapis agreed to the motion, and the amended motion was approved unanimously.

Public Comments (See Appendix I for full text):

- Liza Tucker
- Richard Murphy
- Karim Ameri
- David Slagle
- Ralph Alcantar Jr.
- Kia Villarreal
- Grocery CRV Working Group

Agenda Item 5: 9:35 am (1 hr) Presentation and Discussion around Chemical Recycling

Chair Sanborn emphasized the necessity of technology passing the three-part test, and Commissioner Skye suggested the Commission have a conversation about the three-part test.

Jon Timbers from AmSty presented on advanced recycling. He emphasized that disposables are necessary in our economy, the current plastics recycling system is not working, and system improvements are necessary. He stated that the majority of AmSty's innovation comes from the heat flux in their circular recycling process.

Dr. Neil Tangri with GAIA presented on chemical recycling and the problems of plastic. The primary technology types used for chemical recycling are pyrolysis and gasification. He stated that chemical recycling is not circular because it relies on processing plastics into fuel which is not recycling. He recommended that mechanical recycling should be prioritized over chemical recycling.

Public Comments:

- Tim Shestek
- Stiv Wilson
- Genevieve Abedon
- Daniel Velazquez

Agenda Item 6: 10:35 am (5 min) Update on Legislation

Mindy McIntyre highlighted three new bills, SB 244, SB 289, and AB 332. Chair Sanborn asked about the proper disposal of solar panels.

Deputy Director McIntyre announced the deadline to introduce new bills as February 19th.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 7: 10:40 am (10 min) Review of Response to Commission Report

Chair Sanborn announced that all press entries about the commission are placed in a folder on the Google Drive.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 8: 10:50 am (5 min) Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Commissioner Ward requested a discussion of "doughnut economics" due to the complexity of the topic. Commissioner Skye suggested bringing back the conversation about advanced recycling for the next Commission meeting and requested a presentation on organic waste by the Bioenergy Association of California.

Chair Sanborn moved to extend the next meeting to three hours. The motion passed, and the next meeting will be extended from 9:00am-12:00pm.

Public Comments: None

Agenda Item 9: 10:55 am (5 min) Meeting Summary and Closing

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01am.

Appendix I:

Liza Tucker

Concerning a letter from the Commission on Recycling Markets and C curbside Recycling to the legislature, Consumer Watchdog supports efforts to reopen closed redemption centers and to create new redemption opportunities in rural and underserved areas.

Richard Murphy

Agenda Item #4. We need your help, Humboldt Co. residents have no viable CRV redemption options. The pandemic has crippled our CRV infrastructure and we need recertification of our local recycling centers to get through this crisis. This would require allowing temporary appointment-based redemption. Please help.

Karim Ameri

I strongly recommend an increase in processing payments to underserved and high-cost areas such as the Bay area and Central California. In addition to allotting money per fiscal year in the budget for underserved areas, an additional layer of financial support would be called for to offset high costs and encourage recycling centers to serve those populations that currently have a limited access to CRV redemption centers. I further recommend recycling facilities be allowed to close temporarily, with prior notice, for valid reasons such as inclement weather, emergencies, remodeling, construction, COVID exposure etc. There are a host of valid reasons that may necessitate a temporary closure that may last a single day or more.

David Slagle

Commissioners. Hambro Recycling is operating a successful recycling center in rural, northwest California. Please consider the following issues to address the recycling crisis in rural California: • Provide processing fees for aluminum products when scrap value falls below a baseline level based on an established market index. • Provide matching funding to open centers in underserved areas to enhance the economic viability of such endeavors. • Allow handling fees for all centers in underserved areas whether on dealer sites, dual certified, or paying scrap incentive. • Encourage/incentivize grocers to establish relationships with recycling centers and/or processors. • Allow the Director to authorize the amending of operating hours and locations for specific reasons to accommodate fluctuation in CRV operations due to significant events affecting local communities. • Allow the Director to review and amend minor burdensome policies

affecting rural recycling. With reasonable modifications we would be encouraged to expand operations to adjacent communities. David Slagle Hambro Recycling

Ralph Alcantar Jr.

As overall environmental issues continue to become a much greater priority. The current "Recycling Center infrastructure of positive contribution to help offset some of these challenges has dramatically deteriorated over the past few years and resulted in a record number of site closures. The recommendations established by the Statewide Commission provide additional support to both struggling and marginal recycling centers and develop new opportunities for underserved areas. Another consideration, similar to a franchise model would be limitations to the number of recycling center certifications issued in a specific region to prevent oversaturation of a specific area creating further recycling centers challenges. Californian's need their CRV deposits back more than ever during this "Pandemic Crisis" and the long recovery ahead. The recycling centers play a fundamental role in both positive environmental and economic impact .

Kia Villarreal

Please don't extend the additions or revision process. Urgency in approval of a letter is the most important, this doesn't add in time for Governor or Director acting on this. Thank you for help and conversation.

Grocery CRV Working Group

This letter is requesting the Governor give authority and funds to help with action from the Director of CalRecycle. The Director and her staff should have the ability to make changes as needed not needing to be explicitly listed in the letter. Urgency is the utmost importance. Yes, there can always be a second letter.

Tim Shestek

Thank to you to the Commission for the discussion on the issue of advanced recycling. There has been some previous discussion on the issue of the "3-part test" and that the Commission is only interested in hearing about technologies that meet the 3-part test. If a goal of the Commission is to look at policies to improve recycling and markets for recovered materials, then I believe that all policy options, including possible changes to current regulations and statutes should be on the table for discussion and consideration. Thank you again for today's discussion and I look forward to further conversations on this topic.

Stiv Wilson

The American Chemistry Council continues to push chemical recycling as the latest quick fix to a massive plastic pollution Issue--- For one, chemical recycling has not met any of the standards to actually be considered recycling-- but more importantly, you can't point to something as a solution if it doesn't exist at scale. Do we really believe the same industry that caused the problem will spend billions of dollars in capital infrastructure needed to even come close to addressing the massive increase in plastic production? The reason regular recycling isn't working is because there is too much

plastic in the system which makes its value, as a commodity go down. How on earth does a more expensive and experimental technology address a problem where plastic generation has already outpaced decades of recycling capacity? This is just another scheme for Big Plastic to keep making more plastic. We've already been fooled by one solution-- mechanical recycling. We're not accepting any solution that isn't proven yet, especially one that is still in pilot phase. Let's see proof at scale before believing in another fantasy created by the exact industry causing the problem. Thank You, Stiv Wilson Peak Plastic Foundation

Genevieve Abedon

The Clean Seas Lobbying Coalition supports source reduction and reuse as true solutions to the plastic pollution crisis. We are not going to recycle our way out of it, no matter what form recycling takes, and no form of recycling is a replacement for reducing plastic production. The increasing surge in plastic use exacerbates health risks from production all the way through disposal - predominantly in communities of color and/or low-income communities. Rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses are far greater in communities near oil refineries, plastic production facilities, highways used for shipping, and incinerators or landfills. Steps must be taken to protect the public health of these communities, and in our opinion advanced recycling is not a step in that direction. Advanced Recycling is a false solution that doesn't take into consideration the entire life cycle of plastics.

Daniel Velazquez

I respectfully disagree about the stigmatization of fuels. Plastic and Tire waste are the only types of waste that share and made of hydrocarbon components and Advanced Recycling creates new markets for these types of waste. Fuels can power vessels, school buses with low sulfur fuels, mining machinery for lithium drilling & extraction and so on.