



MINUTES

**SOUTH BAYSIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
MEETING OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

April 3, 2023 2:00PM

RethinkWaste Offices 610 Elm Street Suite 202, San Carlos, CA 94070

Call To Order: 2:05PM

1. Roll Call

Member	Present	Absent
Michael Brownrigg	X	
Al Royse		X
Adam Rak		X
Fran Dehn	X	

Member Brownrigg stated he would need to use one of his emergency exemptions for attending the meeting virtually.

SBWMA Staff Members Present: Joe La Mariana, Julia Au, Cyndi Urman, Jean Savaree

Others Present: Kayla Robinson, Environmental and Energy Consulting; Reed Addis, Environmental and Energy Consulting

2. Public Comment

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3(a), members of the public wishing to address the Committee may do so, and the comments shall be limited to the Special Meeting notice topic(s). Speakers may join the Zoom meeting via the meeting link and using the “raise hand” feature and the Clerk of the Board will call on people.

None

3. Executive Director’s Welcome

Executive Director La Mariana welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave the following updates.

- The retreat had to be cancelled due to a power outage at the venue; we are working on rescheduling it for May 25.
- Board Member Brownrigg has asked to be replaced on the Legislative Committee, so there will be an item on the April Board meeting agenda to find a replacement Legislative Committee Member. He asked Member Dehn if she felt the same way.
 - Member Dehn commented that three Brown Act meetings is a lot, so if there is a replacement she’d be happy to step off, but she will not give up the Zero Waste Committee.
 - Member Brownrigg noted that it’s the driving time in particular, but if we can find others to participate it’s better for the Agency.
 - Counsel Savaree noted that all members of the committee could give a permanent

teleconference location address to the Clerk of the Board and this committee could remain a teleconference meeting with multiple locations on the agenda.

- He is attending a Solid Waste Association of North America industry conference this week, and went on a tour of the Monterey facility as part of the conference. He noted that the MRF at the Monterey facility is 20 acres, and the entirety of Shoreway is 16 acres, and will head into the full conference starting tonight.
 - Member Brownrigg asked if the facility in Monterey handles a similar amount of material.
 - Executive Director La Mariana answered on the MRF side it's virtually identical, but they also have an active landfill that is about 300 acres on that same site.

4. Approval of Consent Calendar

Consent Calendar item(s) are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Committee, staff or public request specific items be removed for separate action. *Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be moved to the end of the agenda for separate discussion.*

A. Approval of the Minutes from the March 6, 2023 Legislative Committee Meeting

Motion/Second: Dehn/Brownrigg

Roll Call Vote: 2-0-0-2

Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Michael Brownrigg	X			
Al Royse				X
Adam Rak				X
Fran Dehn	X			

5. Legislative and Regulatory Updates from EEC and Committee Discussion

Kayla Robinson gave an overview of where the legislative process is in the calendar:

- By 4/28/2023 all fiscal bills need to move through their policy committees
- Non fiscal bills have an extra week to move through policy committees.
- By the end of April we will know which bills are moving to appropriations committee
- By mid May bills need to move through appropriations
- The appropriations bills will keep fiscal bills in a suspense file until May 18 or 19, where they will then potentially act on everything at once
- This year RethinkWaste doesn't have any sponsored legislation, but EEC is still watching this process closely to make sure we are supporting bills that are of high priority to the Agency.

She then went over some questions from the last meeting regarding bills.

SB 244 (Eggman)/SB 271 (Dodd) – Both are related to giving consumers the information they need to repair electronics products in an effort to reduce electronic waste. SB271 is focused on electronic wheelchairs while SB 244 is broader. Last month there was discussion around potentially supporting both bills given the nexus to batteries, but there was clarification requested about one being specific to wheelchairs, and whether the broader one would cover wheelchairs. SB 244 By Senator Eggman covers consumer products between the price of \$50 to \$99. An electric wheelchair would go well above that cost. So, EEC recommends RethinkWaste take a support position on both, with the wheelchair one being lower priority engagement.

Member Brownrigg commented that he wasn't aware of the price point on SB 244 and thought it would cause a lot of lower priced products see their price raised to \$100.

Kayla Robinson agreed noting that it didn't mean you couldn't repair higher price point items, but that the information for repair would only be publicly available for items in that price point. She thought this was probably similar to the way the New York bill that was passed last year was written to get a foot in the door to repair for a broader suite of consumer electronics products.

SB 353 (Dodd) – Expands the bottle bill to include larger size juice containers. Member Rak asked last meeting if it was just plastic or other types of container materials that it applied to. Kayla noted that it includes the suite of materials already deemed recyclable; glass, plastic and aluminum that have the CRV tax on them at purchase. This bill includes the large size juice containers previously excluded.

SB 272 (Laird) – This bill related to sea level rise raised some concerns from the group at the last meeting. Kayla gave an overview of the bill and the discussion from last time noting the concerns about cost and that this would be duplicative work. She clarified that it is a reintroduction of a bill that was vetoed by the Governor's office last year due to fiscal concerns. Cal Cities and CSAC have gotten several amendments to the bill which make them feel more comfortable essentially saying that local governments would not do this work unless there's an appropriation by the legislature, so cost to do sea level rise planning would be covered by the state, and allows for agencies doing work in this area to submit that work on behalf of the agencies where they are. Cal Cities is neutral on the bill after opposition last year, but Bay Area Council and Bay planning Coalition are opposed at this point due to cost concerns.

RethinkWaste will remain neutral on this bill.

Kayla Robinson then went over some substantially amended bills since the last meeting, and that RethinkWaste might want to take a position on.

AB 1548 (Hart) – is a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) grant program for recycling infrastructure projects. She noted that there is an existing fund through the GGRF that helps fund SB1383 implementation, and this bill proposes expanding that fund to include a broader suite of reuse programs and infrastructure funding as opposed to just organics infrastructure. She also noted that it's not a funding bill, but funding that goes through the GGRF program could fund a broader suite of issues that local governments are dealing with and provides more flexibility in the funding. However, it could water down money going towards SB 1383.

Member Brownrigg commented that he was appreciative of more local flexibility but was worried about funding going down as the same pot of money goes to fund a broader scope of issues.

SB 728 (Limón)- would prohibit the sale of plastic gift cards by 2026 which is something that SB 54 doesn't cover. So, it's trying to get at a different level of plastics pollution. She noted that she didn't think it included the larger value ones that can be used at multiple stores.

AB 1590 (Friedman) – would ban single use plastic products at coastal resorts large resorts near the ocean.

Member Dehn asked why this is not all resorts or all hotels.

Kayla Robinson noted that the language has been amended since the committee report was posted, so it's a new bill that EEC will be watching on behalf of RethinkWaste, but the definition includes that they have a golf course so it's really targeting large resorts.

SB 568 (Newman) – requires e-waste to be recycled in California if there is proven capacity in California to recycle it. She thought this bill was partially inspired by his work with RethinkWaste on batteries.

Member Brownrigg commented that he is in favor of the ship it locally first before shipping it overseas policy but thought that it should be taken further by saying that the state wants everything to be recycled in California by a certain date, so that that investing in recycling infrastructure might be possible. He asked if we could go back to the bill sponsor and add a line about encouraging more recycling in California.

Kayla Robinson agreed that these are all very niche bills but added that it was possible to add language to a bill, but often times the reason the legislature takes these niche approaches to legislature is because broad based change is usually opposed.

Joe La Mariana noted that CalRecycle does have an economic incentive program for manufacturers and producers of products that use these products in California to recycle them in California. But, from what he understands, even with those incentives California has too many environmental regulations, and too high of labor costs to make recycling in California cost effective.

The committee then discussed teleconferencing bills. There are several teleconference bills, so it's a matter of which one is the right one for RethinkWaste to support. Staff Au was going to check in with Member Rak on these bills, and Kayla Robinson was going to send the list of teleconferencing bills to Counsel Savaree for review.

Lastly, Kayla Robinson noted that the Legislative Analyst's Office has said that potentially the SB 1383 money that was allocated the last two years was ripe for being pulled back this year. So EEC did lead on a letter with 10-15 organizations to raise that pulling this funding is an unacceptable option.

Member Dehn asked if there have been any changes to AB 1628.

Kayla Robinson noted that the bill passed out of committee last week and was single referred to appropriations, so it is now in that suspense file discussed earlier.

6. Legislative Committee Member Comments

7. Adjourn 2:56PM