

MINUTES
RETHINKWASTE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, May 6, 2025 at 3:00p.m.

RethinkWaste Administrative Office
1245 San Carlos Ave. Suite E
San Carlos, CA 94070

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Member	Present	Absent
Adam Rak		X
Adam Loraine	X	
Fran Dehn	X	
Jeff Schmidt	X	

2. Public Comment

Persons wishing to address the Board on matters NOT on the posted agenda may do so. Each speaker is limited to three minutes. If there are more than five individuals wishing to speak during public comment, the Chairman will draw five speaker cards from those submitted to speak during this time. The balance of the Public Comment speakers will be called upon at the end of the Board Meeting. If the item you are speaking on is not listed on the agenda, please be advised that the Board may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed as allowed under The Brown Act (Government Code Section 54954.2). The Board's general policy is to refer items to staff for attention, or have a matter placed on a future Board agenda for a more comprehensive action or report and formal public discussion and input at that time. **Speakers may also submit comments via email prior to the meeting by sending those comments to rethinker@rethinkwaste.org.**

N/A

3. Executive Director's Report

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 Board, 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 of April 01, 2025, Legislative Committee Meeting

Motion: A. Loraine

Second: J. Schmidt

Motion Passed: 3 – 0 – 1

Member	In-favor	Opposed	Abstain	Absent
Adam Rak				X
Adam Loraine	X			
Fran Dehn	X			
Jeff Schmidt	X			

5. Discussion on RethinkWaste’s Co-Sponsored Bill: AB 762 (Irwin and Wilson)

EEC staff Strella informed the committee that the co-sponsored bill, AB 762, was made into a 2-year bill and was not heard due to a lack of votes and is eligible to be taken up again in January 2026, and added that conversations have begun to find a better strategy for January.

EEC staff Elroi acknowledged the work done by the agency in promoting and supporting the bill.

EEC staff Addis informed the members of Assemblymember Irwin’s decision to not have a public hearing on the bill allowed for more time to make changes and reach more votes.

EEC staff Strella added that an argument is the worry for people to purchase from black markets.

Executive Director La Mariana informed members of the support by teamsters and CA firefighters for this bill and that moving forward the goal is to continue to target the Assembly Business and Professions Committee members, their district, and district delegations.

EEC staff Elroi added to staff Strella’s comment, informing members that the black-market concern and hesitation came from the cannabis industry and law enforcement and stated that EEC staff discovered data that invalidates that point and will continue to do research to address the concern.

Member Schmidt inquired if those that are opposed and aligned with the cannabis industry were more focused on loss of revenue.

EEC staff Strella confirmed that the argument in part is a loss of revenue as well as the impact on small businesses in that industry, adding that the tobacco industry is also included in the opposition.

Member Loraine inquired if the lobbying effort against the bill is data driven or if it is more qualitative and based on a possible future.

EEC staff Elroi informed the committee that the opposition’s rhetorical argument is based on an ongoing talking point from the tobacco industry and has not been historically proven based.

Member Schmidt inquired if EEC has seen data on comparative impact on safety-based shutdown verses the loss of revenue and if there was a sense of the total cost of loss in the center and loss of service. Stating that it would be interesting to know and help with an argument.

EEC staff Addis informed the committee that the time added will provide time to include extended data to add to the bill.

EEC staff Strella informed the committee on the order of operations and procedures that occur prior to the hearing.

Member Schmidt recommended that if more time is available, the agency should reach out to the local mayors and city councils and provide information sessions to have more people to sign on.

6. Legislative and Regulatory Updates from EEC and Commission Discussion

EEC staff Strella provided an update on the agency's priority bills status, informing which bills landed into the Appropriations committee and suspense file.

SB 45 (Padila) Requiring tethering plastic caps to bottles is on suspense in the Appropriations Committee.

SB 501 (Allen) Household hazardous waste producer responsibility act is on suspense.

AB 436 (Ransom) The compost model ordinance bill is on suspense.

AB 80 (Aguiar-Curry) The carpet recycling bill making changes to the previous program on suspense.

SB 561 (Blakespear) Reintroduction of the marine flare bill is on suspense.

AB 864 (Ward) Solar voltaic modules bill that was just sent to Appropriations with the possibility of being sent to suspense.

AB 998 (Hadwick) A vape bill that allows schools to turn in vapes and remove household hazardous waste payment was sent to Appropriations.

SB 14 (Blakespear) Post consumer content for plastics in state agencies is in Senate Appropriations.

AB 259 (Rubio) Extends the ability for local government to have teleconferencing, did not have a fiscal and went straight to the Assembly floor and has been passed to the Senate.

EEC staff Addis informed the committee of a hearing on May 22 that will report what bills will be taken off suspense and continue and which will stay in a suspense file, stating that there might not a reason given as to why the decision is made.

Member Loraine requested clarification on the process of the bills in suspense and in appropriation.

EEC staff Elroi informed the committee that all bill that were under suspense or appropriation were all sent to the appropriation committee. All bills in suspense have been placed in the suspense file in the appropriations committee. On May 22, 2025 the appropriation committee will go into the suspense file list and say which bills have made it out. The bills that were sent to appropriation and not on the suspense file have been sent to the appropriation committee and have yet to be determined if they'll be in the suspense file and hear them.

EEC staff Strella added that most bills are sent to the appropriations committee and are set for a hearing and sent for an analysis to determine the estimate price to implement the bill through applicable agencies. The bills will be placed on suspense when the estimate cost is researched. Once in suspense, the author will wave the hearing until the end and if a bill is under those thresholds and has support, the bill will be heard and voted on.

Member Loraine inquired if the bills listed for the committee under the progress bar did not make it.

EEC staff Strella informed the committee that those bills should be in appropriation and there are some bills that did not progress and a updated list will be provided to the committee soon.

Staff Au informed the committee that staff will rerun the list and if members have questions on specific bills, they can reach out to staff.

Member Loraine inquired about SB 353 (Alvarado) income tax credits food banks and whether it is on track and why it is on watch by the agency.

EEC staff Addis described the logistic of the tax credit. EEC staff Strella added that it was being watched because of the topic and connection to food diversion.

Executive Director La Mariana informed the committee on the watch of bill AB 864 on solar panels and its importance on future waste management and recycling of solar panels.

EEC staff Strella informed the committee members of the announcement of Zoe Heller's confirmation hearing for director of CalRecycle.

EEC staff Elroi informed the committee that CalRecycle has put out a report to the legislature on the updated regulatory process for SB 54 which reports its in the informal rule making phase and a formal process will be start soon after.

EEC staff Elroi inquired on the question on what level of change would require a rerunning of a support letter.

Staff Au informed the committee on an additional comment to agenda item six, stating that two bills were amended between policy committees and letters that were meant to be sent to the committee for review were not sent due to the quick turnaround time of the amendment and committee hearing. Asked what threshold the members would like staff to follow when adjusting a letter and quickly submitting.

Member Dehn stated that if the changes are not substantive and the support is implied by committee members, but if there is substantive change then the letter should be sent to committee members.

Member Loraine inquired if members are comfortable with deferring to staff to determine what is considered substantive.

Member Dehn stated that if it goes against the role and mission of the organization then it should be considered substantive.

Member Loraine informed that committee that the goal is for members to have more visibility when the agency is taking a position on bills in the form of letters. Adding that to deferring to staff on a decision on whether something is considered substantive to bring back or continue is a decent balance and still informing members of what is going on.

Staff Au let members know that staff will keep members informed on what survives appropriations and the next steps.

Member Dehn recommended that if the legislative committee did not exist and a decision would need to be brought to the executive committee then that is what should be brought to the legislative committee.

7. Discussion on the Function of the RethinkWaste Legislative Committee

Staff Au inquired on whether the committee had any feedback or questions on the description of the function of the RethinkWaste legislative committee provided in the packet.

Member Dehn inquired about why staff chose four board members since odd numbers are what is typically chosen to assist with forming a quorum.

Staff Au informed the committee that in previous years, it would be difficult to obtain a quorum with the use of odd number of members, adding that a change of rules for the committees so that quorum is half due to the small size of committees.

Staff Urman inquired if the EEC staff or staff Savaree would like to inform the committee on any brown act legislation.

Staff Savaree informed the committee that no bills on brown act legislation has moved forward.

The committee members provided a consensus of approval for the legislative committee description.

8. Committee Member Comments

9. Adjourn: 4:06 PM