

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
AND
ALAMEDA COUNTY RECYCLING BOARD**

Thursday, June 13, 2019

4:00 P.M.

**StopWaste Offices
1537 Webster Street
Oakland, CA 94612
510-891-6500**

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Sarah Vared called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL OF ATTENDANCE

Bernie Camara, Recycling Materials Processing Industry
Deborah Cox, ACWMA
Tianna Nourot, Solid Waste Industry Representative
Jim Oddie, ACWMA
Dave Sadoff, ACWMA
Sarah Vared, Source Reduction Specialist
Francisco Zermeño, ACWMA

Absent:

Jillian Buckholz, Recycling Programs
Dianne Martinez, ACWMA
Vacant, Environmental Educator
Vacant, Environmental Organization

Staff Present:

Jeff Becerra, Communications Manager
Pat Cabrera, Administrative Services Director
Anu Natarajan, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager
Meghan Starkey, Senior Management Analyst
Farand Kan, County Counsel
Arliiss Dunn, Clerk of the Board

Others Participating:

Steve Lautze, Oakland/Berkeley RMDZ Coordinator, City of Oakland
Geno Uliana, City of Fremont
Myvan Khuu-Seeman, City of Newark
Jeff Krump, City of Hayward
Kerry Parker, City of Alameda
Arthur Boone

DRAFT

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDENT

There were none.

IV. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Arthur Boone provided public comment regarding the most recent data collected on the performance of County relative to recycling activities did not break down the data relative to the cities as mandated by Measure D and implored the Recycling Board to exercise its oversight regarding this issue. A copy of the handout is attached.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **Approval of the Draft Minutes of May 9, 2019, 2019 (Jeff Becerra)**
2. **Board Attendance Record (Jeff Becerra)**
3. **Written Report of Ex Parte Communications (Jeff Becerra)**
4. **Grants Issued Under Executive Director Signature Authority (Wendy Sommer)**

There were no public comments for the consent calendar. Board member Zermeño made the motion to approve the consent calendar. Board member Oddie seconded and the motion carried 7-0: (Ayes: Camara, Cox, Nourot, Oddie, Sadoff, Vared, Zermeño. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Buckholz, Martinez. Vacant: Environmental Educator, Environmental Organization)

VI. REGULAR CALENDAR

1. **Proposed FY 2019-20 Budget (Wendy Sommer & Pat Cabrera)**

That the Recycling Board adopt the Source Reduction and Recycling Board FY 19-20 Budget Resolution (Attachment A).

Pat Cabrera provided a summary of the staff report. A link to the report is available here: [FY19-20-Annual-Budget.pdf](#). The proposed FY 19-20 budget was presented at a combined meeting of the WMA, Recycling Board, and the Energy Council on April 24, 2019. There were no requests for changes to the budget.

There was no public comment on this item. Board member Sadoff made the motion to adopt the FY 19-20 budget. Board member Cox seconded and the motion carried 7-0:

(Ayes: Camara, Cox, Nourot, Oddie, Sadoff, Vared, Zermeño. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Buckholz, Martinez. Vacant: Environmental Educator, Environmental Organization)

2. **Municipal Panel: Public Events (Meghan Starkey)**

This item is for information only.

Meghan Starkey provided an overview of the staff report and introduced the panelists: Geno Uliana, City of Fremont, Myvan Khuu-Seeman, City of Newark, Jeff Krump, City of Hayward, and Kerry Parker, City of Alameda. The panelists shared their cities' experiences with various citizen facing events related to solid waste and recycling. An audio link to the discussion is available here: [Municipal-Panel-Public-Events-06-13-19](#)

President Vared thanked the panelists for their presentations.

3. Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ) (Anu Natarajan)

Provide direction to staff on beginning the process of expanding the Berkeley and Oakland RMDZ to a countywide RMDZ, with StopWaste becoming the Zone Administrator.

Anu Natarajan provided an overview of the staff report and presented a PowerPoint presentation. A link to the report and the presentation is available here: [RMDZ-06-13-19.pdf](#)

Ms. Natarajan introduced Steve Lautze, Oakland/Berkeley RMDZ Coordinator, City of Oakland. Mr. Lautze provided an overview of his role at the City of Oakland and encouraged the Board to consider a regional approach to market development.

Board member Zermeño stated that he supports the proposal and inquired if CalRecycle and the cities of Berkeley and Oakland are in agreement as well. Ms. Natarajan stated that Mr. Lautze has spoken with the City of Oakland and we will soon speak with the City of Berkeley but their staff has indicated that they are in support of the proposal. CalRecycle staff was supportive as well. Board member Zermeño added the benefits of the proposal is that it will increase the facilities for recycling and manufacturing recyclables, the impact on the climate, as well as the notion of a circular economy. He added he is confident that the City of Hayward will support a regional approach. Board member Cox inquired if contamination continues to be an issue with moving of the materials. Mr. Lautze stated that in the past the emphasis was on movement of materials and not on quality of materials, however national sword is sending a message that we need to focus on quality. Board member Cox inquired if the program will include speaking to the haulers about how they can obtain the materials. Ms. Natarajan stated that although contamination is an important issue, an important aspect of the program will be a focus on reuse and waste prevention. President Vared stated that from a business perspective businesses could source feedstock from anywhere and inquired about the benefit of moving it county wide as opposed to keeping it local. Mr. Lautze stated that a criteria for a business obtaining a loan would be the material has to travel to a facility in the zone. Mr. Lautze added one of StopWaste' tasks will be to take inventory in the county, i.e. who are the existing processors that are ready and accustomed to using recycling materials and how do we expand from there and integrate into the messaging that anywhere in the county can host a facility or can supply feedstock and how those businesses can work together. President Vared commented that at a high level this approach makes sense in all the areas that StopWaste is already supporting and suggested that in the next phase we consider the areas that proved successful and unsuccessful with respect to the available resources and what would help drive the needle. Ms. Natarajan pointed out that most of the loans were given in the early years of the program with a different program model. The current model may not be in the large manufacturing area and we will be looking for current gaps in infrastructure and where we want to be in 5-10 years.

Board member Camara indicated that she has mixed feelings on this issue as she moves discarded materials in her occupation and would need to abstain from the vote as she does not have enough information to make a decision.

There were no public comments on this item. Board member Cox made the motion to approve that staff continue the next steps. Board member Zermeño seconded and the motion carried 6-0-1: (Ayes: Cox, Nourot, Oddie, Sadoff, Vared, Zermeño. Nays: None. Abstain: Camara. Absent: Buckholz, Martinez. Vacant: Environmental Educator, Environmental Organization)

VII. COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Board member Zermeno commented on an article in the San Francisco Chronicle “San Francisco takes on an ocean of plastic waste.” The article considers a crackdown on single use plastic waste. A copy of the article is attached.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Arthur R. Boone, Center for Recycling Research, Berkeley. 510/910-6451 arboone3@gmail.com

SHARING REVENUE WITH THE LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES: WHAT MEASURE D SAYS.

The major purpose of Measure D 1990 was to raise revenues for local public agencies to assist them in rolling out the then soon -expected curbside programs and to develop a county-wide research and development program in waste reduction and recycling. The statute was clear as to how the income coming from added tip fees on garbage deposited in landfills sited in the county should be shared.

At 64.060 A. it says, "During the first twenty-seven (27) months after the effective date of the Act, the Recycling Board shall support recycling programs and otherwise fulfill the provisions of this Act by disbursing monies from the Recycling Fund as follows:" and continues at A.1. "Eighty percent (80% of the total shall be apportioned on a per-capita basis to municipalities for the planning and implementation of ... [then listing the programs]." "Funds so disbursed shall be used exclusively for supporting municipal recycling programs."

At 64.060 B. it says, "Commencing twenty-eight months after the effective date of this Act, the Recycling Board shall support recycling programs and otherwise fulfill the provisions of this Act by disbursing monies from the Recycling Fund as follows: 1. Fifty percent (50%) shall be disbursed on a per capita basis to municipalities for the continuation and expansion of municipal recycling programs." (The other 50% was to be distributed as the law requires.)

At 64.060 C it says, "For the purpose of apportionment of funds under the provisions of this Subsection, and for the purpose of sound discarded materials management, the Recycling Board shall cause accurate, reliable and up-to-date estimates to be maintained of the amounts and kinds of recycling and refuse generation occurring in each municipality."

At 64.060 F it says, "Commencing January 1, 1995, the Recycling Board may vote, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors and a double majority of the cities, to adjust the distribution of funds under Paragraph 62.060 (B) in order to further progress toward the recycling policy then in effect."

MY OPINIONS: The purpose of F is to require accountability on the part of local public agencies receiving support from the Recycling Fund. Agencies creating good programs can be awarded with a larger share; agencies shirking their duties would have their distribution shrink. The critical numbers to make that evaluation are missing now because somebody here decided that data "in each municipality" was not to be collected in the most recent report. I would say that's a violation of Measure D and actions should be taken.

June, 2019 File: CRR - Data from each municipality not taken, 6-19.

This page intentionally left blank

California takes on an ocean of plastic waste, considers crackdown on industry

Dustin Gardiner

June 12, 2019 | Updated: June 12, 2019 10:16 a.m.



A wall of baled plastic looming over Recology's Recycle Central represents one day's worth of San Francisco's plastic and water bottles. Low-grade plastic shipped to other countries has polluted them.

Photo: Josie Norris / The Chronicle

SACRAMENTO — Even in an eco-conscious city like San Francisco, more than 9,000 tons of recyclables are dumped in landfills every year largely due to one culprit: flimsy plastics.

Low-grade plastics, such as shopping bags, padded online shipping envelopes and food packaging, are piling up in recycling centers. Part of the reason is that overseas markets such as China and the Philippines — which used to buy America's trash by the shipload — are turning most plastics away.

California lawmakers say the state must act to stop plastics from crowding landfills and polluting the ocean. They've proposed sweeping legislation to require manufacturers to reduce the reliance on single-use plastics.

Supporters say the legislation reflects a game-changing realization: Supposedly recyclable plastic shipped overseas for decades often was never easily recycled. Instead, it polluted other countries.

That's because the low-grade material has little value — it's already broken down to a weak form and difficult to reuse profitably. Rigid plastics, such as water bottles and milk jugs, are easier to recycle.

The majority of the plastic that Bay Area residents throw away belongs in the “problematic” category, said Eric Potashner, vice president of Recology, the Bay Area solid-waste hauler.

“It is going to the landfill more often than not,” he said. “We can successfully sort those materials. The problem is, there's no buyer.”

Some Democratic lawmakers say California can take the lead in solving the problem by passing laws aimed at reducing demand for plastics designed to be used once and tossed in the trash.

They say the solution also requires pushing the plastics industry to design recyclable products and reuse its own material — thereby replacing the lost overseas market.



At Recology’s initial sort deck, Tim Coleman separates out pieces of environment-unfriendly flimsy and film plastic destined for landfill.

Photo: Lea Suzuki / The Chronicle

Two identical bills are at the center of the effort: AB1080 by Assemblywoman Lorena Gonzalez, D-San Diego, and SB54 by state Sen. Ben Allen, D-Santa Monica. The measures would require the state to cut the amount of single-use plastics going to landfills by 75 percent by 2030, by either reducing use or making disposable plastics more easily recyclable or compostable.

But the effort faces powerful opposition from the plastics industry and business groups.

The California Chamber of Commerce has labeled the proposal a “job killer,” arguing that “unprecedented” regulations would dramatically increase costs to manufacture products in the state.

Tim Shestek, a lobbyist for the American Chemistry Council, which represents plastic companies, said the industry is “on record saying that we’re interested in a solution.” But he said the bills aren’t clear about what counts as a single-use item.

Shestek said the bills also wouldn't do anything to improve California's recycling infrastructure. Many communities aren't set up to handle a huge influx of compostable trash or more recyclables, he said.

He said the industry has a goal of making 100 percent of plastic packaging reusable or recoverable by 2040, adding that the council wouldn't set that goal "if we weren't serious about trying to address the issue."

However, lawmakers who support the bills say the accumulation of plastic pollution in marine habitats and elsewhere makes it clear that faster action is needed.

"Plastics are frankly strangling the health of our oceans," Sen. Scott Wiener, D-San Francisco, said as the Senate debated SB54 last month. "This is a huge problem, and it's time to move past baby steps to address it."

Each bill passed in its house of origin last month, and could be amended before coming to a final vote. Lawmakers will probably decide at some point to advance a single version.

The proposals were already watered down so a requirement that manufacturers make all single-use plastics recyclable or compostable now would apply only to the 10 most-littered products.

Those 10 products — which could include such items as shopping bags and disposable utensils — would be determined based on state litter surveys. CalRecycle, the state's recycling agency, would have authority to adopt the rules by 2023.

The bills would have a sweeping impact on shipping materials, requiring all packaging used by online retailers and others to be recyclable or compostable by 2023.

Peter Gallotta, a spokesman for the San Francisco Department of the Environment, said changes in consumer behavior, such as the growth of Amazon, have created far more single-use waste than the city dealt with in the past.

"The convenience culture is driving this culture of disposability," he said. "That convenience really has come frankly at the expense of the environment."

A related bill, AB792 by Assemblyman Phil Ting, D-San Francisco, would require beverage companies to use 75 percent recycled content in plastic bottles by the year 2034. The original measure called for 100 percent, but was amended after the soda industry lobbied for changes.

Ting said plastic pollution is a global crisis, noting that scientists predict that plastics in the ocean will outweigh fish by 2050. He said it's "completely paramount that we go do something this year."

The American Beverage Association, which represents soda companies, still opposes the amended version of AB792. It argues that there isn't enough recycled plastic on the market that meets safety requirements for beverage containers.

The bills, which are sponsored by Californians Against Waste and a host of other environmental groups, mark an important strategic shift for lawmakers wrangling with plastic pollution.

Past efforts focused on single products, like bans on plastic shopping bags and straws. But retailers have found workarounds, like shifting to thicker plastic bags that are "reusable" but still not easily recycled.

Nick Lapis, director of advocacy for Californians Against Waste, said the bills are unlike past legislation because they empower CalRecycle to make the rules so it can keep pace with changes in the plastics industry. He said advocates have grown frustrated by manufacturers' reaction to the state's efforts.

"Legislators realize you can't keep saying no as whales wash up on our shores full of plastic bags," Lapis said.

Dustin Gardiner is a San Francisco Chronicle staff writer.

Email: dustin.gardiner@sfchronicle.com Twitter: @dustingardiner