



1850 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Ste. 320
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Telephone: 925.906.1801
Email: authority@recyclesmart.org
Website: www.recyclesmart.org
Facebook: www.facebook.com/CCCSWA

STANDING LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

APRIL 17, 2025 – 1:30 P.M.

RecycleSmart
1850 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Ste. 320
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Off-site Attendance

Candace Andersen
1516 Kamole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THIS AGENDA**

When addressing the Committee, please state your name, company and/or address for the record.
There is a three-minute limit to present your information. (The Committee Chair may direct questions to any member of the audience as appropriate at any time during the meeting.)

3. **CONSENT ITEM**

- a. Approve Minutes of the Standing Legislative Committee Meeting on March 17, 2025*

4. **ACTION ITEM**

- a. Update on 2025 Legislative Bills*
Review and discuss developments in 2025 legislation and if appropriate direct staff to present recommendations to the full Board for potential action.

5. **COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE ON AN ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Persons wishing to speak on PUBLIC HEARINGS and OTHER MATTERS listed on the agenda will be heard when the Chair calls for comments from the audience, except on public hearing items previously heard and closed to public comment. The Chair may specify the number of minutes each person will be permitted to speak based on the number of persons wishing to speak and the time available. After the public has commented, the item is closed to further public comment and brought to the Board for discussion and action. There is no further comment permitted from the audience unless invited by the Board.

ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE ON AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA

In accordance with State law, the Committee is prohibited from discussing items not calendared on the agenda. For that reason, members of the public wishing to discuss or present a matter to the Committee other than a matter which is on the Agenda are requested to present the matter in writing to RecycleSmart Board Secretary at least one week prior to a regularly scheduled Board meeting date. If you are unable to do this, you may make an announcement to the Committee of your concern under PUBLIC COMMENTS. Matters brought up which are not on the agenda may be referred to staff for action or calendared on a future

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

In accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act and California Law, it is the policy of the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority dba RecycleSmart to offer its public meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to everyone, including those with disabilities. If you are disabled and require special accommodations to participate, please contact RecycleSmart Board Secretary at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at (925) 906-1801.

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
STANDING LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
HELD ON MARCH 17, 2025**

The meeting of the Standing Legislative Committee of the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority (CCCSWA) aka RecycleSmart convened at 1850 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Suite 320, Walnut Creek, County of Contra Costa, State of California, on March 17, 2025. Committee Chair Cindy Silva called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Committee Members: Candace Andersen*
Newell Arnerich
Lisa Maglio
John McCormick
Janet Riley
Cindy Silva, Chair

ABSENT: None

*Off-site Attendance:
Candace Andersen
1516 Kamole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

Staff members present: David Krueger, Executive Director; Janna McKay, Executive Assistant/Secretary to the Board; and Jennifer Faught, Contract Compliance Specialist.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THIS AGENDA

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

3. CONSENT ITEM

- a. Approve Minutes of the Standing Legislative Committee Meeting on May 17, 2024

Chair Silva requested an amendment to the minutes of the May 17, 2024 Legislative Committee meeting, as follows:

~~On what action could be taken, Committee Member Andersen acknowledged that while no one representing the Board could campaign against the measure, by taking a position there could be an ongoing discussion of how bad the measure would be and what it could mean.~~ Committee Member Andersen recommended that the agency be added to the list of those opposed to the measure. [Initiative #21-0042A1, the Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act.]

MOTION by Committee Member Arnerich to approve the minutes of the Standing Legislative Committee meeting on May 17, 2024, as amended.
SECOND by Committee Member McCormick.

MOTION PASSED by the following Roll Call vote.

AYES:	Arnerich, Andersen, McCormick, Riley, Silva
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	Maglio
ABSENT:	None

4. **ACTION ITEM**

a. **2025 Legislation Bills**

Review and Discuss 2025 Legislation and Direct Staff to Present Committee's Recommendations to the Full Board at the April Meeting for Potential Action

Jennifer Faught, Contract Compliance Specialist, displayed a spreadsheet of 2025 Waste Reduction and Recycling Bills, commented that it was early in the season and things could change, stated that information had been added to reflect Republic Services' position, and anticipated another meeting of the Committee in the next month to six weeks to finalize all the information from the State Legislature.

Ms. Faught reported that **AB 80 Carpet recycling: product stewardship for carpet; fines**, was one of those bills that had not been finalized. The bill proposed cleanup language to the existing carpet stewardship law and was sponsored by the California Product Stewardship Council (CPSC). She stated more information needed to be provided on AB 80 before a position could be taken by RecycleSmart.

Responding to questions, Ms. Faught reported that currently the difference AB 80 offered from the existing law was that the bill removed the potential civil penalty of \$25,000 per day for negligent violations to match a similar statute that only allowed the penalty for no intentional or knowing violations. She noted that the changes were generally non-controversial clean-up items and she expected more changes in the future.

By consensus, the Committee placed **AB 80** on a **WATCH**.

Ms. Faught referred to **AB 337 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: grant program; edible food**, and noted the legislation made clear that grant-eligible costs related to edible food recovery could include transportation and costs for software. She recommended support for AB 337.

By consensus, the Committee **SUPPORTED AB 337**.

For **AB 436 Composting facilities. Zoning**, Ms. Faught identified this bill as one of two compost facility-related bills, this one non-controversial. The bill would require CalRecycle to create a technical advisory, which could include documents like a sample General Plan and sample ordinances that local governments could refer to when working on regulations to site composting facilities. This bill had support all around from the industry.

The bill did not require anything but offered local agencies some resources and tools to use, if desired.

Committee Member Arnerich questioned the real reason for the bill because of the reference to the statewide goal of reducing the disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 75 percent by 2025, with the implication that some other regulations might soon be required.

On the discussion, Ms. Faught read from the bill that the technical advisory would reflect best practices to facilitate the siting of composting facilities to meet the organic waste reduction goals, although members of the Committee and staff noted that CalRecycle had no legal jurisdiction related to land use. She surmised that CalRecycle might lend its expertise to local governments when considering their land uses. She stated that if the bill changed, RecycleSmart might want to change its position.

By consensus, the Committee placed **AB 436** as a bill to **WATCH**, for further clarification that this bill was not the precursor to a mandate that would supersede local authority over the siting of landfills.

Ms. Faught referred to **AB 473 related to the chasing arrows recycling symbol and SB54 (the ability to sell materials in the State of California)**, which Republic Services had brought to RecycleSmart's attention because it was a concern. She understood that some producers who had been nervous over SB 54, which had been delayed, wanted to make a change to the truth in labeling law that prohibited the use of the chasing arrows symbol on items that were actually recyclable as determined by a certain number of facilities accepting them and being created into new products. Those producers wanted to change the language so that items would be considered recyclable if the producer was approved by a producer responsibility organization to participate in an organization.

Mr. Krueger suggested that Republic's concern was that it would make it easier for manufacturers to get their products added to the list of things that RecycleSmart had to accept in its programs, even if they were not recyclable.

By consensus, the Committee **OPPOSED AB 473**.

Ms. Faught referred to **AB 762 Single-use Vaping Devices Sales Ban** and explained it was being sponsored by several organizations and would prohibit the sale of disposable vaping devices in the state; disposable because the batteries were not rechargeable or batteries were embedded and unreachable for recharging. A further concern was that lithium-ion batteries were volatile and toxic.

By consensus, the Committee **SUPPORTED AB 762**.

As to **AB 864 hazardous waste: solar photovoltaic modules**, Ms. Faught identified the spot bill related to end-of-life solar panels and noted that similar bills had been proposed last year. The issue that solar panels had thus far been manufactured without consideration of being recyclable was emphasized, and it was noted that the current bill allowed these panels to be handled more easily in the state. The next piece would be the stewardship plan.

By consensus, the Committee placed **AB 864** as a bill to **WATCH**.

Ms. Faught commented that there would be a revival of **SB 615, the electric vehicle battery EPR (extended producer responsibility) Program**. She asked the Committee if it wanted to see that legislation at the next meeting and the Committee confirmed the need to see the current SB 615.

Ms. Faught referred to **SB 45 Recycling Beverage Containers: tethered plastic caps**, where beverage manufacturers after January 1, 2027, shall ensure that beverages offered for sale with plastic caps have a cap that is tethered to the container. For a beverage container with a recycling rate of better than 70 percent, the deadline would be January 1, 2028. Those beverage containers that would be exempt would be 2-liter bottles, beer and other malt beverages, wine and distilled spirits, and 100 percent fruit juice.

By consensus, the Committee **SUPPORTED SB 45**.

Ms. Faught identified **SB 279 Solid waste: compostable materials**, as the more controversial of the composting facilities bills and stated it would allow agricultural composting on site to be excluded from permitting requirements if the pile did not exceed 500 cubic yards, five times over what was currently allowed. Another part of the bill allowed some food, up to 10 percent, to be mixed with green waste in the enforcement agency notification tier.

Ms. Faught suggested that at a minimum there had been arguments that the bill was inappropriate given an unfairness situation with respect to food handling, and since some companies had invested a large amount of money in large, fully-permitted composting facilities.

By consensus, the Committee placed **SB 279** as a bill to **WATCH**.

With respect to **SB 501 Household Hazardous Waste Producer Responsibility Act**, Ms. Faught stated the bill had been brought up last year and was being revived for cleaning supplies, pesticides, mercury products, and antifreeze, among others. She understood the bill had been modeled on the Textile EPR bill from last year. The industry had commented that some things were not appropriate for the bill and some changes were expected.

Given the expected changes and the fact that the bill would involve a lot of work, a watch was recommended.

By consensus, the Committee placed **SB 501** as a bill to **WATCH**.

MOTION by Chair Silva to **SUPPORT AB 337, AB 762, and SB 45**; to **WATCH AB 80, AB 436, AB 864, SB 279 and SB 501**; and to **OPPOSE AB 473**. SECOND by Committee Member Arnerich.

MOTION PASSED unanimously by a Roll Call vote.

The Legislative Committee decided to submit its recommendations to the full Board at its meeting on March 27, 2025, and schedule another meeting of the Committee on April 17, 2025 at 1:30 P.M. to receive updates to the legislation discussed.

5. COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Committee communications or announcements.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, Chair Silva adjourned the meeting at 11:09 A.M. to the next meeting on April 17, 2025, at 1:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janna McKay, Executive Assistant/
Secretary to the Board of the
Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority,
County of Contra Costa, State of California



Agenda Report

TO: CCCSWA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: DAVID KRUEGER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
JENNIFER FAUGHT, CONTRACT COMPLIANCE SPECIALIST
DATE: APRIL 17, 2025
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON 2025 LEGISLATION

SUMMARY

The Legislative Committee met March 17 to discuss solid waste-related bills pending in the legislature, and authorized positions on several bills. The Committee elected to meet again after other bills developed more.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Review and discuss developments in 2025 legislation and if appropriate direct staff to present recommendations to the full Board for potential action.

DISCUSSION

The Legislative Committee met March 17 to discuss several bills pending in the legislature this year. The Board approved supporting three bills, opposing one bill, and watching five bills. Updates and additional information on the bills are provided in the attachments. Staff has also included an additional bill regarding end-of-life management of EV batteries, SB 615 (Allen). A representative from the California Product Stewardship Council will be attending the first part of the meeting remotely to provide updates and information on the extended producer responsibility and end-of-life management bills.

ATTACHMENT

- A. Updated spreadsheet of bills



2025 Waste Reduction and Recycling Bills

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
WATCHED BILLS		
AB 80 (Aguiar-Curry)	<p>Carpet recycling.</p> <p>AB 80 would make several technical clean-ups to the existing product stewardship program for carpet. It would exempt covered materials from the transportation requirement if they were being transported back to the manufacturer. It would also expand approved collection sites to include certain carpet recycling centers, municipal facilities, and retailers. This bill also changes the non-voting appointed seat on the Carpet Advisory Board from a circular economy organization to an environmental protection organization. It would also require the stewardship plan to include information on stamps/product markings to convey manufacturer and material information on the back of covered products. This bill would also authorize a civil penalty of \$25,000 per day if the violation is intentional or knowing (not merely negligent).</p> <p>Policy Platform: Extended Producer Responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – California Product Stewardship Council (CPSC) position: Sponsor – Cal Cities position: Watch – Californians Against Waste (CAW) position: Support – Staff recommendation: Support 	<p>The bill proposes non-controversial edits that should improve the carpet EPR program.</p> <p>Passed Natural Resources Committee and referred to Appropriations Committee.</p>
AB 436 (Ransom)	<p>Composting facilities: zoning.</p> <p>The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 establishes the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to administer an integrated waste management program. Current law establishes a goal that statewide landfill disposal of organic waste be reduced from the 2014 level by 75% by 2025. This bill, on or before June 1, 2027, would require the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, in consultation with the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, to develop and post on the office's</p>	<p>Author's statement: "AB 436 will assist local jurisdictions in California in meeting our organic waste diversion targets by expediting the siting and permitting of composting facilities. AB 436 would provide local governments with an additional tool to help more easily site these facilities, mitigating an existing</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
	<p>internet website, a technical advisory, as provided, reflecting best practices to facilitate the siting of composting facilities to meet the organic waste reduction goals. The bill would require the office to consult with specified entities throughout the development of the technical advisory. In addition, this bill, upon a substantive revision of the land use element, as specified, on or after January 1, 2029, would require a city, county, or city and county to consider, among other things, the best practices, sample general plan, and model ordinance reflected in the technical advisory and to consider updating the land use element to identify areas where composting facilities may be appropriate as an allowable use. By increasing duties on a city, county, or city and county, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Recycling and Organics Processing Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Support – CPSC position: Support – Resource Recovery Coalition of California (MDRR’s trade association) position: Support – Staff recommendation: Support 	<p>permitting barrier that does not impact environmental standards. This is a common sense approach that assists local governments and helps achieve our environmental goals.”</p> <p>Passed out of Natural Resources Committee March 24. Re-referred to Local Government Committee for hearing on April 9.</p>
<p>AB 864 (Ward)</p>	<p>Hazardous waste: solar photovoltaic modules.</p> <p>Existing law requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control to adopt regulations for the identification and management of hazardous wastes. Existing law authorizes the department to adopt regulations designating end-of-life photovoltaic modules that are identified as hazardous waste as a universal waste and subject to regulations applicable to universal waste management. This bill would exempt solar photovoltaic modules not identified as hazardous waste and treated as universal waste, as defined, from state hazardous waste regulations, if transferred to a designated recycler for legitimate recycling, as described, and if the facility meets specified criteria relating to registration permits, as provided.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Waste Diversion; Toxics Reduction/Household Hazardous Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Watch – CPSC position: Support – Staff recommendation: Watch 	<p>AB 864 would allow more solar panels to be recycled in state.</p> <p>Referred to the Committee on Environmental Safety & Toxic Materials for hearing on April 8.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
SB 279 (McNerney)	<p>Solid waste: compostable materials.</p> <p>Current law requires the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to adopt and revise regulations setting forth minimum standards for composting, in accordance with law. Current regulations require all compostable materials handling activities to obtain a permit prior to commencing operations and to comply with specified requirements. Current regulations specify 4 regulatory tiers for composting operations, with different requirements for each tier. The 4 tiers are excluded, enforcement agency notification, registration permit, and full solid waste facility permit. In the excluded tier, existing regulations specify the “excluded activities” that do not constitute compostable material handling operations or facilities and, therefore, are not subject to permit requirements or other regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Specifically, this bill would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the amount of organic material that is excluded from regulation for composting (in the excluded activity regulatory tier) from 100 cubic yards to 500 cubic yards of material. 2. Exclude on-site composting of agricultural materials from a large-scale biomass event (e.g., from removing a vineyard) from compost regulations. Specify that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Material or residues from a large-scale biomass management event do not include animal carcasses. b. Off-site and byproduct agricultural material can be used to blend with the onsite materials for this excluded activity. c. An entity that acquires and uses agricultural materials, agricultural byproduct materials, or agricultural manure shall maintain records identifying the origin of the material or manure and present those records to enforcement agencies upon request. 3. Allow mid-tier composting operations (12,500 cubic yards or less) to accept up to 10% food material and be regulated in the “notification tier” for five years before beginning an application for the “full permitted tier” required for facilities of this size that accept food waste under existing law. 	<p>According to Californians Against Waste, this bill would expand composting capacity in California by providing growers with a sustainable alternative to open burning while increasing opportunities to recycle food scraps and agricultural waste. It would also facilitate the development of additional composting infrastructure to support local governments in achieving their SB 1383 requirements.</p> <p>Passed Senate Environmental Quality Committee and Appropriations Committee; placed on Appropriations suspense file.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
	<p>4. Increase the amount of compost that agricultural operations can give away or sell and still have their compost operations be an excluded activity from 1,000 cubic yards to 5,000 cubic yards.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Recycling and Organics Processing Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Watch – CAW position: Sponsor – Resource Recovery Coalition of California (MDRR’s trade association) position: Oppose – Republic Services: Oppose – Staff recommendation: Watch 	
<p>SB 501 (Allen)</p>	<p>Household Hazardous Waste Producer Responsibility Act.</p> <p>This bill would create a producer responsibility program for products containing household hazardous waste and would require a producer responsibility organization (PRO) to ensure the safe and convenient collection and management of covered products at no cost to consumers or local governments. The bill would define “covered product” to mean a consumer product that is ignitable, toxic, corrosive, or reactive, or that meets other specified criteria. The bill would require a producer of a covered product to register with the PRO, which would be required to develop and implement a producer responsibility plan for the collection, transportation, and the safe and proper management of covered products. The bill would require DTSC to adopt regulations to implement the program with an effective date no earlier than July 1, 2028.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Extended Producer Responsibility, Toxics Reduction/Household Hazardous Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Support – Resource Recovery Coalition of California (MDRR’s trade association): Support – Republic Services: Support – CCCSWA position on similar bill from last year and staff recommendation: Support 	<p>Household hazardous waste is expensive and difficult to manage, and much of it ends up in the landfill or other locations where it pollutes our environment. EPR for hazardous materials in particular makes sense, and the industry should fund and support the end-of-life management of these products.</p> <p>Passed the Senate Committee on Environmental Quality. Re-referred to the Committee on Judiciary for hearing on April 22.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
AB 666 (Rogers)	<p>State Cryptid.</p> <p>Existing law establishes the state flag and the state’s emblems, including, among other things, the golden poppy as the official state flower and the California redwood as the official state tree. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would designate Bigfoot as the official state cryptid.</p> <p><i>For information only.</i></p>	<p>Currently held in committee by the Committee on Arts, Entertainment, Sports, and Tourism.</p>
	ADDITIONAL BILL FOR CONSIDERATION	
SB 615 (Allen)	<p>SB-615 Vehicle traction batteries.</p> <p>This bill would require EV battery suppliers to take responsibility for the proper handling and recycling of lithium-ion vehicle batteries removed from cars still in use or returned to them. It would also establish reporting requirements, a state fund for oversight, and penalties for non-compliance to prevent environmental and safety hazards from abandoned batteries. The bill would require DTSC to conduct a study to determine whether there is evidence of abandonment of orphaned batteries leading to environmental and health and safety hazards and, on or before January 1, 2030, and every 3 years thereafter, to post the results of its findings on its internet website. A similar bill was vetoed by the Governor last year.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Extended Producer Responsibility, Toxics Reduction/Household Hazardous Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Stewardship Action Council – Support – Staff recommendation – Support 	<p>Referred to as “EPR-Lite,” this bill requires battery suppliers/producers to be responsible for end-of-life management of the batteries but does not require them to form an organization or develop a stewardship plan. Because the batteries are valuable, there is already an economic driver to keep the batteries on the market, and a full EPR program is arguably unnecessary at this time. Even so, the bill contains provisions to help ensure that these batteries are managed in a responsible way.</p> <p>Passed Senate Environmental Quality Committee. Re-referred to Committee on Transportation for hearing on April 22.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
BILLS WITH POSITIONS		
AB 337 (Bennett)	<p>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: grant program: edible food -- SUPPORT</p> <p>Current law requires the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, upon appropriation, to administer a grant program to provide financial assistance to promote the in-state development of infrastructure, food waste prevention, or other projects to reduce organic waste, sort and aggregate or process organic and other recyclable materials into new, value-added products, or divert items from disposal through enhanced reuse opportunities. Current law requires the grant program to provide eligible financial assistance for certain activities, including activities that expand and improve organic waste diversion and recycling, including, but not limited to, the recovery of food for human consumption and food waste prevention. Current law specifies eligible infrastructure projects for purposes of the program, including, but not limited to, the construction of facilities to help develop, implement, or expand edible food waste recovery operations. This bill would expand the grant program to provide financial assistance for the recovery of edible food, as specified. The bill would specify that eligible infrastructure projects include transportation and software costs related to edible food recovery, and the construction or expansion of facilities to help develop, implement, or expand edible food waste recovery operations. The bill would require the department to consider the increased amount of edible food recovery capacity that the project will create when awarding a grant for edible food recovery.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Diversion Funding, Food Waste Reduction and Recovery – Cal Cities position: Support</p>	<p>This bill provides clarification that transportation and software costs related to edible food recovery can be eligible for funding through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, as are other edible food activities or infrastructure.</p> <p>Passed out of Natural Resources Committee and awaiting a hearing in the Appropriations Committee.</p>
AB 473 (Wilson)	<p>Environmental advertising: recyclability – OPPOSE</p> <p>Current law prohibits a person from offering for sale, selling, distributing, or importing into the state any product or packaging for which a deceptive or misleading claim about the recyclability of the product or packaging is made. Current law provides that a product or packaging that displays a chasing arrows symbol, among other symbols, statements, or directions, is deemed to be a deceptive or misleading claim unless (1) the product or packaging is considered recyclable in the state pursuant to specified criteria and (2) is of a material type and form that routinely becomes feedstock used in the production of new</p>	<p>AB 473 makes a fundamental change to the SB 343 (2022) truth in labeling law that prohibits the use of the chasing-arrows symbol or any other suggestion that a material is recyclable, unless the material is actually recyclable in most California communities and is routinely sold to manufacturers to make new products.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
	<p>products or packaging, except as provided. Current law, notwithstanding specified criteria, provides that a product or packaging is recyclable in the state if the product or packaging is part of, and in compliance with, a program established pursuant to state or federal law governing the recyclability or disposal of that product or packaging, as provided. This bill would delete the latter provision and would, notwithstanding specified provisions, require, before January 1, 2027, that a product or packaging that is a covered material, as defined, be considered recyclable in the state if the producer is approved by a producer responsibility organization to participate in that organization.</p> <p>Policy Platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Watch – Resource Recovery Coalition of California (MDRR’s trade association) position: Watch – Republic Services: Oppose – Californians Against Waste: Oppose 	<p>Awaiting a hearing in Natural Resources Committee.</p>
<p>AB 762 (Irwin & Wilson)</p>	<p>Single-use Vaping Devices Sales Ban – SUPPORT</p> <p>Would prohibit, beginning January 1, 2026, a person from selling, distributing, or offering for sale a new or refurbished disposable, battery-embedded vapor inhalation device in this state. The bill would define a “disposable, battery-embedded vapor inhalation device” to mean a vaporization device that is not designed or intended to be reused, as specified.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Waste Reduction, Toxics Reduction/Household Hazardous Waste</p> <p>CPSC/RethinkWaste/CAW/PIRG sponsored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Watch – CPSC position: Sponsor – CAW position: Sponsor 	<p>Vaping products, especially disposable ones, present a challenging problem in the waste stream; they contain batteries but are not generally accepted at HHW facilities or in battery collection locations, are often littered, and there is currently no method available to recycle them at scale. From their last waste characterization study, Sonoma County estimates that 70 tons of vapes are landfilled from their county each year (population: 500,000). AB 762 would ban the sale of non-refillable or non-rechargeable vapes.</p> <p>Hearing in Environmental Safety & Toxic Materials Committee April 8.</p>

Bill	Description	Comments/Status
SB 45 (Padilla & Blakespear)	<p>Recycling: beverage containers: tethered plastic caps – SUPPORT</p> <p>The California Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act defines “beverage container” to mean the individual, separate bottle, can, jar, carton, or other receptacle, however denominated, in which a beverage is sold, and that is constructed of metal, glass, or plastic, or other material, or any combination of these materials, but does not include cups or other similar open or loosely sealed receptacles. A violation of the act is a crime. Current law authorizes the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, subject to the availability of funds, to pay a quality incentive payment of up to \$180 per ton to qualified recyclers for thermoform plastic containers diverted from curbside recycling programs, as provided. This bill would delete that authorization. The bill would instead require, on and after January 1, 2027, if a beverage is subject to the act and offered for sale in a plastic beverage container with a plastic cap, the container to have a cap that is tethered to the container that prevents the separation of the cap from the container when the cap is removed from the container by the consumer. The bill would exempt, until January 1, 2028, any type of beverage container with a recycling rate of better than 70% for calendar years 2022 and 2023, as determined by the department, from compliance with that requirement. The bill would exempt beverage containers with a capacity of 2 liters or more and beverage containers that contain beer or other malt beverages, wine or distilled spirits, or 100% fruit juice from the scope of the bill.</p> <p>Policy Platform: Waste Diversion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cal Cities position: Watch – California Product Stewardship Council (CPSC) position: Support – Californians Against Waste (CAW) position: Sponsor – Resource Recovery Coalition of California (MDRR’s trade association) position: Support – Republic Services: Support 	<p>Plastic beverage container caps can be recycled but are too small to collect separately from the containers. They also frequently become litter and can pass through storm drains and into almost every environment. SB 45 will require plastic beverage container manufacturers to tether caps to bottles, eliminating a leading source of litter and allowing the caps to be more easily and frequently recycled. Most plastics recyclers are now able to recycle a cap attached to a bottle, even when the cap is made from a different resin than the bottle (caps are often #5, bottles #1). Loose caps placed in recycling and organics containers often become contaminants in paper, glass, and organics. Because of their small size, caps are a difficult contaminant to remove from other materials.</p> <p>Passed Senate Environmental Quality Committee and Appropriations Committee; placed on Appropriations suspense file.</p>