



Legislation Text

File #: 20-0140, **Version:** 1

TO:

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

THROUGH:

Bruce Moe, City Manager

FROM:

Alexandria Latragna, Management Analyst

SUBJECT:

Consider Approving Letters of Support Regarding Senate Bill 54 (Allen) and Assembly Bill 1080 (Gonzalez) - California Circular Economy and Plastic Pollution Reduction Act (City Manager Moe).

AUTHORIZE LETTERS OF SUPPORT

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council authorize the Mayor to sign a letter of support to the California State Senate and the State Assembly regarding Senate Bill 54 (Allen) and Assembly Bill 1080 (Gonzalez) - California Circular Economy and Plastic Pollution Reduction Act.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no fiscal implications associated with the recommended action.

BACKGROUND:

Senate Bill (SB) 54, introduced by Senator Ben Allen, and Assembly Bill (AB) 1080, introduced by Assembly Member Lena Gonzalez, are identical bills that direct the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) to establish a comprehensive framework to address plastic pollution and waste.

California's solid waste and recycling industries are facing a series of critical issues. First among these challenges are changes in China's trade import policies. These changes are collectively referred to as "National Sword" and have significantly disrupted California's recycling industry by restricting foreign imports of recyclable materials and increasing the requirements that aim to reduce contamination levels in recycling streams.

International markets have served as a key component of California's recycling infrastructure system. Since the change in China's policy, materials including plastics and paper are piling up at local waste facilities across the state with no place to go. This has caused increased costs to local governments, slowdowns in waste processing of other materials, and public health risks.

While the state and local communities in California have tried to reduce the burden of single-use packaging since the 1980s, taxpayers and local governments still spend over \$420 million annually in ongoing efforts to clean up and prevent litter in streets, storm drains, parks, and waterways. Not only

is this cleanup expensive, but it cannot keep pace with the production of single-use disposable items, which continues to grow exponentially.

DISCUSSION:

Local governments have long been responsible for ensuring that California achieves its recycling and waste management goals. These bills, introduced in 2019, would aid cities in reaching these goals by reducing waste at its source before it can reach local landfills and recycling centers, or worse, our beaches and other beautiful natural environments.

SB 54 and AB 1080 address plastic pollution waste through the following strategies and regulations:

- Developing criteria, via an implementation plan with stakeholder input, to determine which packaging materials qualify to be labeled as recyclable or compostable. This implementation plan will also include the development of incentives and policies to encourage in-state manufacturing using recycled material generated in California as a way to shift towards a more circular economy.
- Adopting regulation by January 1, 2024, that require producers to achieve a 75% reduction of waste generated from single-use packaging and priority single-use plastic products (e.g. single-use food service ware, including plates, bowls, cups, utensils, stirrers, and straws) in the California market by 2030.
- Requiring producers to source reduced single-use packaging and priority single-use products to the maximum extent feasible.
- Requiring producers to make single-use packaging and priority single-use products recyclable or compostable by 2030.

Staff recommends that City Council authorize the Mayor to sign letters of support on both of these bills.

PUBLIC OUTREACH:

After analysis, staff determined that public outreach was not required for this issue.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The City has reviewed the proposed activity for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and has determined that the activity is not a "Project" as defined under Section 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines; therefore, pursuant to Section 15060(c)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines the activity is not subject to CEQA. Thus, no environmental review is necessary.

LEGAL REVIEW:

The City Attorney has reviewed this report and determined that no additional legal analysis is necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. SB 54 (Allen) Support Letter
2. AB 1080 (Gonzalez) Support Letter