



Board of Directors Meeting Agenda
Regular Meeting
Thursday, January 12, 2023
6:15 PM

Teleconference/Public Participation Information

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's March 4, 2020 State of Emergency Declaration and enactment of Assembly Bill 361 on September 16, 2021 which adopted exemptions to the Ralph M. Brown Act and the proposed findings to be adopted by the Board at this meeting, this meeting will be conducted by the teleconference only in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e). No physical location will be available for this meeting. This meeting agenda is available online at <https://recyclemore.com/about/board-meeting-agendas>

For this meeting, there will be no physical location from which members of the public may observe the meeting. Members of the public are welcome to observe and address the Board telephonically at the appropriate time for public comment during the meeting, following these instructions:

Link to join Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83970413840>
Or phone: 1-669-900-6833 or 1-408-638-0968
Webinar ID: 839 7041 3840

During the meeting, the Chair will call for public comment. To make a public comment on a desired item while participating in the webinar, click on the "Raise Your Hand" option within the online webinar tool, or if participating via phone - dial *9.

Members of the public are welcome to submit written comments via email to the Board Secretary at donalds@recyclemore.com prior or during the time for public comment at the meeting. The Board Secretary will share all comments with the Board at the meeting and make them part of the public record.

Americans with Disabilities Act

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in an Authority meeting, or you need a copy of the agenda, or the agenda packet in an alternative format, please contact the Authority Board Secretary at (510) 609-1215 or by email at donalds@recyclemore.com with the following information: name, phone number, email, and type of assistance requested. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist Authority staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.

Public Comment

Members of the public may address the Board of Directors on items that are within the jurisdiction of the Authority. Comments by the public pertaining to items listed in this Agenda should be made at the time the item is considered by the Board of Directors. Please note this Agenda contains an item for the Public to address the Board on non-agenda matters. Each speaker is limited to 3 minutes and may speak only once under each agenda item. The Board of Directors may waive these provisions. If you desire to address the Board, please submit your request on a Speaker's Card available from the Secretary.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chair will call the meeting to order and the Secretary will call the roll to establish the presence of a quorum.

2. Closed Session

None.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Chair or a Member of the Board will lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Ex Parte Communications Disclosures

The Chair of the Board will ask if any Director has an ex parte disclosure, pursuant to the Authority's Ex Parte Communications Policy, on any agenda items.

5. Public Comment

Receipt of public comment on non-agenda matters.

6. Consent Calendar

All matters listed in the Consent Calendar will be enacted with one motion. There will be no separate discussion of the items listed. However, upon request by a member of the Board or the Public, items will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately in the agenda order.

Consideration of a motion to approve the following actions:

6.1 December 08, 2022 Authority Board Meeting Minutes.

Consider a MOTION to APPROVE the subject minutes.

6.2 Continue Findings of AB 361 to Allow Teleconferenced Meeting

Consider a MOTION to ADOPT Resolution No. 23-01 to continue conducting Board of Director meetings remotely due to health and safety concerns for the public and making related findings in compliance with Assembly Bill 361 (2021) ("AB 361") effective January 12, 2023 through February 12, 2023.

7. Staff Report

Staff will provide updates on recent and upcoming activities.

8. Regular Agenda

8.1 Authorizing Investment of Monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund

Staff recommends voting in the affirmative to adopt Resolution 23-02.

8.2 Recycling, Organics & Edible Food Contamination Discussion

Discussion item.

8.3 Paint Collection & Recycling Ordinance

Discussion item.

9. Board Member and Staff Announcements

INFORMATION ONLY. Announcement of matters of interest by Board Members, Alternate Board Members, Executive Director and General Counsel.

10. Adjournment

Consideration of a motion to adjourn. The next regular Board of Directors' Meeting is scheduled for February 9, 2023 at 6:15pm.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Agenda Report

DATE: January 12, 2023

TO: West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board

FROM: Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director

SUBJECT: December 08, 2022 Authority Board Meeting Minutes.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider a MOTION to APPROVE the subject minutes.

BACKGROUND:

The minutes of the December 08, 2022 Board meeting are attached.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

[Agenda Item 8.1 - Attachment 1: ActionMinutes 2022-12-08 DRAFT](#)

WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 8, 2022

Meeting Date | Time 12/8/2022 6:15 PM | Meeting Location The meeting was held pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's March 4, 2020 State of Emergency Declaration and enactment of Assembly Bill 361 on September 16, 2021 which adopted exemptions to the Ralph M. Brown Act and the proposed findings to be adopted by the Board at this meeting, to be conducted by teleconference only in accordance with Government Code Section 54953(e). No physical location to be available for this meeting. All votes of the Board to be Roll Call votes.

Meeting called by Board of Directors
Type of meeting Regular
Authority Staff Present Peter Holtzclaw, Reka Abraham, Lisa Borreani, Webster Nguyen, Donald Sturman
Legal Counsel John Bakker

Board Members Present:
Directors: T. Rudnick, El Cerrito (Vice Chair); D. Romero, Hercules (Chair); A. Tave (Pinole); G. McLaughlin and N. Bates, Richmond; and R. Xavier, San Pablo
Absent: M. Willis, Richmond; and F. Glover (Ex-Officio) Contra Costa County

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Romero called the meeting to order at 6:18 P.M. The Roll Call established the existence of a quorum (Bates*, McLaughlin, Romero, Rudnick, Tave and Xavier). *Director Bates arrived at 6:32 P.M.

CLOSED SESSION

There was no Closed Session.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Director Tave led the Pledge of Allegiance.

EX-PARTE COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURES

There were no ex-parte communications or disclosures.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION by Director Xavier to approve Consent Calendar Items 6.1 and 6.2.
SECOND by Vice Chair Rudnick.

MOTION PASSED unanimously by a Roll Call vote.

STAFF REPORT

Staff Report Item 7 - | Presenter | Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director

Executive Director Peter Holtzclaw introduced Reka Abraham as RecycleMore's new Recycling and HHW Manager who had worked in solid waste, recycling and organics in Canada, and who had most recently worked with SCS Engineers helping cities around the Bay Area implement SB 1383.

Reka Abraham introduced herself and looked forward to working with the RecycleMore team.

Mr. Holtzclaw added that he and Mr. Bakker would be meeting with the member agencies between now and January to finalize the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs). El Cerrito and the County were essentially done. There had been additional meetings with Peter Nuti of Republic Services over the conditional rate approval, and staff would come back to the Board with the results of that meeting in January or February 2023, and follow up with CalRecycle to ensure all member agencies were in full compliance and RecycleMore was off any monitoring list. An Executive Director report had been sent out today and he asked the Board to look at the report and offer concrete directions to him and staff for what the Board wanted in 2023.

Donald Sturman, Manager of Finance and Administrative Services, stated as part of bringing accounting and finance in-house to RecycleMore from the City of San Pablo, he would present a Board report and a resolution to ask the Board to approve the transfer of pooled cash from the City of San Pablo eventually to a Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) at the January Board meeting.

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

Agenda Item 8.1 – Raven SR Project Presentation | Presenter | Peter Holtzclaw – Executive Director

Executive Director Holtzclaw introduced Matt Murdock, the CEO of Raven SR, and explained that the project had been in front of the Board in June as a Consent Calendar item to amend the Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) to allow the project to go forward, and to be in compliance with CalRecycle. He noted that the project was an organics processing facility that would derive hydrogen gas for transportation fuel as well as provide a soils amendment.

Director McLaughlin referred to concerns in Richmond with respect to the process that had yet to be permitted and she asked the Board not to move forward pending the completion of the permitting process.

Chair Romero clarified that no action was being requested at this time.

Matt Murdock, Raven SR, advised that permitting was moving forward for the project. He explained that Raven SR had a lot of local history in the Bay Area and he provided the details of that history. He described the development of the diversion process as non-combustion technology to process waste in the cleanest way possible and noted that 16 patents had been approved and 15 were pending. He advised that the technology had been developed in the 1980s and 1990s and since there were companies like Republic Services that were really good at dealing with waste, he had pivoted to become more of a fuels company that could use waste in that Raven SR produced clean fuels and in this case: hydrogen. The project had been proposed at the Republic Services location at the Contra Costa County Landfill in Richmond where Raven SR would use 1.5 acres of the space and use the waste that came into the closed landfill. Republic Services processed green waste and food waste and Raven SR would take 70 tons of what was currently processed to put into their equipment to produce clean hydrogen.

Mr. Murdock presented images of the proposed site, identified the equipment to be used, stated that electricity (and no combustion) would be used to generate hydrogen that would then be sold. The electricity used would be about 15 kilowatts per kilo. There would be seven trucks that would come in daily to pick up and take out the hydrogen, all designated for the mobility sector in the North Bay region and not for refineries. He reported the provisional carbon intensity of the hydrogen would be a negative 10 and if biochar was considered a pathway in California there could be a negative 30. The waste was processed wet, without catalysts and without combustion, and primary emissions would be a solid bio carbon. As a green waste it could be used agriculturally or used into composting at the Republic Services location, CO₂ would be captured or sequestered, and the hydrogen would be produced.

Mr. Murdock was pleased to be able to work with Republic Services in partnership with a diverting technology that would produce clean fuel and that could allow the ability for Republic Services to increase its capacity in the future further addressing SB 1383. He explained that Republic was giving free ground lease for the ground and the waste was being taken at no tip fee. Republic was also using the landfill gas to generate electricity both for it and for Raven SR. As such, Raven SR would actually be cleaning the environment. By processing green waste and food waste into a clean fuel, Raven SR would tackle greenhouse gases on both ends of the equation. There would be de minimis emissions from the generators in that cleaner generators would replace existing generators with a cleaner emissions profile that the Richmond City Council and the California Air Resources Board were currently evaluating. Generally speaking, there was low methane landfill gas that would sometimes get flared and Raven SR could take all of that and either convert it to hydrogen or use it to generate electricity. Raven SR would produce five tons of hydrogen every day for the local market.

Mr. Murdock identified Raven SR's strategic partnerships, further described the site and noted the highest piece of equipment would be 30 feet tall. Raven SR had worked with the Richmond Planning Commission for trail improvements and had also acquired a machine shop in Benicia that would manufacture a lot of its equipment locally. It had also been working with the unions in the Richmond area and would hire ten people to operate the plant and have two interns.

Director McLaughlin reiterated a number of concerns in the Richmond community and asked a number of questions about the process.

In response to those questions, Mr. Murdock clarified that the hydrogen would be made on the site out of waste and there would be no hydrogen coming or going from the Chevron refinery; Raven SR was not a fueling station and the hydrogen would be sold through contracts with partners such as Hyzon, Shell, Iwatani, and Chevron, and would bring a truck in and would truck the hydrogen out with an estimated seven to eight trucks a day. Raven SR would not be involved in any direct marketing to customers, only to an off-taker. He emphasized and reiterated that no hydrogen would go to the Chevron Refinery and all hydrogen would go to the mobility stations, which could include the proposed Chevron Fueling Station in Richmond. When asked to offer his definition of green hydrogen, he explained that when hydrogen was called green it was because it used fresh water and electricity and the California Green System electrolysis had a positive carbon intensity score of 6, while Raven SR would have a negative intensity score of negative 10 or negative 30, and he argued that a negative score was greener than a positive score. He stated that electrolysis, which was very popular, used 60 kilowatts of electricity for every kilo of hydrogen and 9 liters of water. He reiterated that Raven SR did not use electrolysis, used 15 kilowatts of electricity, and would not use water but would take the waste wet from the landfill.

Director Xavier reported that she had seen the Raven SR presentation at the Mayors' Conference and she had been totally impressed with the presentation and supported the approval of the project.

Director Tave referred to secondary and tertiary effects and to greenhouse gases off the landfill and asked whether the calculation from the Raven SR process for clean hydrogen had gone cradle to grave, and Mr. Murdock confirmed that when organic and green waste sat in a landfill it would become methane as it decomposed, which was why SB 1383 had been generated because short-lived climate pollutants were a major means of actually reducing greenhouse gases. The Raven SR process would break up the solid green waste and food waste and rebuild a new fuel – hydrogen – from it. The provisional carbon intensity had a negative 10 cradle to grave including compressing it to 500 bar.

Director Tave asked whether the hydrogen infrastructure would be built for the long term, and Mr. Murdock clarified the intent to ensure hydrogen was available for the heavy-duty trucks and cars that were currently being produced to use it.

Director Tave supported the proposal and wanted to make sure that the focus on the reduction of carbon continued.

Vice Chair Rudnick asked about the amount the hydrogen facility could produce in a day, how many cars could be accommodated, and the number of miles that could be accommodated, and Mr. Murdock explained that a Hyundai Nexa used 6 kilos of hydrogen to 400 miles, and 5,000 kilos would be produced so 950 cars could drive 400 miles a day with the proposed level of production. The Class A trucks would take 50 kilos of hydrogen at about 350 miles and therefore the volume of the proposed fuel could accommodate almost 1,000 vehicles a day.

As to the use of hydrogen in garbage trucks, Mr. Murdock stated that was already in market, Hyzon was selling hydrogen trucks in Europe, and hydrogen fuel cells were typically close to a gas engine, and while those trucks were smaller than a Class A vehicle, it would use 30 kilos of hydrogen to go through the neighborhoods all day long.

Director McLaughlin expressed her appreciation for the information that had been provided and she totally embraced the concept yet understood the details and comprehensive reviews were important.

Mr. Murdock stated that Raven SR had been working with three consulting agencies at the city, county and state levels and the proposal was in line where California wanted to go to eliminate organic waste, produce clean fuels, and wanted non-combustion. He stated if anyone had questions they should contact Raven SR.

Chair Romero noted that a proposed reduction of the huge landfill at 25 percent a day was a positive aspect. He was pleased with the proposal and noted that more would have to be done to inform the member agencies and he supported the innovative proposal that would address major diversion issues. He commented that the presentation should have been made to RecycleMore prior to the presentation to the Mayors' Conference.

Director Bates asked the status of other projects to determine whether this was a nationwide project, and Mr. Murdock expressed the desire to produce hubs to process local waste and produce local fuel to solve local problems. As a result, he would branch out community to community. He commended Republic Services for being so forward thinking and hospitable to the process. If there were other waste areas where the proposal could be a solution Raven SR would be interested in learning of those areas. He added that Raven SR had worked with other states and commented that the entire hydrogen network would take years to allow a hydrogen car to be able to drive across the United States.

In further response to Director Bates, Mr. Murdock agreed that hydrogen was a bit behind electric vehicles, and there was an effort to reduce the cost to make it more affordable, and while state grants and subsidies for fueling stations, drayage and trucks were helpful to create the demand the goal was to be there and provide hydrogen as much as possible, He also commented that the communities would not want to deal with the disposal of a bunch of batteries in landfills and it was his hope that others would get on board with the hydrogen option.

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

Agenda Item 8.2 – Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Metrics Report | Presenter | Lisa Borreani – Program Manager; and Larry Sweetser – Sweetser & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Holtzclaw introduced a report on Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) performance metrics for the Richmond HHW Facility, El Cerrito Satellite HHW Facility and for the one-day special HHW events. He thanked Lisa Borreani and Larry Sweetser for the report and former HHW Program Manager Christina Leard who had prepared the report last year. He commented that West County had the best HHW program in the entire Bay Area.

Lisa Borreani, Program Manager presented the HHW Metrics Report and explained that the new Program Manager Reka Abraham would likely be presenting the report next year. The report had been prepared by Larry Sweetser.

Ms. Borreani identified the two Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facilities for the West County Permanent HHW sites located in Richmond and El Cerrito, identified the periods of operation, the participation analyses of those facilities, explained there was seasonal participation which increased significantly when temporary HHW events were held and noted that collections were slower during the winter months. She explained that participation had rebounded since COVID-19 had been declared. Total participation in 2021 was 14,952, and 2022 year to date was 11,690 (for participation for all events). For the permanent facilities total participation in 2021 was 12,867 and year to date in 2022 was 10,102. She presented a chart to show that participation by jurisdiction and noted an increasing trend for usage overall.

Ms. Borreani reported that as of October 2022, Kensington residents had been able to use both the El Cerrito facility and the Richmond facility, and as of November 8, 2022, seven Kensington residents had used the El Cerrito facility. Outreach to Kensington residents had not yet been defined but would likely involve RecycleMore staff.

Ms. Borreani also identified participation by day of the week and noted there was no one particular day that stood out from another. She described the volume and type of HHW collected during FY 2021 and 2022 with total pounds collected at 870,580. The El Cerrito facility continued to collect more batteries and lamps than the Richmond facility likely because the El Cerrito facility was open six days a week and collected not only batteries and lamps but sharps and pharmaceuticals as well while the Richmond facility collected only four days a week. The top three types of waste collected by pound were identified as latex and oil-based paint 35 percent of the total, flammable and poisons about 25 percent of the total, and e-waste equal to about 19 percent of the total. Latex and oil-based paint was not a cost item because it was collected under the PaintCare Stewardship Program.

Ms. Borreani broke down the temporary HHW events by participation with total participation only down about 4 percent from last year for the temporary events held in Hercules, El Sobrante, and Richmond, and although the number of pounds collected this year compared to 2021 was down overall about 16 percent, the amount of waste in pounds per participant had significantly increased. She also explained that the temporary HHW events had a 2022 participation comparable to 2019 participation before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Ms. Borreani spoke to the Reuse Program at the Richmond facility only and identified those items eligible for reuse. Using an estimate of \$.80 per pound for disposal, she reported that the 13,748 pounds of material set aside for reuse offered a disposal cost savings of \$15,902. The PaintCare Program provided a reuse rate of \$1.60 per gallon and year to date 3,065 gallons of paint had been set aside for reuse with a reimbursement of about \$5,000 for the PaintCare Program. She identified the Architectural Paint Stewardship Program and stated for FY 2021-22 there was 292,668 total pounds of paint collected with a total cost savings of \$152,268.

RecycleMore had sponsored the collection of home-generated sharps and pharmaceuticals through the Richmond and El Cerrito facilities and through seven kiosks throughout the area that Republic Services collected on scheduled

door-to-door collection days, and during FY 2021-22, a total of 19,212 pounds had been collected with 11,452 sharps and 7,760 pharmaceuticals. It was noted that CalRecycle had recently approved other organizations for sharps and Pharmaceutical Stewardship Programs that would provide other locations for collection to Contra Costa County.

Larry Sweetser, Sweetser & Associates, Inc., advised that a stewardship program approved some years ago was offering free drop-off kiosks for pharmaceuticals to residents and next year a few more would be added, and changes in the RecycleMore program might be required. He stated that residents could sign up for a container that could be filled and sent out under a free management program. Current collections would also continue.

Ms. Borreani offered metric comparisons of RecycleMore's HHW permanent collection facilities and the individual events compared to other California HHW programs and stated the West County Program had among the highest participation in California. There had been more pounds per person delivered to El Cerrito than to Richmond and even more pounds per person delivered at the temporary events, with total pounds collected at 859,075 and with a total cost per participant at \$94.22, and a cost per pound of \$1.61.

Chair Romero referred to the fact that El Cerrito was only open one day a week and yet batteries were collected six days a week. He asked how it could be confirmed that those dropping off batteries were from West County.

Mr. Sweetser explained there was no way to confirm the source of the batteries dropped off on the days when the El Cerrito facility was not open and there were likely some out-of-service residents using that facility. For sharps, residency had to be confirmed but for batteries confirmation could not be guaranteed. In the next couple of years there would be a program to pay for the collection of batteries and that cost would also decrease.

Director Xavier asked why it had taken so long for the pharmaceutical take-back kiosks, and Mr. Sweetser explained that RecycleMore and Republic Services had started the collection of pharmaceuticals five or six years ago with some initial funding and the program had continued. The new stewardship program would add more kiosks.

Ms. Borreani noted that the one-day events cost more to produce and \$180,000 had been budgeted for the events in 2022 but did not include administrative time, and she described the factors involved to coordinate and produce the events. Even though total participation for Richmond and El Cerrito facilities was down two percent, participation by at least 14,706 residents represented a 16.5 percent usage rate using a service area population of 88,961 households, one of the highest in California. For the HHW events, participation was down from last year but the amount collected per person had increased; pounds per person had also increased at 77.6 pounds in 2022 compared to 66.8 pounds in 2021; the Reuse Program had year-to-date savings of \$15,902; the cost savings for the Paint Stewardship Program was \$152,268; the home-generated sharps and pharmaceuticals program had collected 19,212 pounds; and the top three waste classifications had collected 224,732 pounds of flammables/poisons, 206,803 pounds of paint, and 164,621 pounds of e-waste.

With respect to items to be considered for future review, Ms. Borreani referred to monitoring the impact and convenience of the pharmaceutical and sharps product stewardship implementation and potentially adjust service levels; review the level of repeat customers; evaluate the storage capacity of the El Cerrito Satellite HHW Facility; possibly expand on the Reuse Program and put aside more eligible materials to the Reuse Program; review usage of the Door-to-Door Program; review the Very Small Quantity Generator (VSQG) Program and monitor the residents of Kensington using the El Cerrito Satellite HHW Facility.

Mr. Sweetser reiterated that West County had a very robust program, the most robust in the Bay Area and California that would not work without the support of the member agencies as well as the work of Republic Services as a good partner.

Director McLaughlin thanked staff for the presentation and asked whether the presentation would be posted on the website, and Ms. Borreani stated it would be posted tomorrow.

Vice Chair Rudnick applauded staff and all those involved in the presentation, which helped substantiate to the communities why it was valuable to make the investment in the JPA.

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

Chair Romero applauded the partnership of staff and the member agencies to create the HHW that helped the environment.

Mr. Holtzclaw also applauded Peter Nuti and Republic staff and the staff of the excellent El Cerrito facility.

BOARD MEMBER AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

Chair Romero requested that the presentation from Raven SR also be posted on the website.

ADJOURNMENT

With consensus of the Board, Chair Romero adjourned the meeting at 7:45 P.M. until the regular Board meeting scheduled for January 12, 2023 at 6:15 P.M.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct statement of the Official Minutes of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board meeting held December 8, 2022.

Board Secretary

Date



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Agenda Report

DATE: January 12, 2023

TO: West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board

FROM: Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director

SUBJECT: Continue Findings of AB 361 to Allow Teleconferenced Meeting

ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider a MOTION to ADOPT Resolution No. 23-01 to continue conducting Board of Director meetings remotely due to health and safety concerns for the public and making related findings in compliance with Assembly Bill 361 (2021) (“AB 361”) effective January 12, 2023 through February 12, 2023.

BACKGROUND:

On March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom declared a State of Emergency to make additional resources available, formalize emergency actions already underway across multiple state agencies and departments, and help the State address the broader spread of COVID-19.

On March 17, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (“**Brown Act**”) in order to allow local legislative bodies to conduct meetings telephonically or by other means. Additionally, the State implemented a shelter-in-place order, requiring all non-essential personnel to work from home.

The Board of Directors established virtual meetings. The virtual meetings have allowed the Board to continue to conduct its business from remote locations while ensuring the public’s continued access to government meetings in a safe manner.

On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which among other

things, rescinded certain clauses of Executive Order N-29-20 after September 30, 2021, including clauses that suspended certain provisions of the Brown Act. Thus, effective October 1, 2021, agencies would have had to transition back to in person public meetings. Since the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21, the highly contagious Delta variant has emerged, causing a spike in cases throughout the state and within Contra Costa County.

On August 2, 2021, the Contra Costa County Health Officer issued a Health Order requiring all individuals in both Counties, regardless of vaccination status, to wear face coverings in all indoor public settings and businesses for the control of COVID-19. The August 2, 2021 Public Health Officer Order will be in effect until rescinded, superseded or amended.

On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361, which was an urgency measure that became effective on October 1, 2021, and it allows a local agency to use teleconferencing for public meetings during a Governor-proclaimed state of emergency as long as the legislative body adopts findings every 30 days that: 1) meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees as a result of the emergency; or 2) state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing.

In such circumstances, a legislative body is not required to make available a physical location from which members of the public may observe the meeting and offer public comment or required to have a quorum of the members of the legislative body participate from locations within the boundaries of the agency's jurisdiction in the following circumstances:

- The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency, and state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing.
- The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency to determine, by majority vote, whether as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees; or
- The legislative body holds a meeting during a proclaimed state of emergency and has determined, by majority vote, as a result of the emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

The legislative body must make certain findings by majority vote every 30 days to continue using AB 361's teleconferencing requirements.

An additional provision of AB 361 states that, in the event of a disruption within the local

agency's control that prevents members of the public from offering public comments using the call-in option or internet-based service option, the legislative body is prohibited from taking any further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting via the call-in or internet-based options is restored.

These new provisions are only operative until January 1, 2024, at which point they are repealed, and the prior Brown Act teleconferencing requirements become effective again.

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) caution that the Delta Variant of COVID-19, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, may cause more severe illness, and even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations. The very recent emergence of the Omicron Variant of COVID-19 has resulted in the CDC's designation of it as Variant of Concern noting that it may spread more easily than other Variants, including Delta, and that fully vaccinated people who become infected with the Omicron Variant can spread the virus to others. In fact, the first verified case of the Omicron Variant in the United States has been confirmed as an individual in the Bay Area who was fully vaccinated.

The Authority meets the requirements to continue holding meetings remotely in order to ensure the health and safety of the public:

- The Governor has declared a State of Emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic; and
- County Health Orders require that individuals in indoor public spaces wear masks and the CDC recommends social distancing of at least six feet due to COVID-19; and
- The Delta variant of COVID-19 has resulted in a significant increase of COVID-19 cases within the state and throughout Contra Costa County.

Thus, meeting in person for Board meetings would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees, the Board and staff. In the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, Authority staff recommends invoking the provisions of Assembly Bill 361 related to teleconferencing.

The Board must make its own determination and findings, no later than 30 days after the adoption of Resolution 23-01, in order to continue to hold teleconferenced meetings in

accordance with AB 361. At this time, Staff intends to schedule special Board meetings every 30 days, if necessary, to consider adoption of similar findings in the future. Staff will return no later than February 12, 2023 with an item for the Board of Directors to consider whether to continue meeting under the provisions of Assembly Bill 361.

CONCLUSION:

None.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

[Agenda Item 8.2 - Attachment 1: Resolution 23-01 AB 361 Continued Findings January 12 - February 12 2023](#)

RESOLUTION NO. 23-01

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
AUTHORIZING TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS PURSUANT TO ASSEMBLY BILL
361 EFFECTIVE JANUARY 12, 2023 THROUGH FEBRUARY 12, 2023**

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom proclaimed the existence of a state of emergency in California under the California Emergency Services Act, Government Code section 8550 et seq. (Declaration); and

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive order N- 29-20 (Executive Order), which suspended the teleconferencing rules set forth in California provided certain requirements were met and followed; and

WHEREAS, on June 11, 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which clarified the suspension of the teleconferencing rules set forth in the Ralph M. Brown Act and further provided that those provisions would remain suspended through September 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom signed Assembly Bill 361, which provides that under Government Code section 54953(e), a legislation body subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act may continue to meet using teleconferencing without complying with the non-emergency teleconferencing rules in Government Code section 54953(b)(3) if a proclaimed state of emergency exists and state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing; and

WHEREAS, such conditions exist in the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority (RecycleMore) jurisdiction. In addition to the Governor’s Declaration, the Contra Costa County Health Officer has issued numerous Health Orders regarding safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, on August 2, 2021, the Contra Costa County Health Officer issued an Order requiring all individuals in the County, regardless of vaccination status, to wear face coverings in all indoor public settings and businesses for the control of COVID-19. The Order was amended as of November 1, 2021 to allow groups of fully vaccinated individuals to remove masks indoors under limited circumstances, but the amendment does not apply to indoor spaces “open to the general public”. This Public Health Officer Order will be in effect until rescinded, superseded or further amended; and

WHEREAS, The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) caution that the Delta Variant of COVID-19, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, may cause more severe illness, and even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations; and

WHEREAS, on December 9, 2021, the Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 21-05 initially authorizing teleconferenced meetings to be conducted pursuant to AB 361 from December 18, 2021 to January 18th; and

WHEREAS, the very recent emergence of the Omicron Variant of COVID-19 has resulted in the CDC's designation of it as Variant of Concern noting that it may spread more easily than other Variants, including Delta, and that fully vaccinated people who become infected with the Omicron Variant can spread the virus to others. In fact, the first verified case of the Omicron Variant in the United States has been confirmed as an individual in the Bay Area who was fully vaccinated; and

WHEREAS, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, RecycleMore intends to continue utilizing the provisions of Assembly Bill 361 related to teleconferencing in the manner authorized by Government Code § 54953(e), and such legislative body shall comply with the requirements to provide the public with access to the meetings as prescribed in Government Code § 54953(e)(2); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority as follows:

1. The Recitals set forth above are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.
2. In compliance with AB 361 (2021), and in order to continue to conduct teleconference meetings without complying with the usual teleconference meeting requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Board of Directors makes the following findings:
 - a. The Board of Directors has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency; and
 - b. The state of emergency, as declared by the Governor, continues to directly impact the ability of the Board of Directors, including RecycleMore's legislative bodies and staff, as well as staff and members of the public, from meeting safely in person; and
 - c. The CDC and Contra Costa County Department of Public Health continue to recommend physical distancing of at least six feet due to COVID-19 and as a result of the presence of COVID-19 and the Delta and Omicron Variants, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, the legislative bodies, and staff.
3. The Board of Directors and RecycleMore's legislative bodies may continue to meet remotely in compliance with AB 361, in order to better ensure the health and safety of the public and staff in accordance with the provisions of Government Code section 54953(e).

4. The Board of Directors will revisit the need to conduct meetings remotely before February 12, 2023.
5. Staff is authorized and directed to take all actions necessary to implement the intent and purpose of this resolution, including conducting open and public meetings in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e) and all other application provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act; and
6. Staff is directed to return no later than February 12, 2023 with an item for the Board of Directors of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority to consider whether to continue meeting under the provisions of Assembly Bill 361.

ATTEST:

CHAIR OF THE BOARD:

Donald W. Sturman – Board Secretary Date

Dan Romero, Board Chair Date

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Directors of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority at its meeting of January 12, 2023, by the following vote:

AYES: Directors: _____

NOES: Directors: _____

ABSENT: Directors: _____

Donald W. Sturman, Board Secretary

5025139.1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Agenda Report

DATE: January 12, 2023

TO: West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board

FROM: Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director

SUBJECT: Authorizing Investment of Monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund

ACTION REQUESTED:

Staff recommends voting in the affirmative to adopt Resolution 23-02.

BACKGROUND:

The Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) is established in the State Treasury under Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the deposit of money of a local agency for purposes of investment by the State Treasurer. Most all public sector organizations in the state of California have monies on deposit with LAIF.

DISCUSSION:

As part of transferring the bookkeeping, accounting, finance, treasury, and controller responsibilities from the City of San Pablo to RecycleMore, staff needs to transfer custody of the Authority's pooled cash funds from the City of San Pablo to LAIF. In so doing the pooled cash funds currently held by the City of San Pablo will be transferred to the custody of RecycleMore.

CONCLUSION:

Staff recommends voting in the affirmative to adopt Resolution 23-02.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The fiscal impact to the RecycleMore is not zero. The Authority must transfer the pooled cash funds from the City of San Pablo no later than 1/31/2023. The pooled cash funds can only go to one of two places which is to the Authority bank account with Mechanics Bank or into LAIF. The compelling business reason to move these funds to LAIF rather than to Mechanics Bank is that, in general, LAIF offers public sector organizations a better rate of return as compared to a regular bank.

ATTACHMENTS:

[Agenda item 8.1 - Attachment 1: Resolution 23-02 - Pooled Cash Transfer to LAIF](#)

RESOLUTION NO. 23-02

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY 3220 BLUME DRIVE SUITE #198 RICHMOND, CA 94806
510-609-1215 AUTHORIZING INVESTMENT OF MONIES IN THE LOCAL AGENCY
INVESTMENT FUND**

WHEREAS, The Local Agency Investment Fund is established in the State Treasury under Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the deposit of money of a local agency for purposes of investment by the State Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors hereby finds that the deposit and withdrawal of money in the Local Agency Investment Fund in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein is in the best interests of the;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY hereby authorizes the deposit and withdrawal of West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund in the State Treasury in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows:

Section 1. The following (City/District) officers holding the title(s) specified hereinbelow or their successors in office are each hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund and may execute and deliver all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of this resolution and the transactions contemplated hereby:

Peter Holtzclaw
(NAME)
Executive Director
(TITLE)

(SIGNATURE)

Donald W. Sturman
(NAME)
Manager of Finance &
Administrative Services
(TITLE)

(SIGNATURE)

Lisa Borreani
(NAME)
Program Manager, Outreach
(TITLE)

(SIGNATURE)

Section 2. This resolution shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded by City Council/Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding this resolution is filed with the State Treasurer’s Office.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, by the Board of Directors of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority on 01/12/2023.

ATTEST:

CHAIR OF THE BOARD

Donald W. Sturman, Board Secretary

Dan Romero, Board Chair

Date

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Board of Directors of the West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority at its meeting on January 12, 2023 by the following vote:

AYES: Directors: _____

NOES: Directors: _____

ABSENT: Directors: _____

Donald W. Sturman, Board Secretary



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Agenda Report

DATE: January 12, 2023

TO: West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board

FROM: Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director

SUBJECT: Recycling, Organics & Edible Food Contamination Discussion

ACTION REQUESTED:

Discussion item.

BACKGROUND:

The implementation of SB 1383 requires ongoing discussions to permit the Authority to support its member agencies in the best possible ways. Key issues include contamination in the various waste streams diverted from the landfill, and potential mitigation and enforcement measures required to decrease contamination in the organics and recycling waste streams, as well as the edible food recovery stream. This agenda item is for staff to receive input and direction from the Board as the Authority ramps up its efforts to decrease contamination, both specifically related to SB 1383 implementation as well as in general to decrease overall program costs.

Contamination Rates

The Contamination Rate, defined as the weight of non-recyclable items in the total incoming stream of recyclables or organics, have generally hovered around 20% for the past 5 to 10 years in the IRRF. The rate at the compost facility, as shown last month during the Rate presentations, jumped from the historical range of 9-12% up to approximately 20% beginning in 2020, where it's remained or even jumped higher (as measured quarterly). There is no data on the edible food stream, although anecdotally food banks have said publicly that SB 1383 is making their job more difficult (just like for compost facilities) to handle the increased volumes with increased contamination.

It is worth noting that contamination has different impacts operationally and financially depending on the waste stream. MRFs that process traditional recyclables (paper, glass, plastic, and metal cans) can handle higher contamination amounts given the robust nature of

the facilities, based on the evolution of some 30-40 years of design, build and operating experience on how to absorb and mitigate the contamination (such as organic waste, hoses, etc).

This is not the case with compost facilities. First, the 20% contamination rate is misleadingly low as it relates contaminants to incoming volume. The composting process sees an overall mass reduction of between 40-50% on account of moisture evaporation throughout the process. Moreover, the nature of compost facilities and the composting process is much less robust than MRFs, making contamination mitigation more difficult and more costly. The evolution of collection programs with three carts or dumpsters for the garbage/recycling/organics streams, has made it easier for contamination to occur in the recycling and organics programs as generators incorrectly place items in the wrong streams .

DISCUSSION:

There are numerous stakeholders involved in the effort to decrease contamination. First there are the solid waste companies contracted to provide collection and processing services. These are Richmond Sanitary (Republic), East Bay Sanitary in El Cerrito, City of El Cerrito for commercial recycling collection, and Republic Services processing facilities. Secondly, RecycleMore, as the JPA/Waste Authority, is a party to the Post-Collection Agreement and represents the five member agencies. RecycleMore has an important role in designing and implementing efforts to decrease contamination. Finally, there are the five cities and the County, who are all in a similar contractual situation as RecycleMore with the haulers mentioned above with regards to their collection franchises.

For edible food, there are a panoply of collection entities, with only a few large processing/distribution/end markets (mainly the County Food Bank and smaller churches). This situation is a fractured, inefficient market compared to the integrated solid waste ecosystem.

Layered on top of all of this are the mandates imposed by SB 1383. Regarding contamination, SB 1383 comes into play with organic collection and processing, which will be discussed below in terms of the MOU and Workplan, specifically with route monitoring and enforcement.

Approach

RecycleMore staff feels the optimal approach to decrease contamination is focused on unique education and outreach programs for segments of the collection system. These targeted education/outreach campaigns will be designed collaboratively with the haulers and our member agencies. If these campaigns are not successful in reducing contamination at the source, then the last resort will be enforcement; where rate-payers are warned and ultimately penalized or charged for not following the directions of how to dispose their solid waste.

Republic and RecycleMore have identified the Multi-Family segment as the area that requires immediate targeting. This is the segment that has been mandated by CalRecycle to subscribe to organic service, and cannot be exempt from the service by de minimis or space-constraint claims. And as such, this segment has the most contamination. The haulers have operational mitigation strategies in place (for instance, layered routing where a heavily contaminated organic dumpster can be efficiently serviced by a garbage truck, minimizing the collection costs while protecting the compost facility from a heavily-contaminated truck load), however, a specific education and outreach campaign needs to be collaboratively created by the haulers, RecycleMore, and its member agencies. The campaign is planned for early 2023.

The enforcement element is not assisted by SB 1383. The route monitoring and enforcement mandates spelled out in SB 1383, that are a part of our member agency's 1383 Ordinances and which are now being memorialized into the MOU's and corresponding Workplans, create confusing, redundancy and unnecessary duties. RecycleMore feels that the current system, where haulers can warn and/or charge their customers (for example, for overloaded and/or contaminated bins), works fine as a deterrent measure against contamination. The Cities are part of this process, as parties to the franchise, and RecycleMore can assist the Cities and their hauler in this endeavor. If absolutely necessary, RecycleMore can also levy warnings and/or charges for select commercial customers that are flouting the law by not doing any sort of organic diversion. The staff feels that these will be very rare circumstances, and the Authority would naturally collaborate and work with both the member agency and the hauler in these situations.

Finally, RecycleMore staff believe that creating a more efficient market for edible food diversion is an important goal to work towards. As a JPA working with the County and its member agencies, the Authority can work with Food Banks and other players in the edible food ecosystem to create more efficient collection and distribution mechanisms. It is well established that our communities across the nation waste huge amounts of food. The free market and unregulated supply and demand forces have not done a good job allocating resources (edible food waste) to the hungry. This seems to be a legitimate and worthy endeavor for RecycleMore to focus some of its resources upon.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Unknown, but will include outreach and education efforts and could potentially involve adding staff to the Authority, or using subcontractors, to assist member cities with possible future enforcement actions.

ATTACHMENTS:

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Agenda Report

DATE: January 12, 2023
TO: West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority Board
FROM: Peter Holtzclaw - Executive Director
SUBJECT: Paint Collection & Recycling Ordinance

ACTION REQUESTED:

Discussion item.

BACKGROUND:

Often times consumers and contractors, who purchase paint, are confused about how to handle the excess and/or unused paint. Oil and latex based paints are classified as hazardous waste and were banned from the trash by CalRecycle in 2006. When trying to discard excess and/or unused paint, the best practice is to bring the paint to a facility that can safely recycle and/or safely dispose of excess paint.

The two permanent HHW facilities in Richmond and El Cerrito accept paint from rate-payers year round; the three one-day events that Republic and RecycleMore coordinate in the summer also accepts unused/excess paint. In FY21-22, the facilities received 251,967 pounds of oil- and latex-based paints. In 2021, the three one-day events received 56,335 pounds of paint, and in 2022 the events collected 48,098 pounds of paint.

Paint Collection (Pounds)

Permanent Facilities	FY 2021-2022
1) Richmond	190,859
2) El Cerrito	61,108
Total Pounds	251,967

One-Day Events	2022	2021
1) Hercules	18,298	23,000
2) El Sobrante	12,200	19,503
3) Richmond	17,600	13,832
Total Pounds	48,098	56,335

DISCUSSION:

Staff seeks direction from the Board on paint collection, and how to increase the volume of paint to be recycled. Consumers and contractors are confused as to how to safely dispose and/or recycle unused excess paint. This is partially due to the fact that many retailers do not accept unused paint for recycling. Adding to the confusion are many false beliefs about recycled paint.

CalRecycle published on its website the "Misconceptions on Recycled Paint." Here are the ten misconceptions:

1. Recycled paint is more likely to crack, peel, or blister.
 - **False.** The performance of recycled paint is comparable to standard paint. Peeling and blistering is commonly due to improper surface treatment before application or moisture present in the substrate. Cracking usually occurs when coats of paint are not allowed to cure/dry completely before the next coat is applied.
2. You cannot use recycled paint in hot conditions or desert environments.
 - **False.** Recycled paint holds up well in hot weather. Some painting contractors recommend applying paint in warmer temperatures to help with adherence. For example, a lot of recycled paint is sold in Africa in extremely dry, hot environments with no complaints about performance. In addition, recycled paint is sold in the desert regions of Southern California and Arizona.
3. Recycled paint is only available in dull colors and sheens, and colors vary from batch to batch.
 - **False.** Recycled paint comes in a variety of standard colors and sheens. Most recyclers will custom tint large batches to meet a customer's needs and can also match colors from already-painted surfaces. Each batch is tested for quality and color consistency.
4. I can't use recycled paint for Direct-to-Metal applications.
 - **False.** Recycled-content Direct-to-Metal (DTM) paints are available, and perform similar to standard DTM paint. For example, the City of Santa Monica and Big Bear use recycled-content DTM paints on trash bins and roll-off bins.
5. The extra hassle of locating recycled paint is not worth the cost savings.
 - **False.** Recycled paint is much less expensive than most standard paints. On average, a high-quality recycled paint costs \$10-15 per gallon, whereas a gallon of comparable standard paint can often cost as much as \$30-50+ per gallon.
6. Recycled paint has a shorter shelf-life than standard paint.
 - **False.** An unopened can of paint (whether standard or recycled) can last for decades if it is stored in a dry, cool (but not too cold), dark place. It's best not to leave paint in direct sunlight, outdoors, or in a moist location. Visit PaintCare's website for tips about how to properly store paint to ensure it lasts.

7. Recycled paint cannot be used in environments close to the ocean.
 - **False.** Recycled paint is often utilized near the ocean, which has no impact on the performance of recycled paint. For example, recycled paint is used in southern California near the ocean and in China and the Philippines in areas with heavy rain.
8. Recycled paint is not available near me.
 - **False.** Recycled paint is sold statewide in various retail locations, as well as available directly from recyclers. See PaintCare's list of locations that sell recycled paint in California to find where to purchase recycled paint near you.
9. Recycled paint is lower quality than virgin paint.
 - **False.** Recycled paint is tested for performance and quality including pH, viscosity, sag resistance, sheen, coverage and fineness of grind. The performance and quality of recycled paint is comparable to standard paint.
10. Recycled paint is not suitable for interior use.
 - **False.** There are low-VOC recycled paints that are less than 50g/L VOC content and suitable for interior use.

Source: <https://calrecycle.ca.gov/buyrecycled/stateagency/categories/misconcepts/>

CONCLUSION:

The lack of retail outlets to dispose/recycle paint is a serious impediment for ratepayers. An ordinance requiring paint retailers to take back unused paint has been offered as a potential fix to this issue. Only one county in the State has such an ordinance (San Luis Obispo), owing to the difficulty of drafting and passing such an ordinance.

Staff is asking for direction from the Board if to pursue this, and if so, about drafting and coordinating a paint ordinance or other strategies to collect and divert paint, and how to coordinate the process with the County.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:



recyclemore
WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

www.recyclemore.com