









**EENR Committee Analysis**

The table below provides an analysis of the bills’ impacts on key issues affecting the San Gabriel Valley.

<b><u>Issue</u></b>	<b><u>Explanation</u></b>
Costs	<p><i>Collection:</i> It is estimated that implementing a stewardship program for batteries would add 1 – 3 cents to the cost of each battery. Under the current collection system, all of the collection costs are paid by rate and taxpayers regardless of whether or not they use batteries. CalRecycle has also found that only one-half of one percent of batteries are recycled through city and County household hazardous waste programs and cost in excess of \$31 million per year.<sup>4</sup> This amounts to \$2,700 per ton as compared to approximately \$100 per ton required to manage the general solid waste stream. Under SB 1100, this paradigm would change and the cost would likely be passed onto consumers who purchase the hazardous material. Furthermore, battery manufacturers in British Columbia voluntarily submitted an EPR plan that found it was feasible for them to manage the collection of batteries.</p> <p><i>Program Administration:</i> The purpose of the administrative fee is to fully cover, but not exceed, costs to CalRecycle for providing plan review, approval, and program development, oversight and compliance for the type of product for which the producer is responsible. The administrative fee amount is not specifically identified in the codified language. As a point of comparison, the State of Oregon recently passed EPR framework legislation and the regulatory process has set an administrative fee of \$10,000 per plan submitted to cover the plan review and oversight process. Multiple producers, or “stewards,” can submit a joint plan and pay a single fee.</p>
Local Government Support	Several cities and counties, including the County of Los Angeles and League of California Cities, have adopted a position of support for these bills. <sup>5</sup>
Relevance to San Gabriel Valley	EPR affects all of our cities as they current bear the burden of complying with state regulations to properly collect, manage, and dispose of household hazardous waste with limited budgets. Additionally, the recommended position is in keeping with the COG’s EPR resolution that was adopted in April and the adopted Solid Waste Policy paper. Also, the COG is currently working on a grant, funded by CalRecycle, to pilot a EPR program to create retail and business take back locations for batteries and CFLs.
Affect on Jobs	It is expected that these bills will create additional jobs in the recycling industry. A local example is a battery recycling company in Anaheim, Kinsbursky Brothers, who testified before a Senate committee that jobs would be added if the bill passed. CalRecycle has found that recycling a ton of “waste” has twice the economic impact of burying it in the ground. Each year, recycling provides an average of 85,000 jobs, \$4 billion in salaries and wages, and \$10 billion in goods and services. <sup>6</sup>
Benefit to Environment, Energy, or Natural Resources	Decreases toxic materials in waste stream (batteries contain heavy metal acids); increases recycling (carpets are readily recyclable, but currently make up 3.2% of California’s waste stream); reduces greenhouse gas emissions; and encourages innovative green design of materials and packaging.
Meets EENR Policy Paper(s) Criteria	Yes (EPR Resolution and Solid Waste Policy Paper)

Bill Analysis Matrix

**Table 1.**

The EENR Committee recommends the Governing Board take a position of “support” for this legislation.

<sup>4</sup> California Integrated Waste Management Board. “Household Universal Waste Generation in California.” Publication #520-02-004. August 2002.

<sup>5</sup> See Attachment 1 for a full list of bill supporters and opposition.

<sup>6</sup> Website: <http://www.calpsc.org/policies/docs/2009/CA-EPR-FactSheet.pdf>. Accessed 6/7/10.

