



2026 OFFICERS

Chair	Curtis Larkin, <i>County of Fresno</i>
Vice Chair	Sharon Green, <i>LA County Sanitation Districts</i>
Treasurer	Frank Caponi, <i>retired</i>
Secretary	Deepti Jain, <i>City of Sunnyvale</i>

SWANA Legislative Task Force Meeting Agenda

MEETING MINUTES

March 26, 2026

9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

In person

Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange, Inc.

1415 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

1. Administrative Items (9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.) – Curtis Larkin

- 1) Roll Call, Introductions -- The meeting was called to order and a quorum was established. This was a hybrid meeting, with some attendees in person in Sacramento and several participating online. The following approved guests were in attendance: Josh Mann (WM), Corinne Awad (County of Riverside), Robert Sedita (Orange County Waste and Recycling, Phillip Vander Klay (LACSD), Michelle White (City of Roseville)
- 2) Legal update – Mr. Larkin, Ms. Green and Mr. Kobold gave an update on new legal complications related to revenues and IRS rules. They will be working to resolve/address these issues as expeditiously as possible. They will be setting up a meeting with Chapter Presidents after the Western Regional Symposium.

2. Legislative Review (9:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.) - Dylan Hoffman

- 1) Attachment
- 2) Leg Update – Mr. Hoffman provided an update on the legislative schedule and process.
 - i. Schedule – all bills have been introduced, most are now amended and in print. Hearings ramping up; most will occur in April. Legislative recess next week.
 - ii. Many bills have coalitions forming, others will require letter writing just for LTF.
- 3) Bill review:
 - i. AB 1153 – allows CalRecycle to remove/dispose of recreational vehicles and to develop enforcement strategies. Note that the bill had been more detailed and was revised to be more general. **Watch/seek information**
 - ii. AB 1604 – bans use of bisphenol-A and other bisphenols (BPA and BPS) in receipts. **Watch**
 - iii. AB 1612 – CEQA exemption for siting incinerator for incineration of controlled substances – **Support**
 - iv. AB 1617 – HHW reporting alignment – RCRC sponsored – **Support**
 - v. AB 1777 – Air Quality: Indirect Sources – allows CARB to regulate stationary sources to get at indirect sources such as trucking – **Oppose**
 - vi. AB 1812 – Compostable Products – CA Compost Coalition=supporting, Californians Against Waste=opposed to initial version. Need more information to properly evaluate this bill. **Watch/seek information**

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCATE

Jason Schmelzer

- vii. AB 1941 – Allows metal theft meeting applicable criteria to be prosecuted under organized crime laws – **Support**
- viii. AB 2076 – broad nitrous oxide bill – **Drop**
- ix. AB 2112 – Annual reports (potential spot bill)– **Watch/seek information**
- x. AB 2226 – reverses ban on reusable precheckout plastic bags – Sponsored by CA Grocers Assoc – CAW opposes. **Watch**
- xi. AB 2245 – Lubricants Producer Responsibility bill – CPSC has been working on this bill (working with sponsors – org called Interstate 360). Trying to create an EPR program; reintroduction of AB 1325 from last year. Targeting all automotive lubricants. Remaining issues: convenience standard, what will happen at MRFs (what will they be required to do), how will this work in terms of used oil containers (need collection system to be set up), and how will funding work – **Watch & reevaluate**
- xii. AB 2253 – environmental marketing claims/recycled content claims – sponsor=CAW. **Watch**
- xiii. AB 2310 – Illegal dumping – focus on construction debris, increased penalties – **Support**
- xiv. AB 2462 – Unsafe products: disposal: penalties – has to do with recalled products and holds manufacturers and distributors responsible for proper management – co-sponsored by CSAC and CPSC. Department=CalRecycle, adding solid waste and recycling entities & local gov to entities that should be able to have recalled products retrieved at no cost. **Support**
- xv. AB 2549 – embedded batteries & e-waste – cleanup for thrift and second-hand stores. **Watch and seek more information.**
- xvi. AB 2559 – deposits related to Construction & Demolition debris mgmt. – comes out of district issue – has to do with CalGreen Building Code requirement to recycle waste. **Watch**
- xvii. AB 2667 – vape management – RCRC=sponsor. Had ESTM hrg, passed unanimously. **Support**
- xxviii. SB 58 – Air Quality: Hydrogen Sulfide – **2-year bill** in 2nd house. Coordinate with CASA and SWIG – **Watch & reevaluate.**
- xix. SB 501 – 2-yr bill in 2nd house– just for loose batteries now (medium size) – distinguishing between embedded and non-embedded (loose) batteries; more batteries will be included in battery EPR program. **Support**
- xx. SB 594 – Padilla – 2 year bill in 2nd house – prohibits the Regional Water Boards from issuing a waste discharge permit for a new Class III landfill unless the county board of supervisors for the county in which the proposed project resides has held a separate publicly noticed hearing to consider whether the proposed landfill is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the environmental justice element adopted by the county in its General Plan. **Oppose**
- xxi. SB 758 – ban on sale of nitrous oxide in retail locations – **Drop**
- xxii. SB 811 – metal shredding regulatory framework – reintroduction because last year's bill was vetoed -- **Watch**
- xxiii. SB 881 – extension of tax credits for food donations – **Drop**
- xxiv. SB 919 – Biomethane Interconnection -- **watch close** – let Dylan know if the bill is being amended/poised to move.
- xxv. SB 922 – discuss next time
- xxvi. SB 936 – RCRC and others sponsoring – nitrous oxide limitations related to solid waste concerns – **Support** (join coalition letter)
- xxvii. SB 955 – reverse vending machines and CRV/beverage container program – **watch**
- xxviii. SB 1010 – EPR bill on refrigerant products (household appliances/refrigerators that contain refrigerants) – there are issues with safe handling and recycling. CPSC = sponsor. Review and take position next time.
- xxix. SB 1031 – compostable products and their labeling – **watch**
- xxx. SB 1081 – Water Boards: mandatory minimum penalty reform for very small wastewater agencies. **Drop**
- xxxi. SB 1180 (Allen) – **SB 54 Mitigation Fund** – **Review** and take position next time

- xxxii. SB 1218 – DMV would be required to refuse to renew vehicle registration if owner has been mailed notice on illegal dumping. **Watch**
- xxxiii. SB 1230 – illegal dumping fines (increases the penalties) – **Support**
- xxxiv. SB 1341 – wine or spirit container processing fees (if boxes, bladders or pouches) – **watch**
- xxxv. SB 1371 – SW handling services bill and labor disputes. Review and take position next time.
- xxxvi. SB 1396 – spot bill - **watch**

3. Working Lunch (12:00 pm-1:30pm, lunch provided)

- 1) Jordan Wells, California State Association of Counties
 - i. Priority issues – AB 2462, SB 1383 implementation/funding, SB 54 implementation, compostable plastics, bottle bill, Advanced Clean Fleets
- 2) John Kennedy, Rural County Representatives of California
 - i. Priority issues – AB 2462, compostable plastics, SB 54 – e.g. local gov reimbursements, can we seek state mandate reimbursement?, Cong Adam Gray – fed leg on compostable/non-compostable plastics. Litigation over SB 343 (plastics labeling law). LMR update implementation at CARB.
- 3) Discussion of bills:
 - i. Compostable plastics – AB 1812 – Jordan – supporting it. Background – petition by BPI, trying to get around SB 54. CSAC/RCRC are going to support the bill. SB 1031 – still looking at it, needs to be clearly differentiated (easy to ID in facilities).
 - ii. Illegal dumping – quite a few bills. Bonta bill not as helpful as John had hoped. Has budget request to pay for it. Carillo bill – like that one, RCRC going to support. Valadares bill – just increases penalties. RCRC also going to support that. Generally Public Safety Com hasn't been too supportive of increasing penalties. CalRecycle BCP on SETs also includes \$ for work on illegal dumping (asking for 2 PYs).
 - iii. AB 28 – John – urging Schiavo to keep Cal-EPA coordination role in bill. Financial assurances for subsurface elevated temperatures (SETs) are likely to be controversial. RCRC also has concerns about the scope of the community notification requirements. This bill isn't really going to address Chiquita's issues, more about preventing future SET issues.
 - iv. SB 1289 (Hurtado) – WM & Kings County= co-sponsor- would require all CA haz waste to go to HW landfill. Still a spot bill. Right now, a lot of contaminated soil (CA-only HW) goes out of state for disposal.
 - v. SB 936 – nitrous oxide cylinders – cost \$66/cylinder to dispose (at HHW facilities), very serious public health issue. ACLU and other groups (CURB-anti-prison group) & SF Public Defender oppose because they don't want it to be in Penal Code. Have coalition supporting. RCRC plus Humboldt, SC and OC are co-sponsors.
 - vi. AB 2667 – Vape bill -- support
 - vii. AB 1617 – HHW reporting – support
 - viii. SB 922 – Laird – LOCC is sponsor, counties/RCRC helping – has to do with authority to charge fees imposed on public service hauling (trucking) – correcting a court decision.
 - ix. AB 2253 – support. CAW = sponsor
 - x. SB 1371 – Durazo – re: solid waste labor disputes – heard that only (a) and (b) will remain in bill, other stuff might be removed.
 - xi. Composting and manure – Inyo County – looking for solutions, issue is pharma compounds and how to address.

4. Regulatory Update (1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.)

- 1) SB 54 Subcommittee update
 - i. Last set of 15-day changes – we submitted a comment letter, although most of our comments not really addressed. Regs went to CAL for review. A lot of Needs Assessment reports have

been released. Status of collection systems, processing facilities, recycling, markets – not too much was surprising in them. There is a summary report with overview of all of the needs assessments. Major gaps in handling flexible plastics. MRFs will require upgrades, need to improve inbound material quality. Pretty much these reports did not contain surprises, pretty much what you would expect. If no markets, may want to apply for exemptions. Operators should begin talking to CAA about reimbursement payments. Should start figuring out costs and categories of costs, if you enter into an agreement with CAA. Expect to have more reporting. Start listening in on some of the meetings. CalRecycle – Public Info workshop on April 6.

- 2) CalRecycle – no updates
- 3) CARB – no updates
- 4) DTSC – no updates

5. Priority issue discussion (2:30 – 3:00)

- 1) **Prioritization of issues & bills:**
 - AB 28 & LMR + SB 58
 - Compostable plastic issues (TBD on positions though)
 - AB 1777 – oppose
 - EPR bills – AB 2245, AB 2462, SB 1010, SB 501

6. Administrative Items (3:00 p.m. – 3:30 pm)

- 1) Approval of February 2026 Minutes – Curtis Larkin - **approved minutes**
- 2) Approval of February 2026 Treasurer's Report – Frank Caponi - **approved**
- 3) Western Regional Symposium LTF Presentation Update – Curtis Larkin – has outline for our time slot (50 min)
 - i. Doug Kobold & Dylan Hoffman will do a panel & presentation
 - 1. LTF 101
 - 2. Leg 101 – how process works, how LTF interfaces with Legislature
 - ii. Curtis Larkin to give update at Joint Chapters meeting
- 4) 2026 Workplan – Curtis Larkin/Sharon Green to finish
- 5) Outreach – Chris Hanson, Monique Gama and Jane Fajardo will work up a short leg update to go up on website. Olivia Thomas/Dylan Hoffman will update priority bill tracking list and post both on website.

Enclosures:

February 2026 minutes

February 2026 Treasurer's Report

Bill Fact Sheets



2025 OFFICERS

Chair	Curtis Larkin, <i>Fresno County</i>
Vice Chair	Sharon Green, <i>LACSD</i>
Treasurer	Frank Caponi, <i>Retired</i>
Secretary	Deepti Jain, <i>City of Sunnyvale</i>

SWANA Legislative Task Force Meeting Minutes

February 26, 2026

10 am - 12 pm

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84209610967?pwd=l2WvdOOqMMVYYE8fsjsxbY3hXaswtR.1>

1. Administrative Items (10:00 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.)

- a. Roll Call, Introductions – Quorum present.
 - I. Attendees: Frank, Larry, Curtis, Mike m, Deepti, Josh, Tari, Jim, Doug, Mike S, Ryan, Dawayne. Robert, joe, Monique (during meeting)
 - II. Guests:
 1. Josh Mann, WM – new guest SoCal
 2. Corinne Wad, Riverside Dept. of Waste Resources – new guest SoCal
 3. Ryan Tenney, City of Irvine – new guest SoCal
- b. Approval of January 2026 Meeting Minutes (Deepti)
Motion to approve was made, seconded and approved. (Frank/Doug)
- c. Approval of October, November, December 2025 and January 2026 Treasurer's Report (Frank)
Motion to approve was made, seconded and approved with the addition of a footnote regarding Misc. Legal Expenses (to the For Purpose Law Group for MOA assistance).
Key Discussion Points
 - Frank noted that prior months/ revisions include additional footnotes added.
 - Group agreed Frank would provide reports to the LTF in Excel, not PDF, for ease of editing during the meeting.
 - Revenues include agency contributions and the MOLO revenues of nearly \$50k. Anticipate will hit goal of \$20k in agency contributions.
 - In Expenses, December column is blank, as the SYASL November invoice was overlooked and will be paid and reflected in a subsequent month.
- d. Officer's update
 - I. SWANA LTF dues disbursement to LTF update (Curtis)
 1. Curtis will send Dues Sharing Agreement to Chapters with deadline to comment.
 - II. Legal updates (Curtis)
 1. LTF has some tax documents to file; in progress.
 - III. Insurance (Sharon)
 1. No update.
 - IV. Election of Officers (Curtis)
 1. Alignment to FY (as much as possible August – July?)
 2. Curtis suggested elections in August, which would cut current officers' term by six months. No concerns expressed.
 - V. COI forms, have they been signed?
 1. Conflict of Interest forms are needed by Directors; some are still outstanding.
- e. Website update, new lead (Jane)
- f. WRS LTF Presentation (4/22/26, 9:50 am – 11:00 am)
 - I. LTF 101 (LTF Officers)

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCATE

Dylan Hoffman

Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange • 1415 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 446-4656 • Fax (916) 446-4318

- II. Legislation 101 (Dylan, SYASL)
- III. Bill updates (Dylan)
- IV. Q&A
- g. 2026 Work Plan
 - I. Distribution to Chapters by?
 - II. Curtis has reviewed. Sharon will give final review before sending to Chapters.
 - III. Goal to get to Chapters soon.
 - IV. Doug noted that submitting a Work Plan is not mentioned in the bylaws (only our prior MOA). May ultimately need separate agreement with Chapters for things like this.
 - V. Discussion in support of continuing to streamline the Work Plan and putting more accessible and detailed information on the LTF website instead. Still desire that the Work Plan serve as a tool to report on the LTF's benefit to the Chapters.
- h. 2026 LTF Adopted budget distributed to Chapters by 2/1/26? (Frank / Curtis)
 - I. Will get new LTF FY-formatted budget to Chapters soon. Frank will send to Curtis.
- i. March in person meeting
 - I. Draft agenda (Curtis)
 - 1. Audit committee volunteers
 - 2. Curtis requested ideas for guest speakers – interest expressed to invite CAA.
 - II. Guests?
 - III. R.S.V.P.s important
- j. Lobby day (set date)
 - I. Discuss at March meeting.

2. SWANA Update (Joe)

- a. Joe reported he has stepped down from the SWANA Region 1 Advisory Board.
- b. Larry attending advocacy committee meetings; will share agendas from those meetings.
- c. Sharon noted that Kristin Olendorf sends out minutes with policy updates.
- d. Sharon reported on her trip to DC where there were many discussions about PFAS. Work that SWANA and others have done have helped with recognition for landfills. She also shared about many SWANA partnerships with other entities.

3. Legislative Review (10:45 a.m – 11:30 p.m.) (Dylan) – Bill introduction deadline was February 20. Dylan noted some of these bills are spot bills; will be amended by our next meeting. Dylan gave an overview of the following bills but the LTF will not take positions on any bills until discussed further at the in-person meeting in March.

- a. [AB 28 \(Schiavo\) Solid waste landfills: subsurface temperatures.](#)
 - I. Oppose unless amended
 - II. Two-year bill
 - III. Dylan will talk with author's staff to see what their plans are.
- b. [AB 80 \(Aguiar-Curry\) Carpet recycling.](#)
 - I. Support
 - II. Two-year bill
 - III. Nothing moving forward now. Doug is on Carpet Advisory Board and should hear updates soon.
- c. ***AMENDED** [AB 643 \(Wilson\) Climate change: short-lived climate pollutants: organic waste reduction.](#)
 - I. Senate Rules Committee, pending referral to policy committee
 - II. Significantly amended - *This bill would authorize a local jurisdiction to include organic material used as a beneficial agricultural amendment towards its recovered organic waste procurement target if the material is processed at a facility authorized by the department using specified approved technologies.*
- d. [AB 762 \(Irwin\) Disposable, battery-embedded vapor inhalation device: prohibition.](#)

- I. Support
 - II. Senate Rules Committee, pending referral to policy committee
 - III. Amended to remove cannabis products.
- e. [AB 864 \(Ward\) Hazardous waste: solar photovoltaic modules.](#)
 - I. Watch
 - II. Two-year bill
- f. [AB 998 \(Hadwick\) Household hazardous waste: vape pens](#)
 - I. Support
 - II. Two-year bill
- g. [AB 2667 \(added\) – vape products at schools](#)
 - I. Incorporates some of AB 998
- h. [*NEW AB 1604 \(Stefani\) Product safety: proofs of purchase: intentionally added bisphenols.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Prohibition of BPA in receipt paper.
- i. [*NEW AB 1612 \(Alanis\) Incineration of controlled substances: California Environmental Quality Act: law enforcement exemption.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Exemption under CEQA for law enforcement to procure incinerators to dispose of controlled substances.
 - III. Sharon noted may be due to closure of two incinerations facilities.
- j. [*NEW AB 1617 \(Alanis\) Household hazardous waste: reporting.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Changes to Form 303 reporting.
 - III. Potential early action needed.
- k. [*NEW AB 1777 \(Garcia\) Air pollution: indirect sources](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Reintroduced Indirect Source bill – would authorize CARB to adopt regulations to reduce or mitigate emissions from indirect sources of pollution.
 - III. Potential early action needed.
- l. [*NEW AB 1780 \(Rodriguez, M\) Beverage containers: redemption payments: exemption](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Exemptions for donated beverages.
- m. [*NEW AB 1826 \(Lackey\) Cannabis: recall, embargo, and destruction of cannabis and cannabis products.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. New rules around destruction of cannabis products.
- n. [AB 1941 \(added\) metal theft](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. New crime for organized metal theft.
- o. [*NEW AB 2076 \(Lowenthal\) The Parent’s Accountability and Child Protection Act: online marketplaces: nitrous oxide.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Remove from list; follow SB 936 (below).
- p. [AB 2100 \(added\) Greenhouse gases](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Alternative manure disposal
- q. [SB 501 \(Allen\) Responsible Battery Recycling Act of 2022: covered batteries.](#)
 - I. Support
 - II. Assembly Desk, pending referral to policy committee

- r. [SB 615 \(Allen\) Vehicle traction batteries.](#)
 - I. Watch
 - II. Two-year bill
- s. [SB 633 \(Blakespear\) Beverage containers: recycling.](#)
 - I. Watch
 - II. Two-year bill
- t. [SB 881 \(McNerney\) Income taxation: credits: food bank donations](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Senate Revenue & Taxation Committee
- u. ***NEW** [SB 919 \(Grayson\) Biomethane projects: investment costs](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Require PUC to allow rate-based cost recovery for biomethane infrastructure
- v. ***NEW** [SB 936 \(Blakespear\) Nitrous oxide: sales](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Ban on sales.
- w. ***NEW** [SB 955 \(Blakespear\) Beverage containers: supermarkets: reverse vending machines.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Certain requirements for the machines and underserved convenience zones.
- x. ***NEW** [SB 1010 \(Ashby\) Solid waste: Plastic Pollution Prevention and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Spot bill. Refrigerants and large appliances recycling. Language to come.
- y. ***NEW** [SB 1031 \(Blakespear\) Solid waste: compostable products.](#)
 - I. Introduced
 - II. Spot bill. Language to come.

4. Regulatory Update (11:30 a.m. – noon)

- a. Illegal Disposal (Larry)
 - I. CalEPA Task Force – provided funding for annual TF conference.
- b. CARB Landfill Methane Rule Update (Frank/Larry)
 - I. Larry reported that industry met with CARB staff recently. Will be another 15-day comment period, but no public Board meeting. Will make some changes. The 131-degree threshold, and 5% oxygen, will be the regulation. Will align Corrective Action items for cover with Title 27. Discussion about working face controls, wells for waste in place, smaller grid monitoring, alternatives for field testing, corrective action offramps, ability to decommission wells, consideration for wildfire/safety shutoffs, etc.
- c. SB 54 Regulatory Update (Chris)
 - I. Updated CMC List released in December – Recommend jurisdictions and facilities get familiar with what we need to collect/process/market (anything deemed recyclable/compostable).
 - II. Needs Assessment reports released – indicated funding needed for processing and markets.
 - III. PRO Plan in progress
 - IV. Funding portal not yet open.

5. Rumors (time permitting)

- a. AB 2462 re recalled products should be added to our list.

SWANA LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
February 2026 Treasurer's Report
SUMMARY

MONTHLY SUMMARY												
JULY 2025	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN 2026	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	
REVENUES	\$0.30	\$0.28	\$0.21	\$19,705.76	\$5,251.04	\$0.99	\$56,097.08	\$3,062.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
EXPENSES	\$7,361.15	\$5,041.00	\$5,200.00	\$5,290.00	\$10,963.44	\$0.00	\$7,538.52	\$14,742.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BEGINNING ACCT. BALANCES												
Operating Acct.	\$66,411.93	\$59,051.06	\$54,010.30	\$48,810.51	\$48,059.71	\$42,136.46	\$42,136.63	\$34,638.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ACH Acct.	\$500.00	\$500.01	\$500.03	\$500.05	\$6,586.33	\$1,545.56	\$1,545.62	\$51,350.74	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Restricted Acct.	\$500.00	\$500.01	\$500.03	\$500.05	\$12,750.11	\$18,000.73	\$18,001.49	\$24,252.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ENDING ACCT. BALANCES												
Operating Acct.	\$59,051.06	\$54,010.30	\$48,810.51	\$48,059.71	\$42,136.46	\$42,136.63	\$34,638.27	\$29,973.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ACH Acct.	\$500.01	\$500.03	\$500.05	\$6,586.33	\$1,545.56	\$1,545.62	\$51,350.74	\$44,330.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Restricted Acct.	\$500.01	\$500.03	\$500.05	\$12,750.11	\$18,000.73	\$18,001.49	\$24,252.29	\$24,253.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES				

YTD	BUDGETED	% BUDGET
\$84,118.48	\$63,006	134%
\$56,137	\$77,430	72%



ASSEMBLY BILL 1777

Indirect Source Rule

ASSEMBLYMEMBER

Robert Garcia



SUMMARY

The state of California has the second worst air pollution in the nation on average, with 88% of Californians living in communities with unhealthy air.

Studies have proven that poor air quality contributes to a wide range of negative health impacts, including childhood asthma attacks, impaired lung function and development, lung cancer, heart attacks and strokes, and premature deaths. Many Californians, especially those in lower-income communities and communities of color, often face disproportionate impacts due to multiple, local sources of pollution.

AB 1777 makes a simple declaration, affirming the state of California's authority to adopt statewide indirect source regulations, prioritizing flexibility and collaboration with regional air districts, to reduce air pollution and improve air quality throughout the state.

BACKGROUND

Air quality is not simply an environmental issue, it is also a health and safety issue. Transportation-related air pollution is associated with premature death, death due to cardiovascular disease, death due to lung cancer, onset of asthma in children and adults and other health emergencies.

Nearly half (46%) of people living in the United States are impacted by unhealthy levels of air pollution. In California, it's far worse. Nearly 9 in 10 Californians live in counties impacted by air pollution. Tailpipe emissions and record heat drive up ozone pollution, while prolonged drought conditions and other impacts from climate change, such as historic wildfires, contribute to particle pollution. California's hard-earned progress toward clean air is increasingly at risk.

Residents in the 50th Assembly District experience some of the highest levels of particulate and ozone pollution, but this issue is not unique to the Inland Empire with the San Joaquin Valley and entire South Coast Air Basins also being heavily impacted by poor air quality.

PROBLEM

Despite significant efforts to reduce pollution, Californians still breathe some of the unhealthiest air in the nation. Emissions associated with indirect source — defined as facilities, buildings, structures, installations, real properties, roads, or highways which attracts or may attract mobile sources of pollution — include pollutants that contribute to regional air quality issues such as smog, and localized toxic diesel pollution, which disproportionately harms nearby communities.

The transportation sector contributes nearly 80% of nitrogen oxide pollution in the state, and 90% of diesel particulate matter pollution. This pollution has a disproportionate impact on communities of color, who are exposed to as much as 43% more particulate matter pollution. Exposure to harmful air pollution leads to an increase in pre-existing health conditions and premature death.

While indirect source rules have proven effective at improving regional air quality, existing indirect source rules are local in nature, and the associated health benefits are limited to those regions. AB 1777 affirms that the state may create a statewide indirect source review program to eliminate gaps in the investments needed to ensure California can meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets.

SOLUTION

AB 1777 simply affirms the state of California's authority to adopt statewide regulations on pollution, caused by indirect sources as defined in [42 U.S. Code § 7410\(a\)\(5\)](#) as "facilities, buildings, structures, installations, real properties, roads, or highways which attracts or may attract mobile sources of pollution".

Statewide indirect source rules are an important tool to further safeguard the public health of all Californians and to meet our climate goals. This bill provides California with that important tool by affirming the authority to adopt these rules.

CONTACT

Brendan Murphy, *Chief of Staff*
brendan.murphy@asm.ca.gov | (916) 319-2050

SUPPORT

Earth Justice (Sponsor)





AB 1941 Summary

AB 1941 will enhance enforcement against copper wire theft by:

- Targeting repeat and organized offenders who steal, or traffic prohibited metal materials.
- Creating a statewide data-sharing tool to allow for increased visibility into organized theft operations.

Background

Copper wire theft is a growing and significant issue in California. The price of copper is at historic highs and theft has only been increasing. Recent reports have shown that cities across the state have been grappling with the issue; from Sacramento, San Jose, Los Angeles, Richmond, and Fresno.

These thefts often occur at sites of critical public infrastructure such as telecommunication lines, electrical utility equipment, water infrastructure, streetlights, and traffic lights. Even fiber optic cables which contain no copper are frequently vandalized by would-be thieves searching to strip any metal to sell. By removing copper, essential services like 911, electricity, water, and street safety are cut with no immediate fix.

To try and tackle this issue, AB 476 (2025) was passed and modernized the types of information junk dealers and recyclers must collect before purchasing metal and prohibits metal from essential public infrastructure from being possessed was the first law to tackle this issue in more than decade.

Problem

Copper theft is not a victimless crime and costs far more to repair and replace the infrastructure than just the actual lost value of the copper itself.

In the City of Los Angeles, seven miles or 38,000 feet of copper wire was stolen from the historic Sixth Street Bridge costing an estimated \$2.5 million to repair it.

Streetlight outages have increased exponentially, more than doubling since 2021. The City's Bureau of Street Lighting reported out approximately 45,000 service requests in 2024 alone. And cases of theft or vandalism can take up to six months to repair as they require coordination with multiple teams of different disciplines to ensure a safe repair.

AT&T reported 2,200 separate incidents of copper wire theft in 2024, more than a 3000% increase. They also spent \$60 million on copper wire theft repairs in 2025 due to theft and vandalism to their network.

Solution

AB 1941 builds upon previous efforts to tackle copper wire theft by creating a new tool of "organized metal theft", allowing prosecutors to bring enhanced charges for coordinated or repeated thefts.

It also enables law enforcement agencies, public agencies, and private entities such as telecommunication companies and junk dealers and recyclers to share information in a statewide database to better tackle this problem.

Support

CalBroadBand (Co-Sponsor)
League of California Cities (CalCities) (Co-Sponsor)
Mayor of San Jose, Matt Mahan (Co-Sponsor)
US Telecom – The Broadband Association (Co-Sponsor)
Asian Pacific American Community Center
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce

Chamber San Mateo County
City of Hidden Hills
City of Lakewood
Curry Senior Center
Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce
Mission Bit
Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco African American Chamber of
Commerce
Sf.citi
San Mateo County Economic Development
Association (SAMCEDA)
San Rafael Chamber of Commerce
Self-Help for the Elderly



ASSEMBLYWOMAN

Blanca E. Rubio
DISTRICT 48

AB 2226 (Rubio): Compostable precheckout bags.

SUMMARY

This bill removes the requirement that pre-checkout bags provided to consumers be certified compostable, as determined by the USDA, to provide flexibility to the grocery industry as federal definitions of compostable bags face potential changes.

BACKGROUND

In 2021, the legislature passed SB 1046 (Eggman) requiring, as of 2025, all pre-checkout bags – the thin produce bags used for fruits, vegetables, bulk items, and raw meats – must be compostable to remain legal in California.

In the same year, AB 1201 (Ting) was approved which, as of 2026 requires all products be labeled “compostable” to meet a standard to be determined by the USDA National Organic Program (NOP). As of July 1, 2025, USDA NOP had yet to determine what constitutes as compostable.

Because of USDA NOP's failure to develop a timely compostable standard that would apply to pre-checkout bags, grocers were left with the option to provide either no pre-checkout bag or offer one whose composability was unclear. In response, CalRecycle had to provide an extension for enforcement of the original SB 1046 timeline until July 2027.

PROBLEM

At this point, the grocery industry, the only sector currently subject to the compostable bag standard, remains unaware of when and if the USDA NOP will draft a new compostable standard.

Moreover, commercial composters have stated “compostable” pre-checkout bags are not truly compostable, raising concerns with the efficacy of finished compost sold to large scale users, farmers, and landscapers.

In short, the state is left with an unknown standard, creating operational challenges, discouraging proper organics management, and increasing confusion for retailers, consumers, and waste handlers.

SOLUTION

Rather than continue to operate in the unknown, this bill will repeal the Public Resource Code requiring all pre-checkout bags be compostable, as determined by USDA NOP. This will allow grocers to determine which are the most appropriate pre-checkout bags to be provided in stores.

SUPPORT

California Grocers Association (**Sponsor**)

STAFF CONTACT

Madeline Mabry
916-319-2048
Madeline.Mabry@asm.ca.gov



Michelle Rodriguez

Assembly Bill 2245

Lubricant Waste and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act of 2026

Introduced: 2/19/26

Summary

AB 2245 amends the Public Resources Code to establish the Lubricant Waste and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act of 2026, creating a new extended producer responsibility (EPR) program for automotive and mechanical lubricants and their packaging. It requires producers to fund and operate a statewide system for the collection, transportation, and safe management of covered products and packaging, overseen by CalRecycle and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The measure builds on California's existing waste management and producer responsibility framework and includes regulatory timelines beginning in 2029, with full producer compliance required by 2031.

Background

California has existing programs for used oil recycling and household hazardous waste management, but many lubricants and related packaging fall outside current regulatory coverage. These products—including oil, antifreeze, lubricants, engine additives, and similar fluids—are widely used in automotive and mechanical applications and can pose environmental and public health risks when improperly disposed. Local governments currently bear significant costs for collecting and managing these materials through household hazardous waste programs and landfills, without consistent funding from producers.

Problem

This leads to several issues including:

Improper disposal risks: Lubricant products and their packaging can contaminate soil and waterways and create hazardous waste management challenges.

Local government burden: Cities and counties fund hazardous waste programs without dedicated producer funding, increasing costs for ratepayers and taxpayers.

Regulatory gaps: Existing used oil programs do not cover all lubricant-related products and packaging. Lack of producer accountability: Producers currently have limited responsibility for end-of-life management of these products.

Solution

AB 2245 addresses these issues. The bill establishes a producer-funded, statewide collection and management system for covered lubricant products and packaging, including:

Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO): Producers must join or create a nonprofit PRO to develop and implement a CalRecycle-approved plan.

Statewide Collection System: Within 24 months of regulations, the PRO must provide convenient, no-cost collection and management services for residents.

Regulatory Oversight: CalRecycle and DTSC jointly review and approve producer plans, with DTSC overseeing safe handling and hazardous waste components.

Performance Metrics: Plans must include collection and recycling goals consistent with broader packaging responsibility laws.

Education and Outreach: Producers must fund statewide education to promote proper disposal and participation.

Enforcement: Beginning in 2031, producers cannot sell covered products in California without participating in an approved plan.

Alignment to SB 54: AB 2245 improves the performance of the <name of act> by addressing a complicated packaging stream that would otherwise contaminate curbside collections.

Contact Information

James Malone

Office of Assemblymember Michelle Rodriguez

Phone: (916) 319-2053

Email: james.malone@asm.ca.gov



Assemblymember Tasha Boerner, 77th District

AB 2253 PROTECTING CONSUMERS AGAINST GREENWASHING ACT

(AS INTRODUCED ON FEBRUARY 19, 2026)

SUMMARY

AB 2253 would protect consumers from deceptive recycled content claims by requiring companies that advertise recycled content in their products to maintain and make available written documentation proving the recycled material was diverted from the waste stream and demonstrate that their claims comply with the Federal Trade Commission standards.

AB 2253 also prohibits companies from using misleading recycled content “credit” schemes and other accounting gimmicks to advertise recycled content even when none is physically present in the product.

BACKGROUND

For decades, California has relied on recycled content as a cornerstone of its recycling and waste-reduction strategy. Incorporating recycled materials into products such as plastic bottles, packaging, paper, and glass creates stable demand for materials collected through recycling programs. That demand helps keep materials out of landfills, reduces the need for virgin resource extraction, and supports recycling infrastructure and jobs.

In recent years, however, some plastics and consumer product companies have increasingly turned to recycled content “credit” schemes or accounting gimmicks rather than using actual recycled material in their products. Under these systems (often referred to as “mass balance,” “free allocation,” or “book-and-claim accounting”) companies can purchase credits associated with debatably recycled material from elsewhere in the global supply chain or use convoluted accounting methods that generate credits untethered from recycled material.

[California’s Attorney General’s Office filed a lawsuit against ExxonMobil in 2024](#) to protect

Californians from these deceptive claims, saying the recycled content “scheme employed by ExxonMobil is actually a false and misleading marketing scheme, which ExxonMobil uses to mislead the public into believing that products made with “certified circular polymers” have significant environmental benefits or are made of plastic waste”. Similarly, under the Biden Administration, the [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Safe Choice standard updated their standards](#) to require recycled content be determined “by weight,” effectively forbidding these deceptive accounting schemes.

EXISTING LAW

Existing law requires manufacturers and suppliers that make recycled content claims about plastic food containers to keep written documentation proving the recycled material was diverted from the waste stream and that the claim complies with Federal Trade Commission standards, and to make that documentation available to the public upon request or online.

THIS BILL

AB 2253 would extend the existing recycled content claim requirements to all products, ensuring that all product categories are held accountable for truthful recycled content claims.

This bill also clarifies that recycled content claims reflect the physical recycled material in a product, prohibiting credit-based accounting or book-and-claim systems, and establishes that postconsumer recycled content only includes materials recovered after consumer use, not manufacturing scraps or byproducts reused in production.

SUPPORT

- Californians Against Waste (Sponsor)
- PureCycle

- Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)

OPPOSITION

- None on file.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Christian Filbrun, Legislative Aide
(916) 319-2077
Christian.Filbrun@asm.ca.gov



AB 2462: Producer Responsibility for Recalled Products

As Introduced 02.20.2026

BACKGROUND

When a product recall or warning is issued, the Federal Product Recall Safety and Protection Act requires that an effort be made to contact customers and post a notice on its website. The manufacturer of the product must also provide for the safe return of the product to the manufacturer at no cost to the end consumer or retailer. This places the responsibility of managing recalled products on the commercial dealer, manufacturer, distributor, wholesaler, or retailer. Manufacturers are then responsible for proper disposal or if applicable, instead repair, retrofit, or choose another corrective action to be performed at the consumer's home.

CURRENT LAW

AB 1860 (Huffman, Chapter 569, Statutes of 2008) created state-level protections for consumers in response to Federal Product Recall Safety and Protection Act. The purpose of AB 1860 was to enhance protection for consumers by prohibiting the sale of recalled products, imposing fines for the sale of recalled products, requiring disposal or repair of recalled products, establishing a notification system for consumers, and providing for safe and cost-free return for both retailers and consumers. This law covers products that are recalled because they do not conform to state or federal laws, as well as products that are recalled by the manufacturer due to safety reasons.

PROBLEM

Since the passage of AB 1860, many producers have directed consumers to bring these recalled items to public solid waste facilities instead of returning them to the manufacturer, resulting in an explosion in costs for local public agencies. There is sufficient ambiguity in current law to allow manufacturers to shift their burden onto public agencies by directing consumers to drop recalled

products at local solid waste facilities instead of sending them back to the manufacturer. As a result, recalled products show up at public collection sites as an economic and environmental burden. AB 1860 does not cover local government costs of returning these products to the manufacturer. In addition to the problems with cost shifting, the current program has inadequate penalty structures and enforcement to drive compliance.

SOLUTION

AB 2462 eliminates the ability for responsible manufacturers to shift their responsibility for recalled products to public agencies. Specifically, this bill does the following:

1. Updates the definition of manufacturer to include distributors, wholesalers, and retailers in case the manufacturer refuses to comply with the law, much like Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) bills;
2. Adds local governments to the list of entities able to return a recalled product to the manufacturer at no cost to that entity; and
3. Increases the civil penalties for violations and provide the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery with clear enforcement authority.

SUPPORT

- California Product Stewardship Council (Sponsor)
- California State Association of Counties (Sponsor)

CONTACT

Charmaine Mills, Legislative Director

Charmaine.Mills@asm.ca.gov

916-319-2028



Fact Sheet: AB 2559

Construction and Demolition Program Deposit Refunds

PROPOSED BILL

Assembly Bill (AB) 2559 would require local governments that require refundable deposits as a condition of issuing a construction and demolition permit to return the full deposit, if the permit holder submits all required documentation demonstrating compliance with the deposit's terms within five years of the project's final inspection.

BACKGROUND

The California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) mandates locally permitted new residential and non-residential building construction, demolition, and certain additions and alteration projects to recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum 65% of the nonhazardous construction and demolition (C&D) debris generated during the project (CALGreen sections 4.408, 5.408, 301.1.1 and 301.3).

To meet the requirements of CALGreen, many jurisdictions adopted local construction and demolition (C&D) diversion ordinances, as an effective method of reducing material sent to disposal facilities. As part of these ordinances, many local governments require refundable deposits to help ensure compliance with applicable diversion standards.

However, there is no standardized timeline for permit holders to request a refund of these deposits. For example, in the City of San Diego, applicants must submit a refund request within 180 days of final inspection. Unfortunately, the final inspection can occur well before the project is fully complete. As a result, a permit holder, who typically relies

on a contractor to manage compliance, may be unaware that the deadline has passed until months later.

As such, permit-holders can incur double costs as they must pay the upfront deposit and separately pay recycling fees required to document compliance and qualify for a refund.

SOLUTION

AB 2559 would establish a uniform statewide standard requiring local governments to return refundable construction and demolition deposits, if adequate compliance documentation is submitted within five years of final inspection. By creating a clear and reasonable timeline, the bill would prevent premature forfeiture of deposits while preserving existing diversion requirements under CALGreen.

SUPPORT

None at this time.

OPPOSITION

None at this time.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Contact: Silverio Rizo Llamas
Phone: (916) 319-2078
Email: Silverio.Rizo@asm.ca.gov

Bill Version: Introduced February 20, 2026

HEATHER HADWICK

MEMBER FOR THE 1ST ASSEMBLY DISTRICT



FACT SHEET

AB 2667 – Combating Deceptively Marketed Vapes and Enabling Safe Disassembly of Vape Pens

IN BRIEF

Vaping is a public health crisis in schools and pose challenges for household hazardous waste (HHW) collection facilities (HHWCF) to identify and properly dispose.

Assembly Bill 2667 will help combat the proliferation of vapes in schools and gives HHWCFs and law enforcement more tools to manage vapes.

Specifically, this bill bans the sale of disguised vapes (like those that are virtually identical to school supplies, clothing, and household products) and video game vapes (which increase dependence on the vape), directs the Department of Toxic Substances Control to develop recommendations for schools to more easily manage and dispose of vapes confiscated by schools, and authorizes HHWCFs to disassemble vapes to reduce the costs to properly dispose of those devices.

BACKGROUND & ISSUE

U.S. teens and adults are buying roughly 12 million disposable vapes per month, and Americans throw away 4.5 vapes per second.

Schools often confiscate vape pens that students bring from home. While a student or parent can dispose of a vape pen as HHW at an HHWCF, schools cannot because they are not considered a household. This increases management challenges and costs for schools.

Local governments are responsible for the collection, processing, recycling and disposal of solid waste, including the operation of local HHWCFs. These local programs provide important public services and prevent improper disposal of HW.

Vapes are HW because they contain nicotine or cannabis, lithium batteries, and electronic components. Vapes are considered HHW when generated from a household and can be accepted for disposal at an HHWCF. Vape disposal can cost HHWCFs \$350 or more for a five-gallon bucket. Those costs could be significantly reduced if HHWCFs had the authority to disassemble vapes and separate the expensive-to-manage cartridges from the more recyclable batteries and circuitry. However, existing law considers any physical modification of HW as treatment requiring a special permit.

SOLUTION

AB 2667 directs DTSC to identify ways to improve the management and disposal of vapes confiscated from students by schools. The bill also protects schoolchildren and young adults by banning the sale of vapes that are disguised to conceal the nature of the vape product from parents, teachers, or other adults. Vapes should not be disguised as highlighters, sharpies, and other household goods to avoid detection, as there are real world consequences when those devices make their way into the waste stream and pose substantial fire risks. Similarly, AB 2667 bans vapes with interactive video game devices intended to increase addiction by promoting active interaction with the device.

By allowing HHWCFs to disassemble vapes, they can separate electronic components from other hazardous components in the vape, thereby facilitating recycling of the batteries and circuitry while reducing costs to properly dispose of the hazardous cartridge.

AB 2667 will help schools and local governments manage the vape pen waste stream while protecting children, schools, and holding violators accountable.

SUPPORT

Rural County Representatives of California
(Sponsor)

CONTACT

Andrew Nickens
Andrew.Nickens@asm.ca.gov
(916) 319-2001

SB 501 –Producer Responsibility for Medium-Format Batteries

SENATOR BEN ALLEN

Fact Sheet

SUMMARY

SB 501 will expand California’s extended producer responsibility (EPR) program for loose batteries to include medium-format batteries, such as those found in e-bikes, outdoor lawn equipment, and portable power systems.

BACKGROUND

Batteries are a significant source of household hazardous waste and pose significant safety risks when improperly managed. For instance, small batteries from cell phones have [caused dangerous trash fires](#), and certain e-bike batteries were [recently issued a product safety warning](#) by the US Consumer Product Safety Commission due to the risk of ignition and explosion.

Municipal solid waste entities are required to provide for safe collection of household hazardous waste, and these products are technically prohibited from being sent to landfills. However, consumers often face inadequate access to convenient collection options from their local jurisdiction, which can increase the chance of improper and dangerous disposal. Local jurisdictions are also facing significant fiscal burdens from the cost of proper collection and disposal of these products, which are increasing in the waste stream.

In 2022, [AB 2440 \(Irwin\)](#) and [SB 1215 \(Newman\)](#) established programs to promote the safe and proper collection and management of small loose batteries and battery-embedded products, respectively. AB 2440 required the producers of household batteries to either comply individually or through a stewardship program for the collection and recycling of these batteries, through an EPR framework. This includes planning for a specific number of collection sites, minimum recycling efficiency rates, and outreach and education. SB 1215 extended the consumer-facing fee of the e-waste program to additional products to pay for disposal costs.

EPR refers to a policy framework that places shared or full responsibility on managing the end-of-life of a product on to the producers of that product and entities in

the product chain, rather than on local governments and consumers. The framework usually entails a producer responsibility organization (PRO) made up of industry companies, which develops and implements a plan for end-of-life management under oversight of a public entity. EPR can also incentivize producers to make more sustainable product design choices.

Medium-format batteries were not included in AB 2440 and are only included in the SB 1215 program if they are embedded in the product, meaning they are not easily removable by the consumer. However, many medium-format batteries in products are designed to be easily removed by the consumer, and have been increasing in both the marketplace and waste stream as products such as [e-bikes become more popular](#).

States including Vermont, Illinois, Washington, Connecticut, Colorado, and Nebraska have all included medium-format batteries in recently enacted EPR programs for batteries, allowing for efficiencies in distributing costs for program administration amongst battery producers and implementing the program.

SOLUTION

SB 501 expands the batteries covered under AB 2440’s EPR program to those up to 25 pounds in order to include batteries typically considered “medium format.” The bill would also clarify that a key or locking device to prevent theft would not preclude a battery from being considered a loose battery covered under the program as long as the battery meets other criteria for being easily removable by a consumer.

SUPPORT

National Stewardship Action Council
Rural County Representative of California
Resource Recovery Coalition of California
Californians Against Waste
California Product Stewardship Council
Rethink Waste

CONTACT

Laurel Brodzinsky | Office of Senator Ben Allen
Laurel.Brodzinsky@sen.ca.gov; (916) 651-4024



TOM UMBERG

SENATOR, 34TH SENATE DISTRICT

SB 758 Drug Retail Integrity Act



SUMMARY

SB 758 prohibits the sale of nitrous oxide by any retailer with a cigarette and tobacco license. A retailer does not include a grocery store or a general retail merchandise store with a grocery department

BACKGROUND

Nitrous oxide is a colorless gas with legitimate uses (including medical/dental applications in clinical settings, industrial applications, and as a propellant for food products), but it is also misused recreationally because it is easy to obtain and relatively inexpensive. The prohibition on engaging in the recreational use of nitrous oxide is within existing law; however, existing law does not prohibit the sale of nitrous oxide by individuals with a tobacco license. This creates a loophole for individuals to engage in the sale of nitrous oxide without a penalty, as they are not advertising the substance's recreational use. Under the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act of 2003, any "retailer" must hold a license from the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration to sell cigarettes or tobacco products, and breaking those licensing rules is a misdemeanor.

PROBLEM

Recent reporting shows how nitrous oxide's easy retail availability can translate into

devastating tragedies. A September 2024 crash in Sutter County was reportedly caused when a 20-year-old driver repeatedly inhaled nitrous oxide from a large canister, lost consciousness, crossed the median at highway speeds, and collided head-on with another vehicle—killing himself and two people in the other car and leaving his 21-year-old passenger with a severe traumatic brain injury. The victim's family said the case underscores how nitrous oxide can be purchased in places like smoke shops and gas stations despite the well-known risks.

Local governments describe significant harms tied to nitrous oxide misuse and the ongoing ease of retail access. The City of Santa Ana and Buena Park's ordinance findings state that recreational misuse can cause permanent vitamin deficiencies and long-term neurological effects, including paralysis and death, and that misuse has been rising over the past decade. Their findings also show that nitrous oxide has been offered for sale in locations like liquor stores, gas stations, food marts, and tobacco shops that have no real connection to legitimate uses.

SOLUTION

This bill would make it illegal for individuals with a tobacco license to sell nitrous oxide and specifies that this does not apply to grocery stores.

SUPPORT

California Narcotic Officers' Association
(co-sponsor)
California League of Cities (co-sponsor)
Orange County (co-sponsor)
Rural County Representatives of California
(co-sponsor)
City of Stanton
San Bernadino County Sherrif's Department
Riverside Sheriff's Association
American Kratom Association
Arcadia Police Officer's Association
Brea Police Officer's Association
Burbank Police Officer's Association
CA Association of School Police Chiefs
CA Coalition of School Safety Professionals
CA Reserve Police Officer's Association
Claremont Police Officer's Association
Corona Police Officer's Association
Culver City Police Officer's Association
Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
Kern County Board of Supervisors
Fullerton Police Officer's Association
LA Schools Police Association
LA School Police Management Association
Murrieta Police Officer's Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Novato Police Officer's Association
Palos Verdes Police Officer's Association
Placer County Deputy Sherrif's Association
Pomona Police Officer's Association
Riverside Police Officer's Association
City of Buena Park

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Mufida Assaf
Phone: (916) 651-4034
Email: Mufida.Assaf@sen.ca.gov

Emily Augusta
Phone: (916) 651-4034
Email: Emily.Augusta@sen.ca.gov



Anna M. Caballero

14th Senate District

SB 811 – Metal Recycling Regulation Act

SUMMARY

SB 811 establishes a new statutory framework to ensure comprehensive and safe regulation of metal shredding facilities in California. The new framework would be administered and enforced by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

BACKGROUND

Metal shredding facilities recycle millions of end-of-life vehicles, household appliances, and other metallic items produced annually in California. Unless recycled, these materials would rapidly overwhelm all available landfill capacity, creating a massive accumulation of damaged and abandoned cars, appliances, and other items while posing threats to public safety. Instead, recovered material is a valuable product for metal manufacturing. Over the course of the LA fires, one facility was responsible for taking hundreds of burned vehicles from the city and county in order to recycle them into useful metal products. By providing a reliable and effective means of recycling metal products that are no longer serviceable, metal shredding facilities provide an essential service to reduce environmental waste and create a successful circular economy.

PROBLEM

Metal shredding can pose concerns to surrounding communities due to the potential release of materials and the risk of fires. However, the current framework for hazardous waste does not include metal shredding facilities and therefore they are not required to obtain a permit and are not regulated by DTSC. Without a comprehensive regulatory framework, DTSC on their own has begun to regulate the industry using hazardous waste enforcement authority on a facility-by-facility basis. This has created an uncertain and inconsistent legal environment for the facilities, placing California's circular economy at risk.

The industry and DTSC have both acknowledged that a comprehensive regulatory program that recognizes the unique nature and importance of scrap metal is in the best interest of the industry, the state, and communities living near these facilities; and have

engaged in years of discussion about the appropriate nature of regulation for this important industry.

SOLUTION

SB 811 will ensure comprehensive oversight and enforcement of metal shredding facilities under DTSC's authority, while recognizing the difference between these facilities and facilities that engage in the treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste.

This bill will require both existing and new facilities to receive a DTSC permit, and these facilities must meet articulated operational and performance standards to do so. These standards would include implementing fire prevention strategies, emergency response protocols, and stormwater management requirements. The bill specifically establishes detailed standards required to be met to avoid the release of materials such as metal shredder aggregate and residue into the environment. Facilities must also undergo California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. The bill gives DTSC robust enforcement authority to ensure these standards are met, including the authority to shut down a metal shredding facility in some circumstances. The bill authorizes DTSC to collect fees from metal shredding facilities to cover the bill's costs.

This bill will ensure that California has a robust regulatory process to oversee the metal shredding industry and will ensure that California remains a sustainability leader in "reducing, reusing and recycling" by fostering the recycling of scrap metal into new metal products.

SB 811 includes provisions to address the governor's veto message on SB 404.

SUPPORT

California Metal Recyclers Coalition (Sponsor)
California State Association of Electrical Workers
California State Pipe Trades Council

CONTACT

Kyle Krueger, Legislative Aide
Kyle.Krueger@sen.ca.gov | (916)651-4014

Senate Bill 881

Farmer to Food Bank Tax Credit

Senator Jerry McNerney (SD 5)

THIS BILL

This bill reauthorizes California's Farmer to Food Bank Tax Credit, extending a successful program that provides farmers, growers, and food producers with a state tax credit when they donate excess, safe-to-eat food to California food banks. Specifically, the bill extends the existing 15 percent tax credit for qualified food donations through 2032, helping ensure that surplus agricultural products are not wasted and instead help feed Californians in need.

SB 881 also extends the Emergency Food for Families Voluntary Tax Contribution Fund, ensuring Californians can continue to voluntarily contribute to food banks through their tax returns. Together, these provisions strengthen California's food safety net at a time when many Californians are struggling to put food on the table.

ISSUE

Hunger remains a persistent and growing problem across California. Today, more than [one in five California households – and a quarter of households with children – experience food insecurity](#). Rising grocery prices and stagnant wages have made it even harder for families to afford basic nutrition.

Federal actions are expected to further exacerbate hunger issues. While food costs continue to climb, recent federal actions are projected to cut CalFresh benefits for nearly [800,000 California households](#).

As a result, food banks in California are facing increasing demand from struggling families. Food banks are a critical lifeline for families experiencing food insecurity. Across the state, food banks serve as trusted community hubs that distribute fresh fruits and vegetables, protein, dairy, and other staples to millions of Californians each year.

Meanwhile, California is the nation's leading agricultural producer, growing nearly half of all

vegetables and more than three-quarters of the country's fruits and nuts. Tariffs and dynamic market conditions mean that sometimes these farmers have excess crops which they cannot sell into the regular market.

The California Farmer to Food Bank Tax Credit provides a win-win for food producers and hungry Californians, allowing producers to be paid through a modest tax incentive for donating excess food to food banks. This program has been in place since 2011 and in that time farmers have donated over \$81 million worth of food to food banks and nearly 4000 donations have been claimed.

Additionally, the Emergency Food for Families Fund provides a tax checkoff box on all Californians' tax returns which allows them to voluntarily donate all or part of their tax reimbursements to support food banks.

Both the California Farmer to Food Bank Tax Credit and the Emergency Food for Families Fund are scheduled to expire by 2027, unless extended by the legislature. Without these vital programs, nutritious food will go to waste just as families and food banks need it most.

SOLUTION

This bill extends the Farmer to Food Bank Tax Credit through 2032 and the Emergency Food for Families Voluntary Tax Contribution Fund through 2037.

SUPPORT

California Association of Food Banks (Sponsor)
Californian's Against Waste (Co-Sponsor)

CONTACT

Aaron Gilbert-O'Neil
Aaron.Gilbert-O'Neil@sen.ca.gov
916-651-4005



SB 936: Nitrous Oxide

SUMMARY

This bill would prohibit the public retail sale of nitrous oxide (laughing gas or N₂O) tanks, with limited exemptions for medical, dental, culinary, and automotive applications.

Nitrous oxide tanks are defined as any size canister or tank larger than the standard 8-gram whipped cream charger.

BACKGROUND

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is increasingly popular as an illegal recreational drug in California. Better known as “Whippets,” these products are commonly used as recreational party inhalants and present serious public health, safety and waste management challenges.

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is increasingly popular as an illegal recreational drug in California. Better known as “Whippets,” these products are commonly used as recreational party inhalants and present serious public health, safety and waste management challenges.

In 2025, the Food and Drug Administration issued a consumer warning that N₂O has [several negative short-term health impacts](#), including dizziness, impaired brain function, possible asphyxia or death, as well as long-term complications, such as neurological and organ damage. Drug users in recovery have compared the addictiveness of nitrous oxide to that of [crack cocaine](#).

Nitrous oxide has a range of legitimate applications, including culinary use (e.g., whipped cream), medical use (e.g., anesthesia), and automotive engineering and manufacturing (e.g., engine propellant), which has historically contributed to its broad availability in the retail market. However, most legitimate large-scale users obtain nitrous oxide through authorized, licensed distributors rather than retail outlets.

PROBLEM

Under current law, it is illegal to sell N₂O to minors, regardless of size. However, large tanks labelled for “culinary use” are often marketed towards children with flavors like cherry, bomb pop, vanilla, etc. Additionally, retailers have gone further with names like “Baking Bad” and similar slogans that intentionally blur the line between legitimate culinary use and recreational inhalation.

As a result, the retail sale of nitrous oxide has been banned in the California counties of [Orange](#), [San Mateo](#), [Humboldt](#), and [Santa Cruz](#). In addition, it has been banned in the cities of [Santa Ana](#), [Costa Mesa](#), and [Newport Beach](#), as well as the state of [Louisiana](#) and [Nebraska](#).

Nitrous oxide cylinders also present a growing waste management problem for local agencies. While these cylinders typically cost consumers \$30-\$50 to purchase online, they regularly cost local governments \$50-\$75 each to dispose. Some Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facilities have reported residents

dropping off several large cylinders at a time. This cost burden has been unfairly falling on haulers and counties, which in turn pass the cost to consumers.

SOLUTION

SB 936 would prohibit the public sale of nitrous oxide canisters larger than 8 grams, with exceptions for legitimate usage.

SUPPORT

Rural Counties Representatives of
California (Co-Sponsor)

National Stewardship Action Council
(Co-Sponsor)

County of Orange (Co-Sponsor)

San Diego County District Attorney,
Summer Stephan (Co-Sponsor)

STAFF CONTACT

Annika Olsen | Capitol Fellow
Office of Senator Catherine Blakespear
Annika.Olsen@sen.ca.gov | 916-651-4038



SENATOR CATHERINE BLAKESPEAR SENATE DISTRICT 38



SB 955: Bottle Collection Update

SUMMARY

SB 955 would make changes to California's bottle recycling program to ensure all major stores selling beverage containers are participating in the program, increase the number of collection sites for consumers to use and ensure there is enough capacity in communities to accept 100% of the recyclable containers sold in those areas.

BACKGROUND

In 1986, the California Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act ([AB 2020](#)) established California's recycling program, setting a 80% recycling rate goal for aluminum, glass, plastic, and bimetal beverage containers. It also introduced the California Redemption Value (CRV), which requires consumers to pay a deposit, typically around 25 cents, that is refunded to consumers upon return of containers. It also defined "supermarkets" as stores with a bakery and/or deli with an annual sale of \$2M or more and placed responsibility for in-store redemption or nearby collection options on those supermarkets.

In 2021, [SB 1013](#) (Atkins) modernized the program by allowing retailers to meet their obligations through dealer cooperatives or convenience zones, rather than only in-store recycling. [Dealer cooperatives](#) operate under CalRecycle-approved stewardship plans that outline how member dealers will collectively offer redemption

opportunities, such as through staffed collection sites, mobile pickup and bag drop programs, or other means. Dealer Cooperatives allow dealers to share the responsibilities and costs of compliance while increasing consumer access to CRV redemption in areas lacking certified recycling centers.

[Convenience zones](#) are designated areas, usually within 1 mile of a supermarket, where redemption options must be made available. One popular way is by using reverse vending machines, which accept empty CRV-eligible beverage containers, verify them by material and barcode, and automatically refund the consumer's deposit while storing the containers for later collection and recycling.

PROBLEM

The statutory definition of a "[supermarket](#)" has not been updated since the 1980s, and because it requires the presence of a bakery and/or deli, many large grocery retailers are not considered supermarkets and are therefore exempt from participating in dealer cooperatives or convenience zones. This has created recycling "dead zones," where consumers have few or no options to turn in containers and collect CRV funds. Under the [current system](#), the average redemption rate in 2024 was 60%.

Under current law, a single reverse vending machine can meet the requirement for "serving" a convenience zone, but a single machine is often

insufficient. A vending machine's capacity is limited, with holding capacities ranging from a [few hundred to several thousand](#) containers per unit depending on model, and once full, they can't be used by consumers.

SOLUTION

SB 955 would change state recycling law to restore the effectiveness of California's recycling system in two ways.

First, it would update the definition of "supermarket" by removing the bakery/deli requirement and increasing the annual sales threshold from \$2 million to \$5 million to account for inflation. This ensures large grocery retailers are properly included in the recycling framework and closes existing participation gaps.

Second, it would strengthen the definition of "collection service" by requiring that convenience zones demonstrate the capacity to collect 100% of recyclable beverage containers sold within that zone. Retailers and cooperatives would retain flexibility in how they meet this requirement would have to provide the capacity to fully serve consumers and refund CRV deposits. This can include using reverse vending machines, drop-off sites, curbside programs, or any alternative or combination to meet a zone's need.

SUPPORT

Circular CRV (Sponsor)

STAFF CONTACT

Annika Olsen | Senate Fellow
Office of Senator Catherine Blakespear
Annika.Olsen@sen.ca.gov | 916-651-4038

SB 1180 –Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund

SENATOR BEN ALLEN

Fact Sheet

SUMMARY

SB 1180 establishes detailed spending requirements and guidelines for the California Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund.

BACKGROUND

Single-use packaging and food service ware generate non-recyclable and non-compostable waste with significant impacts on public health and the natural environment. In 2024 alone, California discarded over 8 million tons of covered material, of which 3 million tons were plastic. Plastic pollution persists in the environment for decades or longer, contaminating waterways, soils, and marine ecosystems, and causing widespread harm to marine life and wildlife. Microplastics are now widely detected in air, drinking water, and food, and have been identified in human blood and tissues, with emerging research linking exposure to inflammation, cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, and reproductive and developmental harms.

To address this issue, SB 54 (Allen, 2022) established a comprehensive regulatory framework requiring producers of covered materials to reduce covered plastic material and ensure that covered materials offered for sale in California are recyclable or compostable by January 1, 2032. The law required producers of covered materials to either join a Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO) or independently comply with funding and implementing a plan to collect and manage the material according to the statute's requirements.

In addition to the budget allocated by the PRO plans, SB 54 created the California Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund (PPMF) to address environmental and public health impacts of plastic pollution. The fund consists of at least \$5 billion over the next 10 years, funded by environmental mitigation surcharges, interest, penalties, and specified charges on the PRO. The statute established that 60% of the fund must be expended to monitor and reduce the historical and current environmental justice and public health impacts of plastics, while 40% must be expended to monitor and reduce the environmental impacts of plastics on terrestrial, aquatic, and marine life and human health.

In its current form, the statute establishes broad parameters and goals for the PPMF but requires additional operational specificity for successful implementation.

SOLUTION

SB 1180 provides the detailed framework necessary to effectively administer the Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund. The bill:

- Requires each expenditure from the fund to achieve specific purposes, including improving public or environmental health and engaging relevant communities in project planning, development, and implementation.
- Mandates that implementing agencies provide technical assistance, use standardized simplified grant applications, initiate projects in a timely manner, and reimburse grantees' indirect costs.
- Expands the definition of eligible fund recipients beyond those listed in SB 54.
- Establishes reporting and transparency measures, requiring the Secretary for Environmental Protection to publish annually a comprehensive document listing all program and project expenditures.

CONTACT

Emily Miaou
Office of Senator Ben Allen
(916) 651-4024
Emily.Miaou@sen.ca.gov





CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR

Jesse Arreguín

REPRESENTING SENATE DISTRICT 07

SB 1218 – Delinquent Illegal Dumping Citations

SUMMARY

Senate Bill 1218 establishes an accountability mechanism for illegal dumping by requiring the California Department of Motor Vehicles to refuse to renew the registration of a vehicle if the registered owner has outstanding illegal dumping fines. This legislation focuses on those businesses and individuals who are deliberately dumping waste in California's streets and public spaces, polluting our waterways and creating public health impacts.

BACKGROUND

Illegal dumping is the unlawful disposal of large waste items such as furniture, appliances, construction debris, and household trash that continues to plague California communities up and down our state.

Illegal dumping is a persistent public health, environmental, and quality-of-life crisis in Oakland and across California. Abandoned waste attracts additional dumping, creates fire hazards, blocks sidewalks, harms local businesses, and disproportionately impacts low-income communities and communities of color. Despite significant investments in cleanup, including expanded weekend staffing, increased bulky pickup services, and aggressive pursuit of grant funding, enforcement remains the critical missing component.

California Penal Code Section 374.3 prohibits the dumping of waste or construction material on public streets, spaces or property, and allows for the imposition of penalties for individuals convicted of dumping.

Currently in Oakland, illegal dumping citations are routinely ignored and collection rates for administrative citations remain unacceptably low. Cities across our State lack a meaningful enforcement tool to ensure compliance, and repeat offenders face little deterrent. Without a predictable consequence, there is a lack

of accountability, and individuals may continue to dump waste and debris impacting the safety of neighborhoods.

PROBLEM

Current efforts at cleanup and prevention remain costly and ineffective without stronger enforcement mechanisms and collection tools. In other words, those that are apathetic enough to toss their waste in someone else's neighborhood are not going to pay a citation.

Between 2021 and 2024, Oakland issued nearly 3,000 illegal dumping citations totaling about \$1.3 million in fines. However, the city has collected only about \$109,000 which is roughly 11% of total fines issued. Last year, Oakland received over 25,000 calls reporting illegal dumping. As a result, Oakland crews removed 15 million pounds of trash.¹ When the city routinely cleans up these hotspot areas, it sends a signal to perpetrators that their actions do not have consequences and that their dumping will be addressed by the city.

SOLUTION

SB 1218 provides a straightforward and proven solution. The bill would amend the California Vehicle Code to require payment or resolution of illegal dumping fines before DMV vehicle registration can be completed. This aligns with an existing enforcement mechanism already in place for unpaid parking citations.

Under the proposed framework, a city issues an administrative citation for illegal dumping linked to a vehicle. If the citation remains unpaid or unresolved, the fine is transmitted through existing DMV registration hold processes. The offending individual's vehicle registration then cannot be completed until the fine is paid or otherwise resolved.

¹ [Illegal dumpers face big fines in Oakland, but they rarely have to pay](#)

By establishing a meaningful consequence for unpaid citations, SB 1218 will deter repeat illegal dumping, improve compliance, and support cleaner and safer neighborhoods.

CONTACT

Jessica Matlock

(916) 651-4007

Jessica.Matlock@sen.ca.gov

SUPPORT

The Honorable Barbara Lee, Mayor, City of Oakland (Sponsor)



CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR
SUZETTE MARTINEZ VALLADARES
REPRESENTING DISTRICT 23

SB 1230 – Illegal Dumping

Summary:

SB 1230 strengthens California's response to illegal dumping by increasing penalties strictly for repeat offenders and designating CalRecycle as the lead statewide resource hub for cities and counties. The goal is to deter chronic dumping, reduce cleanup costs for local governments, and improve coordination and access to enforcement and prevention tools.

This Bill:

1. Strengthens Penalties for Repeat Offenders
Increases fines for second and third illegal dumping violations. The non-commercial repeat offender fines and commercial minimum thresholds have not been substantively updated since AB 1802 (2004). While AB 2374 (2022) raised maximum fines for large businesses, it did not address minimums or other categories of repeat offenders, leaving significant deterrence gaps.
2. Establishes CalRecycle as the Lead State Resource
Designates CalRecycle as the primary point of contact for cities and counties addressing illegal dumping.
Improves coordination and access to technical assistance statewide.
3. Creates a Centralized Resource Hub

Requires CalRecycle to maintain a public website with:

Enforcement tools
Grant and funding opportunities
Best practices for prevention, cleanup, and community education

Problem:

Illegal dumping is the unauthorized disposal of waste on public or private property. Illegal dumping poses serious environmental, public health, and fiscal challenges across California.

Local governments spend tens of millions of dollars annually on cleanup, diverting resources from essential services. Illegally dumped materials contaminate soil and groundwater, attract vermin, and increase wildfire and disease risks.

While the cost for households and businesses to legally dispose of waste, including landfill tipping fees and municipal waste disposal charges, has steadily increased due to operational costs and inflation in solid waste services, the non-commercial repeat offender fines and commercial minimum thresholds under Penal Code Section 374.3 have not been substantively updated since AB 1802 in 2004. Although AB 2374 in 2022 raised maximum fines for businesses employing more than 10 employees, it did not address the fine minimums or the non-commercial infraction ranges, leaving those penalty floors unchanged for over two decades and often well below the true

cost of cleanup and environmental harm. This gap opens the door for repeat offenders to continue dumping with limited deterrence.

Cities and counties lack a centralized state resource for enforcement guidance, best practices, and funding information. Research consistently shows illegal dumping disproportionately impacts rural, desert, and lower-income communities, raising environmental justice concerns along with these smaller local governments to try and figure out what to do without clear proper guidance or experience in this area before.

Background:

Illegal dumping remains a persistent issue across California, particularly in rural, desert, and unincorporated areas where enforcement resources are limited. Local governments often bear significant cleanup costs, while the non-commercial repeat offender fines and commercial minimum thresholds under Penal Code Section 374.3 have not been substantively updated since AB 1802 in 2004. Although AB 2374 raised maximum fines for larger businesses in 2022, the fine minimums and non-commercial infraction ranges were not addressed and remain unchanged after more than two decades. Cities and counties also lack a centralized state resource to guide best practices, funding opportunities, and enforcement strategies.

In Senate District 23, particularly across the high-desert communities of the Antelope Valley and surrounding unincorporated areas, illegal dumping has escalated into a significant environmental and public health challenge. Residents have documented hundreds of unauthorized dump sites with construction debris, household waste, plastics, and other materials scattered across remote land and dry washes, degrading natural habitats and posing fire and contamination risks. Local landowners and community groups have raised concerns that these sites, some stretching acres in size, reflect persistent dumping activity that strains limited local enforcement resources and undermines efforts to protect the desert

landscape that defines much of the district's character and economy.

Illegal dumping is not just a quality-of-life issue, it is a public health and fiscal liability. Stronger penalties deter chronic violators, while centralized state support ensures local governments have the tools needed to enforce the law efficiently and equitably.

This bill delivers a practical, cost-effective solution that supports local agencies, protects communities, and promotes cleaner, safer neighborhoods across California.

Staff Contact Information:

McKenna Harrop-St. John
(916) 651-4023

McKenna.Harrop-St.John@sen.ca.gov

Supporters:

RCRC

LTF Director's Roster - March 2026

Name	Mar-26	Organization
Christina Hanson	X	Placer County/Western Placer WMA
Deepti Jain (S)		City of Sunnyvale
Doug Kobold	X	California Product Stewardship Council
Joe La Mariana	X	South Bayside Waste Management Authority
Michelle White,	X	City of Roseville,
Larry Sweetser		Sweetser and Associates/ESJPA

Curtis Larkin (C)	X	Fresno County
Dawyne Balch	X	City of Clovis
Mike Schlessinger	X	City of Merced
Tari Heslop	X	City of Santa Maria
Monique Gama	X	City of Merced

Frank Caponi (T)	X	Retired
Jane-Marie Fajardo	X	City of San Diego
Jim Marchese	X	LA Sanitation & Environment
Mike Mohajer		Southern California Waste Mgmt. Forum
Sharon Green (VC)	X	LA County Sanitation Districts

Olivia

X

Dylan

X

GUESTS

Name		Organization
Meilin Tsao	X	Marin County
Corinne	X	Riverside
Josh	X	WM
Robert Sedita	X	OC Waste and Recycling
Phillip Vander Klay	X	LA County Sanitation Districts

X* - Joined or left call while meeting was in process.

X** Guest