

**AB 939 LOCAL TASK FORCE REGULAR MEETING**  
**Thursday, June 08, 2023**  
**1:30 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.**  
**Sonoma County Infrastructure Department**  
**(formerly Transportation and Public Works)**  
**2300 County Center Drive, Suite B-100, Main Conference Room**  
**Santa Rosa, California 95403**  
**Call in Conference Number: 707-565-2283**

<b><u>Absent (In alphabetical order)</u></b>	<b><u>In attendance (In alphabetical order)</u></b>
<p>Alyssa Messer – 3rd District Rep  Arthur Deicke  Aryam Blanco- Sonoma County  Environmental Health  Brandon Hart – TPW – Integrated Waste/  Sonoma  Brian Bauer- Resynergi  Caren McNamara- Conscious Container  Ellen Hathaway- Sierra Club Redwood  Chapter  Emily Harris- Recycology  Hugo Mata- SOS and LatinX Hub  Jennifer Lyle, Sonoma County  Joey Hejnowicz, Zero Waste Coordinator -  City of Santa Rosa  Katie Cushwa- Zero Waste Sonoma  Leslie Lukacs – Zero Waste Sonoma  Leslye Choate- LEA  Michael Anderson- Marketing and Recycling  Historian  Michael LeRusso  Portia Sinnott, Zero Waste USA  Sunny Galbraith – 350 Sonoma County, city of  Sebastopol  Trish Pisenti- Sonoma County</p>	<p>Casey Farber  Catherine Dodd- families advocating for chemical  and toxic safety fact  Casey Fritz- Zero Waste by Sonoma County  Celia Furber- Recology  Dan Nobel- Association of Compost Producers  Francie Finn- cow shades  Greg Carr- 1st district rep  J. Glen Morelli – TPW – Integrated Waste  Kristen Sales- Zero waste  Kyle LaRue- Director of Zero Waste and  Compliance  Lendri Percel-  Liz Bortolotto – Chair  Mark Soiland- City of Cotati Representative  Max Bridges- League of Women Voters  Patti Moore- PRCC  Sloan Pagal- Zero Waste Sonoma  Stephen Zollman- Sebastapol city  Stu Clark – 4th District Rep  Tasha Wright- City of Santa Rosa (Water Dept)  Terry Taylor- town of Windsor  Xinci Tan – Zero Waste Sonoma (by phone)</p>

<p>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions</p>
<p>II. Approval of draft minutes from April 13, 2023 meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion to approve- <i>Mark Soiland</i></li> <li>• Seconded- <i>Max Bridges</i></li> <li>• Motion Passed</li> </ul>
<p>III. Regulatory Barriers Subcommittee update – Stu Clark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Background:</b> initially developed as a sub committee and ad hoc committee to address barriers to meeting zero waste goals.</li> </ul>

- Subcommittee met to review the previous recommendation from the ad hoc committee to address permitting issues with updated data and updated finding and recommendations.
- **Project relevance: why is this important:**
- **statewide**
  - identify barriers and identify the benefits to reducing/eliminating permitting barriers.
  - Assess state level and local level status. The recycling rate is 40% v the 75% target.
  - California needs 26.6 million tons of diversion to meet the AB 341 recycling goal.
  - CalRecycle estimates that we need 27 million tons of organic materials will need to be redirected from landfills in 2025 to meet SB 1383 goals.
    - Of this, 18 million tons of organic waste will need to be processed at compost, AD, or grind facilities.
  - Current projections show only 10 million tons of processing capacity leaving 8 million ton shortfall
  - Overall trends for recycling on slight decline while trash is on slight incline.
  - In order to hit targets, organic waste needs to be drastically reduced.
- **Sonoma county**
  - Diversion rate fell from 76.1% to 67.6%
    - Saw a peak in 2017 and 2018, but this is an outlier
  - Disposal trending down and diversion up in recent years
  - Disposal volume up and down, but overall 34% increase since 2012.
    - Recent years has seen this back to trending downwards.
- Most diversion facilities in county are at or near capacity.
- Significant new/expanded facilities will be needed.
- ***Need 89,000 tons per year of new diversion needed to get back to 75%***
- **Project finding**
  - Lack of public awareness
  - Outdated zoning & general plan definitions/designations/policies for recycling facilities
  - Complexity of permitting process & applicant awareness of the regulations and permitting path
  - Inconsistency between various permitting authorities
  - Lack of comprehensive/integrated plan on how to achieve zero waste in the county
  - CEQA- agency and applicant permitting paralysis over fear of legal challenges.
  - Public opposition regarding siting of facilities.
- **Barriers**
  - Lack of public awareness regarding the need for many more recycling facilities
- **Recommended actions**
  - Implement sustained public educational efforts regarding the need for many more recycling facilities using collaborative public/private partnership via
    - Editorial board presentations
    - Social media
    - Workshops
    - Zero waste newsletters
    - Hauler newsletters
    - Conferences
    - School presentation
    - Educational video
    - Permitting advocacy
- **Barriers**
  - Outdated zoning & general plan definitions/designations/policies for recycling facilities
- **Recommended actions**
  - All cities and the county consider updating their general plans and zoning codes to accommodate state solid waste language and zero waste policy
    - Via as part of the jurisdictions next scheduled update or as a stand alone updated

- Should occur in the near term
- **Barriers**
  - Complexity of permitting process & applicant awareness of the regulations and permitting path
- **Recommended actions**
  - Promotion of existing or development and use of:
    - Comprehensive permit checklist for solid waste & recycling facilities
    - Ombudsman to aid in guiding an applicant through the permitting process
    - Pre application meeting designed for solid waste and recycling facilities
  - Promote a permitting system for solid waste & recycling facilities with a clear path that includes identified milestones and schedule for approval.
- **Barriers**
  - Inconsistency between various permitting authorities
- **Recommended actions**
  - State legislative advocacy
  - Support streamlining the permitting process among multiple agencies involved in solid waste and recycling
    - Land use
    - Solid waste
    - Water
    - air
  - Develop multi-agency tools
    - Joint pre-application meeting
    - Multi-agency permit checklist
    - Multi-agency ombudsman
- **Barriers**
  - Lack of comprehensive/integrated plan on how to achieve zero waste in the county
- **Recommended actions**
  - Update the ColWMP
- **Barriers**
  - CEQA- agency and applicant permitting paralysis over fear of legal challenges.
- **Recommended actions**
  - Consider developing a program EIR for solid waste facilities, possibly in conjunction with the ColWMP
  - Develop CEQA exemptions for small facilities at a local level
- **Barriers**
  - Public opposition regarding siting of facilities.
- **Recommended actions**
  - Early outreach to impacted neighborhoods/communities
  - Zero waste advocacy and support
  - Coordinated public outreach and education activities
- **Project Conclusions**
  - Significantly more recycling facilities needed to achieve goals
  - Seven permitting barriers categories identified many unwarranted impediments exist
  - Actionable solutions recommended to feasibly reduce or eliminate unnecessary barriers
- **Next steps**
  - LTF to:
    - discuss suggested updates,
    - adopt finding and recommendations
    - Present offer to ZWS & individual jurisdiction
- **Questions/discussion:**
  - Will slides be available?
    - **Yes.**
  - Will the recommendations in the presentation also be taken on by the LTF?

- **There may be some of these items that can be taken on by the LTF and will need to be identified.**
  - **Diversion, recycling, and disposal rates are different measures and is based on the calculation of lbs per person per day and the target for Sonoma County has remained unchanged.**
  - How can we push this forward and what is a tangible action step?
    - **We present this to the zero waste board and there would be a strategic planning meeting and address the recommendations/ needs identified on this list.**
    - **Next step is to take the findings and a motion for the LTF to adopt the recommendations on the relevant slides to make the offer to make the presentation to the zero waste Sonoma Board.**
  - **Motion**
    - Adopt project findings as presented?
      - Liz Bortolotto
- Seconded- Mark Soiland
- All in favor- motion passed
- Motion to present findings to interested bodies
  - Seconded- Stu Clark
  - All in favor- motion passed
- *There is an upcoming Zero Waste meeting where this can be presented*

IV. Infrastructure Committee update – Terry Taylor, Dan Noble

- **Postponed for the upcoming meeting**

V. Update on Zero Waste Week – Sloane Pagal

- **Updates**
  - **This is the second year**
  - Free and public events
  - This upcoming event will be larger in scale
  - Will be offering repairs and other low cost/ free events to spread awareness and encourage community involvement
  - Tie in with the symposium
    - The ticket sales from the event is covering the marketing for the zero waste event.
- **Questions/ comments:**
  - The part that takes time with the fix it clinic is finding who has these skills in the community, create the network, extend the network and move the location around on varying scales.

VI. NDFE Approval for Windsor Transfer Facility – Sloane Pagal

- **Posted agenda item.**

VII. Discussion of artificial turf moratorium – Liz Bortolotto

- **Background:**
  - Last meeting this concern was presented to the LTF (*see minutes from April 2023 meeting*)
  - Options today: to have a discussion, learn more about the issue, and identify whether to back the moratorium.
- **Questions to consider:**
  - Where are we at in the county for how much plastic turf is being proposed, the kind of turf available, and what other grass alternatives are being moved through state legislation?
- **Discussion:**
  - The issue is not a ban, but a pause and a consideration a plethora of complex issues related to synthetic turf. The request for a moratorium (artificial cannot be banned in CA) in order to have a conversation regarding this issue.
    - How intelligent would it be to set up evaluation criteria and purchasing guidelines that we apply to decision making and doing our due diligence when making decisions that impact tax payer funds and environmental impact.

- Two things to consider-
  - There is a total life cycle for raw materials and getting it across from where it needs to be from overseas. When looking at it's total impact (manufacturing, shipping, and the forever chemicals), there is a larger impact and considerations.
- Question- are there multiple kinds of turf products that can be purchased?
  - There is no ideal model, but the "best" kind so far is a type of plug that inserts a nontoxic plastic that is inserted into the soil and does not have the same toxicity as the entire plastic.
- Action steps for todays meeting?
  - More information is needed.
    - Do we need to have a presentation on this during our upcoming meeting or a subcommittee to explore these options further.
    - The regional climate protection authority wrote up a draft of the moratorium that is being addressed city by city, and then will go up to the board of supervisors.
  - Options
    - Organic grass that can be managed/ focused on soil health
    - Hybrid model (used in Europe since the 90s) to include the plugs & recyclable plastic that is underneath the seed (no PFAS)
      - No infill, the water system goes underneath and is caught/ recycled through
    - Assess the newer technologies.
      - There are PFAS free turfs, but they are not consistently tested and may be too costly.
- One of the bills in Sacramento is being passed to address water usage with these kinds of turfs.
- Question- how does the proposed moritorium effect schools/parks that are already in the process of laying down turf?
  - **In Petaluma, the Parks Department is coming out to push back on carpet plastic grass field and further conversations are needed/taking place.**
- Question- would this just be a moritorium on public land or private as well?
  - **Public.**
- Comment- this may be a slippery slope, there are a lot of products that has PFAS and when we look to do a moritorium on any products, this could be applied to numerous products that we use today. If we are asking on a moritorium, what precedent can be set and would it be more helpful to focus on providing the guidelines for more sustainable solutions.
  - Response- **the issue is that the cost is higher than the benefit, but a first step may be a moritorium for something that is going to create a larger problem in the long run. Perhaps the moritorium a certain amount of time (perhaps some places can look at how to actually recycle). We have not figured out how to figure this out.**

**Action step:**

Another meeting is needed to focus on the waste stream issues and the more immediate concerns.

There is no timeline for moritorium to be presented to the board.

Motion to form subcommittee to discuss the moritorium with a focus on the waste stream

Seconded- Dan

All in favor- motion passed.

**VIII. Public Comments\***

- First solar panel collection event with the conservation corp- appointment is required.

VIX. Member Announcements

X. Next Regular Meeting Date/Suggestions for Agenda Items -  
August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023

XI. Adjournment

- Motion passed to adjourn.

\*PUBLIC COMMENTS: Members of the public desiring to speak on items that are within the jurisdiction of the Local Task Force shall have an opportunity during each regular meeting of the Local Task Force. When recognized by the Chair, each person should give his/her name and address and limit comments to 3 minutes, with the discretion of the Chair to modify that time limit.