

**SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**  
**Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair**  
**2025-2026 Regular Session**

SB 561 (Blakespear)  
Version: April 7, 2025  
Hearing Date: April 22, 2025  
Fiscal: Yes  
Urgency: No  
AM

**SUBJECT**

Hazardous waste: Emergency Distress Flare Safe Disposal Act

**DIGEST**

This bill requires producers of marine flares to establish an extended producer responsibility (EPR) program for the collection, transportation, recycling, and safe and proper management of marine flares in California.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Federal regulations require vessels longer than 16 feet operating on coastal waters to carry visual distress signals that are specifically approved for day use or night use, or for use during both day and night. (33 C.F.R. §§ 175.110 & 175.130.) Carrying three pyrotechnic flares that are not expired per the manufacturer meet the regulation requirements. (33 C.F.R. § 175.103.) The average shelf life of pyrotechnic flares is between 36 and 42 months as the chemicals in them can break down over time. Failure to meet these federal requirements can result in a fine and pose safety hazards for boaters. Once pyrotechnic flares can no longer be used as intended, they are classified as hazardous waste by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the federal Environmental Protection Agency due to the fact they are toxic, reactive, and ignitable.<sup>1</sup> This bill seeks to enact an EPR program for the safe and proper management of marine flares in California within DTSC. The bill is sponsored by the National Stewardship Action Council and Zero Waste Sonoma. The bill is supported by numerous environmental organizations and associations representing California retailers, waste haulers, and environmental health administrators. The bill is opposed by Orion Safety Products, the leading manufacturer and distributor of marine flares. The bill passed the Senate Environmental Quality Committee on a vote of 8 to 0.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Disposal of Expired Marine Flares in California*, Cal. State Parks, Div. of Boating and Waterways, [https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=31166#:~:text=These%20flares%20must%20be%20in,can%20break%20down%20over%20time.](https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=31166#:~:text=These%20flares%20must%20be%20in,can%20break%20down%20over%20time.)

### **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW**

Existing federal law requires any boat operating in coastal waters or bodies of water directly connected to coastal waters to be equipped with distress signals, and specifies that three in-service flares approved for daytime and nighttime use must be carried and that each signal is in serviceable condition and has not expired. (33 C.F.R. § 175.110 & 175.125.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Regulates the disposal, management, and recycling of solid waste under the California Integrated Waste Management Act (IWMA) of 1989, and establishes EPR programs for various products, including, carpet, mattresses, batteries, pharmaceutical and sharps waste, and single-use plastic and packaging. (Pub. Res. Code § 40000 et. seq.)
- 2) Regulates the management and handling of hazardous waste and hazardous materials by the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC).
  - a) Defines "household hazardous waste (HHW)" as hazardous waste generated incidental to owning or maintaining a place of residence, but does not include waste generated in the course of operating a business at a residence. (Health & Saf. Code § 25218.1(e))
  - b) Establishes procedures for managing hazardous waste as universal waste. (Cal. Code of Reg. Tit. 22, Div. 4.5, Ch. 23)
- 3) Requires counties and cities to ensure HHW is collected and requires the state to provide an expedited and streamlined regulatory structure directing locals how to properly dispose of HHW. (Health & Saf. Code § 25218 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the Emergency Distress Flare Safe Disposal Act (Act), which creates an EPR program for a covered product (marine flare), and states that the purpose of this Act is to provide for the safe and proper management of pyrotechnic marine flares, which pose significant threats to health and safety and may cause significant and costly damage to the environment when managed improperly.
- 2) Defines "covered product" to mean a product that meets all of the following:
  - a) Is a pyrotechnic device that produces a brilliant light or a plume of colorful smoke as a visual distress signal, including, but not limited to, on marine vessels to attract attention and pinpoint a boater's location in an emergency;
  - b) At the time of disposal, meets the criteria for household hazardous waste; and
  - c) Is either or both of the following:

- i. a flare used on a vessel that is manufactured or operated primarily for pleasure, or leased, rented or chartered to another for the pleasure of that person, excluding passenger vessels, small passenger vessels, and vessels used for competition;
    - ii. a flare used for signaling location in a large unmodified or slightly modified area retaining its natural character and influence, without permanent or significant human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural condition.
  - d) A marine flare that contains perchlorate.
- 3) Requires all manufacturers to register with a single manufacturer responsibility organization (MRO) to develop and implement a single manufacturer responsibility plan for the collection, transportation, and the safe and proper management of covered products on behalf of all producers.
- a) DTSC must review the plan for compliance and approve, disprove, or conditionally approve the plan.
  - b) Requires the MRO to retain specified documents, annually audit its accounting books, and make documents available to DTSC for review, as specified. Requires all reports and records provided to DTSC pursuant to the Act to be provided under the penalty of perjury.
  - c) Requires a manufacturer or MRO to pay DTSC all actual and reasonable regulatory costs to implement and enforce this article, including the full personnel costs and reimbursement of the costs to DTSC to develop and adopt the regulations described in 4), below.
- 4) Requires DTSC to adopt regulations to implement the Act on or before January 1, 2027.
- 5) Requires, except as specified, a manufacturer that sells, offers for sale, imports, or distributes a covered product in the state to submit to DTSC a manufacturer plan within one year of the adoption of the regulations described in 4), above.
- 6) Requires an approved manufacturer responsibility plan to be a public record published on DTSC's website. Specifies that financial, production, or sales data reported by the manufacturer to DTSC is not open to public inspection.
- 7) Requires a manufacturer or MRO to submit an annual report to DTSC, under penalty of perjury, and requires DTSC to post online a list of manufacturers that are in compliance with the program requirements.
- 8) Prohibits a manufacturer, retailer, dealer, importer or distributor from selling, distributing, or importing covered products into the state that contains perchlorate.

- 9) Authorizes DTSC to take various enforcement actions and impose administrative and civil penalties pursuant to authority granted to DTSC under existing provisions of law related to hazardous waste control.
- 10) Provides that a manufacturer or MRO is not subject to penalties for noncompliance with the Act before July 1, 2029.

### COMMENTS

#### 1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

Expired marine flares sound harmless but can be quite dangerous and damaging to the environment. Properly disposing of expired flares is extremely difficult. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency classifies expired marine flares as hazardous waste that cannot be disposed of in waterways or the trash. They are explosive devices that require special handling and transportation and contain toxic metals and other pollutants that can contaminate water and impair thyroid function.

Only one county in California has the permits necessary to accept expired flares and there are no facilities in the state that can safely and legally dispose of them. Boaters in coastal communities across California are frustrated by the lack of disposal options for flares, with some stockpiling them or illegally disposing of them in trash or waterways. Expired flares have also been abandoned in front of fire and police stations, placing the responsibility (and cost) for disposal on local governments that are not permitted to accept them.

For example, Zero Waste Sonoma does not have the equipment necessary to safely and legally accept pyrotechnic flares. However, flares have been found hidden at the bottom of a box with acceptable HHW and illegally dumped at the fire station. In less than one year, Zero Waste Sonoma had about 60 flares to dispose of. They partnered with neighboring jurisdictions to hire a contractor to transport the flares across the country to a permitted facility. Because a relatively small number of flares were taken for disposal, the high fixed transportation costs were \$185 per flare, a cost that was ultimately passed on to taxpayers, many of whom do not have a boat.

SB 561 will shift responsibility for disposing of expired flares from local governments to those who manufacture and use them. SB 561 would require manufacturers to create a plan for the collection, transportation, and safe and proper disposal of expired flares. The plan requires a free and convenient collection program with temporary collection sites in coastal counties. A strategic collection program would significantly reduce the disposal costs per flare. In fact, a 2019 collection event saw

costs of less than \$13 per flare, roughly the price of a new flare. Therefore, the cost increase to pay for disposal is not significant and could easily be borne by consumers.

## 2. This bill establishes the Emergency Distress Flare Safe Disposal Act

This bill intends to address the difficulty and environmental health and safety hazards of disposing of marine flares in California. This bill is similar to SB 1066 (Blake spear, 2024), which passed this Committee on a vote of 11 to 0 but was vetoed by Governor Newsom. In the Governor's veto message, he wrote:

While I support the author's goal to provide boaters with a safe and responsible method to dispose of their marine flares, this bill lacks a comprehensive program scope to effectively achieve the goal of protecting human and environmental health and would not cover implementation costs incurred by DTSC. Additionally, this bill falls short in providing DTSC with the appropriate enforcement authority to effectively ensure compliance.

The author has attempted to address the Governor's veto message by, among other things:

- requiring an MRO to establish a method for fully funding its manufacturer responsibility plan;
- requiring an MRO to pay DTSC all actual and reasonable regulatory costs to implement and enforce the Act, including, but not limited to, full personnel costs and reimbursement of the costs to DTSC to develop and adopt the regulations; and
- providing authority to DTSC to audit an MRO and authority to impose administrative and civil penalties.

### *a) Extended producer responsibility (EPR) programs*

EPR "is an environmental policy approach that holds producers responsible for product management through the product's lifecycle. EPR supports recycling and materials management goals that contribute to a circular economy and can also encourage product design changes that minimize environmental impacts."<sup>2</sup> California currently has several statewide EPR programs overseen by CalRecycle, including for paint, carpet, mattresses, textiles, pharmaceutical and sharps waste, plastic packaging, and single-use plastic items.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)*, CalRecycle, <https://calrecycle.ca.gov/epr/>.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

*b) Environmental and safety hazards of disposing of marine flares*

According to the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California State Parks Department (Division), “a marine flare is a type of pyrotechnic device that produces a brilliant light or a plume of colorful smoke as a visual distress signal to attract attention in an emergency, and to help pinpoint the boater’s exact location. Handheld flares (which operate on the ground) and rocket flares (which are fired into the air) are the two most-used visual distress signals because they can be used for daytime or nighttime.”<sup>4</sup>

The Senate Environmental Quality Committee’s analysis of this bill explores the problem of disposing of marine flares, noting that DTSC classifies pyrotechnic flares that will no longer be used as hazardous waste because they are toxic, reactive, and ignitable as defined by state and federal hazardous waste regulations.<sup>5</sup>

The analysis also states that according to the Division:

- common ingredients in various types of pyrotechnic flares include: strontium nitrate and strontium peroxide (listed on the EPA’s Toxic Substance Control Act Inventory List); potassium perchlorate and potassium nitrate (known irritants), magnesium, and black powder (a mixture of sulfur, charcoal, and potassium nitrate);
- pyrotechnic flares contain toxic metals and pollutants such as perchlorate, which is recognized as a water and health pollutant that can impact our waterways and can impair thyroid function;
- an estimated 174,000 outdated flares are generated each year by recreational vessels in California;
- expired marine flares must be transported as explosives and disposed of at a hazardous waste facility permitted by the U.S. EPA to manage explosives, and that currently there are no permitted facilities in California that can accept, treat and/or dispose of non-military explosives waste streams;
- it costs approximately \$7 to \$50 per flare to be properly disposed of at an out-of-state permitted facility; however, Zero Waste Sonoma states it cost an estimated \$185 to properly dispose of one unwanted marine flare in 2023, when partnering with nearby jurisdictions to help share the cost of transportation.<sup>6</sup>

California’s Statewide Commission on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling stated in its 2022 policy recommendations to the Legislature that marine flares are “a 100-year-old technology, have polluted water, and are a chronic problem for boaters to

---

<sup>4</sup> *Disposal of Expired Marine Flares in California*, Div. Of Boating and Waterways, Cal. Parks Dept., [https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=31166](https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=31166).

<sup>5</sup> Sen. Environmental Quality Comm. analysis of SB 561 (2025-26 reg. sess.) as introduced Feb. 20, 2025 at p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

dispose of safely and expire every 3 years and have no management plan. Now that less hazardous and more reliable electronic signals are an option, these flares should be banned from sale.”<sup>7</sup>

The Senate Environmental Quality Committee analysis concluded that:

A lack of convenient disposal options has created a significant end-of-life management problem for expired marine flares. Most HHW facilities are unable to accept flares due both to not having the necessary permits or equipment to safely handle explosives and the significant costs to properly manage them. SB 651 establishes an EPR program for expired or unwanted marine flares operated by DTSC. This program requires manufacturers of marine flares to fund and operate a convenient collection system, with appropriate oversight from DTSC, to manage expired or unwanted flares. This could help ensure that these flares are disposed of in a manner that is protective of the environment and public health, while shifting the costs of managing this product from cities and counties to the producers/users.<sup>8</sup>

c) *The Dormant Commerce Clause*

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution grants the United States Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce.<sup>9</sup> The converse proposition—that states may not usurp Congress’s express power to regulate interstate commerce—is known as the Dormant Commerce Clause—“the [Commerce] Clause also contains a further, negative command, one effectively forbidding the enforcement of certain state economic regulations even when Congress has failed to legislate on the subject.”<sup>10</sup> The United States Supreme Court recently affirmed that the dormant Commerce Clause generally does not prohibit a state from regulating commerce within its borders, even if the prohibition affects out-of-state sellers, unless the prohibition acts to discriminate against out-of-state interests for the benefit of in-state commerce.<sup>11</sup> The Court has held that “[s]tate laws that ‘regulat[e] even-handedly [across all in-state and out-of-state businesses] to effectuate a legitimate local public interest...will be upheld unless the burden imposed upon such commerce is clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits.’ ”<sup>12</sup> The bill does not favor in-state businesses over out-of-state businesses at it applies equally to all manufacturers, distributors, and importers, regardless to whether they are in-state or out-of-state.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Policy Recommendations Report 4*, Cal. Statewide Comm. on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling, (Jun. 30, 2022) at p. 46, <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Docs/Web/121911>.

<sup>8</sup> Sen. Environmental Quality Comm. analysis of SB 561 (2025-26 reg. sess.) as introduced Feb. 20, 2025 at p. 9.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3.

<sup>10</sup> *National Pork Producers Council v. Ross* (2023) 143 S.Ct. 1142, 1152 (internal quotation marks and alterations omitted).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at pp. 1152-1153.

<sup>12</sup> *South Dakota v. Wayfair, Inc.* (2018) 138 S.Ct. 2080, 2091.

A statute may also violate the dormant Commerce Clause, even if it "regulates even handedly to effectuate a legitimate local public interest, and its effects on interstate commerce are only incidental" and the burden imposed on commerce "is clearly excessive in relation to the putative local benefits" or substantially burdens interstate commerce.<sup>13</sup> (*Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.* (1970) 397 U.S. 137, 142.) As this bill's provisions are intended to address the serious environmental and health concerns posed by covered products, this bill would likely not be found to substantially burden interstate commerce in violation of the Dormant Commerce Clause.

*d) Access to public records*

Access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state. (Gov. Cod § 7921.000.) In 2004, the right of public access was enshrined in the California Constitution with the passage of Proposition 59 (Nov. 3, 2004, statewide general election),<sup>14</sup> which amended the California Constitution to specifically protect the right of the public to access and obtain government records: "The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and therefore . . . the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny." (Cal. Const., art. I, sec. 3 (b)(1).) In 2014, voters approved Proposition 42 (Jun. 3, 2014, statewide direct primary election)<sup>15</sup> to further increase public access to government records by requiring local agencies to comply with the CPRA and the Ralph M. Brown Act<sup>16</sup>, and with any subsequent statutory enactment amending either act, as provided. (Cal. Const., art. I, sec. 3 (b)(7).)

Under the CPRA, public records are open to inspection by the public at all times during the office hours of the agency, unless they are exempt from disclosure. (Gov. Cod § 7922.525.) A public record is defined as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business that is prepared, owned, used, or retained by any public agency regardless of physical form or characteristics. (Gov. Code § 7920.530.) There are several general categories of documents or information that are permissively exempt from disclosure under the CPRA essentially due to the character of the information. The exempt information can be withheld by the public agency with custody of the information, but it also may be disclosed if it is shown that the public's interest in disclosure outweighs the public's interest in non-disclosure of the information. (*CBS, Inc. v. Block* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, at 652.). Additionally, some records

---

<sup>13</sup> *Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.* (1970) 397 U.S. 137, 142; *National Pork Producers Council* supra at fn. 6 at pp. 1162-1163.

<sup>14</sup> Prop. 59 was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature. (SCA 1 (Burton, Ch. 1, Stats. 2004))

<sup>15</sup> Prop. 42 was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature. (SCA 3 (Leno, Ch. 123, Stats. 2013))

<sup>16</sup> The Ralph M. Brown Act is the open meetings laws that applies to local agencies. (Gov. Code §§ 59450 et. seq.)

are prohibited from disclosure or are specifically stated to not be public records. (*see* Gov. Code § 7924.110(a).)

This bill expressly provides that an approved plan is a public record under the CPRA; however, it exempts from disclosure financial, production, or sales data reported to DTSC by the program operator. The bill authorizes DTSC to release this data in summary form only, so it cannot be attributable to a specific entity. Under the bill, an MRO is required to be audited annually by an independent public accountant, and DTSC is required to review the MRO's annual audit and conduct its own audit. The MRO may request that DTSC withhold disclosure of confidential proprietary information to the extent allowed under Section 1040 of the Evidence Code and the CPRA. Section 1040 of the Evidence Code provides that a public entity has a privilege to refuse to disclose official information if: 1) disclosure is forbidden by a federal or state statute or the disclosure, or 2) disclosure is against the public interest because there is a necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information that outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice. "Official information" is defined as information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of their duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made.

As these provisions imposes a limitation on the public's right of access to public records, the bill provides the following justification for the limitation: "In order to ensure the effective hazardous waste management of, and viable markets for, marine flares, it is necessary to protect the proprietary information of producers, retailers, wholesalers, and solid waste enterprises by keeping confidential the financial, production, and sales data reported by those entities [...]"

e) Penalties

The bill grants DTSC the authority to enforce the Act and impose administrative and civil penalties pursuant to provisions in Article 8 (commencing with Section 25180) of the Health and Safety Code relating to hazardous waste enforcement. These provisions grant DTSC the authority to seek permanent or temporary injunctions, restraining orders, or other orders. (Health & Saf. Code § 25181.) Any civil action brought at the request of DTSC is to be brought by a city attorney, the county counsel, the district attorney, or the Attorney General in the name of the people of the State of California. (Health & Saf. Code § 25182.) These provisions provide various procedures related to hearings. (*see e.g.* Health & Saf. Code § 25187.)

3. Statements in support

The National Stewardship Action Council and Zero Waste Sonoma, the sponsors of the bill, write in support, stating:

A almost complete lack of disposal options has created a significant EOL management problem, with all but one household hazardous waste (HHW) facilities unable to accept them. Managing HHW is one of the core responsibilities of Zero Waste Sonoma, which has one of the most comprehensive HHW programs in the country. Sonoma County is also home to 76 miles of coastline and has a large recreational boater population. Despite these facts, there are no disposal options in Sonoma County for expired marine flares. The HHW programs are not equipped to safely handle explosives. One marine flare can cost \$11 to \$185 to properly manage but can be purchased for approximately \$13 each. Shifting the cost of managing boaters safety equipment to non-boaters does not seem equitable to us.

The sole producer currently selling into California, Orion, threatened to leave the state if Senator Blakespear's first pyrotechnic distress flare Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) bill, SB 1066, was signed into law. SB 1066 was supported by a diverse group of stakeholders and received strong bipartisan support but was vetoed by Governor Gavin Newsom because it lacked a "comprehensive program scope", "would not cover implementation costs incurred by DTSC" (Department of Toxic Substances Control), and did not provide DTSC with "the appropriate enforcement authority to effectively ensure compliance."

Since the veto, we and the author's office have been working with DTSC to reduce costs and ensure SB 561 addresses the concerns expressed by the Newsom Administration.

#### 4. Statements in opposition

Orion Safety Products, the leading manufacturer and distributor of marine flares approved for use as a visual distress signal, writes in opposition to the bill stating:

We continue to struggle with the seemingly ongoing lack of understanding regarding the economics of the proposed EPR for recreational marine flares. As has previously been shared with the author, Orion's net profit from the sale of the covered goods in California is approximately \$90,000. This number has remained relatively consistent for several years. Orion has repeatedly stated that it would devote a portion of this amount to address the need for more options for California boaters to dispose of unwanted marine flares. However, DTSC has indicated that its cost estimate to stand up and manage the EPR program would be approximately \$500,000 per year. There has been no effort that we are aware of to price the costs associated with the rest of the EPR program, which would likely include the costs to hold collection events to which boat owners could bring their unwanted flares, aggregate and store the collected flares, package the flares for shipment, transportation to a final destination, and disposal costs for a final end-of-life scenario. These costs would likely be orders of magnitude greater than DTSC's cost

estimate for the program. The math simply does not add up, which is the basis of our opinion that the proposed EPR program is unworkable.

Our proposal last year to join several already scheduled local government sponsored events to collect unwanted flares was rejected. We indicated that we could be able to learn more about the dynamics of the existing collection efforts if Orion was allowed to participate and take all of the Orion flares turned in at these collection events and return them to Orion's production facility in Peru, Indiana. We intended to repurpose the devices, as our research indicates we can. For example, Orion currently sells flares to the U.S. Forest Service as a tool for its firefighting efforts. The collected flares could be reused for this purpose.[...]

There still remain several items of frustrating inaccuracies and misinformation that we hope to correct. For example, the projected 174,009 units for return every year is from an 11-year-old study and does not comport with Orion's actual annual sale volume number that is approximately 54,000 units per year. Further, a recent California Product Stewardship Council press release provided numbers from marine flare collection events in eight jurisdictions in 2024. Only 8,596 flares total were collected at these events. These discrepancies beg the question, just how many annual returns will there likely be for this program? The answer to this question speaks to the need for proper sizing of any EPR program.[...]

Proponents of the SB 561 are actively promoting electronic beacons as a replacement for pyrotechnic flare, despite the well-known limitations of electronic beacons. The supporters of the bill fail to recognize or value boater safety, and the very real challenges presented in marine distress situations. To illuminate this concern, electronic beacons are not USCG approved for daytime use. The only other option for daytime emergency signal use other than a pyrotechnic flare is an orange flag. Even during nighttime use, electronic beacons are not equivalent to flares. Electronic beacons are less visible during both day and night, are dark (projecting no signal at all) 62.5% of their "signaling time", cannot reach significant altitudes to increase sighting area (unlike aerial flares), are three times more expensive than handheld pyrotechnic signals and are often misunderstood as navigation or shore lights (a rhythmic blinking light does not communicate danger or distress like dynamic and well understood red distress flares). Further, electronic beacons are battery dependent, unlike flares which require no annual maintenance. It is undisputed that pyrotechnic flares outperform beacons in brightness and recognition, which can be the difference between a rescue or a casualty.[...]

### **SUPPORT**

National Stewardship Action Council (sponsor)

Zero Waste Sonoma (sponsor)

7th Generation Advisors

Atrium 916 Creative Innovation Center for Sustainability  
Ban SUP (Single Use Plastic)  
California Association of Environmental Health Administrators  
California Product Stewardship Council  
California Professional Firefighters  
California Resource Recovery Association  
California State Association of Counties  
Californians Against Waste  
California Public Interest Research Group  
Center for Environmental Health  
Cleaneearth4kids.org  
Climate Reality Project San Fernando Valley Chapter  
Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation  
County of Mendocino  
Del Norte Solid Waste Management Authority  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
Heal the Bay  
League of California Cities  
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts  
Marin Sanitary Service  
Merced County Regional Waste Management Authority  
Northern California Recycling Association  
Plastic Pollution Coalition  
Republic Services  
Resource Recovery Coalition of California  
Rethink Waste  
Rural County Representatives of California  
Sacramento Splash  
San Francisco Baykeeper  
Sierra Club California  
Sonoma County Fire District  
Surfrider Foundation  
Swana California Chapters Legislative Task Force  
The Last Plastic Straw  
Waste Management  
Zero Waste Marin Joint Powers Authority  
Zero Waste Strategies

**OPPOSITION**

Orion Safety Products

**RELATED LEGISLATION**

Pending Legislation: SB 501 (Allen, 2025) establishes an EPR program for the collection, transportation, recycling, and the safe and proper management of products containing household hazardous waste (HHW) in California, as provided. SB 501 is pending in this Committee on the same day as this bill.

Prior Legislation: SB 1066 (Blakespear, 2024) *see* Comment 2, above.

**PRIOR VOTES:**

Senate Environmental Quality Committee (8 Ayes, 0 Noes)

\*\*\*\*\*