

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

SB 501 (Allen)
Version: April 7, 2025
Hearing Date: April 22, 2025
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AM

SUBJECT

Household Hazardous Waste Producer Responsibility Act

DIGEST

This bill establishes an extended producer responsibility (EPR) or stewardship program for the collection, transportation, recycling, and the safe and proper management of products containing household hazardous waste (HHW) in California.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Many common household items contain hazardous materials that, when not disposed of properly, can cause harm to public health and the environment. Universal waste can be handled, transported, and recycled following relatively simple requirements set forth in the universal waste regulations (such as batteries), while HHW is more hazardous and must be handled and disposed of by specified local agencies (such as paint, motor oil, antifreeze, etc.). According to the California's Statewide Commission on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling the state's current system for managing HHW has proven inadequate and operates at a significant public expense.¹ This bill seeks to address the issue of HHW by enacting an EPR program that will provide for the proper management and disposal of HHW in the state that is overseen by the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC). This bill is substantially similar to SB 1143 (Allen, Ch. 989, Stats. 2024) as that bill was heard by this Committee. SB 1143 was eventually amended to delete the contents of the bill and instead address a completely different topic. SB 1143 passed this Committee on a vote of 10 to 0. This bill is sponsored by the National Stewardship Action Council, the Resource Recovery Coalition of California, and the Rural County Representatives of California. The bill is supported by numerous environmental organizations, government entities, and others. The bill is opposed by a coalition of organizations representing businesses and various industries. The bill passed the Senate Environmental Quality Committee on a vote of 6 to 0.

¹ *Policy Recommendations Report 4*, Cal. Statewide Comm. on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling, (Jun. 30, 2022) at p. 43, <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Docs/Web/121911>.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing 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 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))
- 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 the HHW. (Health & Saf. Code § 25218 et seq.)
- 4) Establishes numerous EPR programs and stewardship programs in the state. (Pub. Res. Code §§ 48700 et seq.; § 42420, §§ 42460 et seq., §§ 48631-48691, & §§ 42040 et seq.; Health & Saf. Code §§ 25214.8.10 - 25214.8.19)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the Household Hazardous Waste Producer Responsibility Act (Act), which creates an EPR program for a covered product.
 - a) States that the purpose of the Act is to provide for the safe and proper management of HHW, which poses a threat to public health and safety, is costly for California's local governments, and may cause significant damage to the environment when managed improperly.
- 2) Defines "covered product" as a consumer product that is one or more of the following specified products.
 - a) A pesticide, as defined in Section 12753 of the Food and Agricultural Code.
 - b) An aerosol.
 - c) An oxidizer.
 - d) An adhesive, glue, cleaner, degreaser, or solvent, which is ignitable, toxic, corrosive, or reactive.
 - e) A designated product, as defined in Section 108952 of the Health and Safety Code, which is ignitable, toxic, or reactive.

- f) An automotive product that is a lubricant, oil, antifreeze, cleaner, wax, or degreaser, which is used for purposes of maintaining the function of a motor vehicle, as defined in Section 670 of the Vehicle Code.
 - g) A compressed gas, including, but not limited to, propane, helium, and oxygen.
 - h) A lithium battery.
 - i) A product containing asbestos, mercury, or polychlorinated biphenyls.
 - j) An electronic delivery system of a nicotine or non-nicotine aerosolized or vaporized solution to a person, including electronic cigarettes and vape pens.
 - k) A product that is ignitable, toxic, corrosive, or reactive, that is added by the department via the assessment described in subdivision (d) of Section 25218.52 of the Health and Safety Code, and that is not exempted.
- 3) Requires the PRO to prepare an initial statewide needs assessment designed to determine the necessary steps and investments needed for covered products to achieve the requirements and purposes of the Act, as provided.
- 4) Requires the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) to approve a producer responsibility organization (PRO) on or before January 1, 2028, and provides that DTSC is not to adopt regulations with an effective date earlier than July 1, 2028.
 - a) DTSC must review the plan and approve, disprove, or conditionally approve the plan.
 - b) Requires a producer to notify DTSC electronically it has registered with the PRO no later than 30 days after the effective date of the regulations above become effective.
- 5) Requires the PRO 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.
- 6) Prohibits a producer, upon approval of the plan by DTSC, from selling, distributing, or importing covered products into the state unless the producer has:
 - a) registered with the PRO;
 - b) the covered product is accounted for in the plan; and
 - c) DTSC has approved the PRO's plan.
- 7) Authorizes DTSC to impose an administrative civil penalty on a producer, PRO, or importer manufacturer, distributor, or retailer that does not meet the requirements of the Act. The administrative civil penalty cannot exceed \$10,000 per day, but if the violation is intentional or knowing the penalty cannot exceed \$50,000 per day.
- 8) Specifies that the Administrative Adjudication Bill of Rights (Article 6 (commencing with Section 11425.10) of Chapter 4.5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the

Government Code) applies to hearings conducted under the Act and mandates minimum due process.

- 9) Authorizes DTSC to apply to the small claims court or superior court, depending on the jurisdictional amount and any other remedy sought, in the county where the penalties, restitution, or other remedy was imposed by DTSC, for a judgment to collect any unpaid civil penalties or restitution or to enforce any other remedy provided by the Act after the time for judicial review.
- 10) Authorizes the Attorney General (AG), at the request of the Director of DTSC, to bring an action in the superior court for an order enjoining the act, practice, or omission if, in the judgment of the director, a person has engaged in or is about to engage in an act, practice, or omission that constitutes, or will constitute, a violation of the Act. The order may require remedial measures and direct compliance with the Act.

COMMENTS

1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

SB 501 requires producers of problematic hazardous consumer products to fund and ensure convenient access to a system for the safe collection, transportation, and disposal of the household hazardous waste (HHW) created by their products. The bill will shift the cost burden of managing this HHW disposal from local jurisdictions and ratepayers to the producers through an extended producer responsibility (EPR) system. Thousands of everyday household products are classified as HHW since they pose severe threats to residents, animals, and the environment if improperly managed at the end of life. This includes cleaning products, pesticides, and pool chemicals. Consumers struggle to understand which products are considered hazardous and how to properly dispose of those that are, especially as the list of products that can be collected at a local HHW facility varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and is often a function of what that jurisdiction can afford. Many communities lack convenient access to facilities permitted to accept these dangerous products altogether.

Places like Canada and Vermont are implementing EPR programs for HHW to increase access to safe collection and shift the cost burden of managing these products from local cities and counties, and ultimately ratepayers, to the producers designing the products. SB 501 builds on California's extensive experience with EPR programs and allows producers a degree of flexibility in meeting these goals while also saving ratepayers money and encouraging safer, sustainable household products.

2. This bill establishes the Household Hazardous Waste Producer Responsibility Act

This bill intends to address the difficulty and potential environmental and health and safety hazards of disposing of household hazardous waste. This bill is substantially similar to SB 1143 (Allen, Ch. 989, Stats. 2024) as heard by this Committee. SB 1143 was eventually amended to delete the contents of the bill and instead address a completely different topic. SB 1143, passed this Committee on a vote of 10 to 0.

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.”² California currently has several statewide EPR programs overseen by CalRecycle, including for paint, carpet, mattresses, textiles, pharmaceutical and sharps waste, and plastic packaging, and single-use plastic items.³ The author of the bill notes that Canada and Vermont are implementing EPR programs for HHW.

b) Environmental and health and safety hazards of disposing of household hazardous waste

The Senate Environmental Quality Committee’s analysis of this bill explores the problem of HHW and universal waste and its effects on the environment. The analysis notes:

- Many common household items contain hazardous materials that pose a threat to the health of humans, animals, and the environment if these products are incorrectly disposed of and, therefore, cannot simply be thrown out in the garbage;
- DTSC’s 2023 Hazardous Waste Management Report shows approximately 65,020 tons of HHW was collected in California during the 2020-21 reporting period, with electronic devices making up roughly 29,320 tons (88%) of the universal waste portion of HHW collection and about 45 percent of the total HHW collected;
- Common HHW listed on DTSC’s website includes: antifreeze, batteries, drain cleaners, electronics, glue and adhesives, household cleaners, oven cleaners, paints, pesticides, pool cleaners, solvents, used oil, waste containing asbestos, and wastes containing mercury; however, there is no statutory or regulatory

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

³ Ibid.

definition of HHW and little data is available to evaluate the waste streams collected at HHW facilities.⁴

The California's Statewide Commission on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling stated in its 2022 policy recommendations to the Legislature that:

[...] the largest fraction of HHW remains in the materials disposed of. When improperly placed in recycling or organic materials recovery streams, HHWs pose chemical and explosive hazards within those streams, significantly increasing the costs of those operations. The costs to manage HHW, including costs for load checking, and the construction and operation of permanent HHW facilities across the state, though a significant continuing expense, is proving inadequate to the task of removing the increasing density and diversity of hazards in materials discarded. Continuing municipal support for the diversity of HHW programs required also takes limited local funds away from other programs such as composting. Municipalities continue HHW programs in part to reduce potential long-term liabilities but have limited resources to fund a program that is sufficiently effective. If a community under-performs in its efforts to remove hazardous materials from materials landfilled, that community becomes more vulnerable to potential future expenses associated with superfund cleanups for such a landfill. Companies selling such products have not shared these municipal expenses or liabilities. In other words, our current system for managing HHW is both a significant public expense, and also an expensive failure. If we had to grade the HHW system effectiveness, it would be an F-, not because the efforts of those providing HHW services are deficient, but because the current HHW system has proven inadequate to these challenges.⁵

The Senate Environmental Quality Committee analysis concluded that:

The improper disposal of HHW presents a clear safety danger to frontline workers and significant risks to public health and the environment. Current HHW recovery programs recover less than 25% of material discarded. This is likely due to the current patchwork system of managing HHW. Customers are often confused about which products are hazardous and how to properly dispose of them. SB 501 replaces the current system of managing HHW with a well-crafted EPR program with appropriate oversight from DTSC. This EPR program will also shift costs of end of life management from local governments and ultimately Californians to producers

⁴ Sen. Environmental Quality Comm. analysis of SB 501 (2025-26 reg. sess.) as amended Mar. 24, 2025 at pp. 5-7.

⁵ *Policy Recommendations Report 4*, Cal. Statewide Comm. on Recycling Markets and Curbside Recycling, (Jun. 30, 2022) at p. 43, <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/Docs/Web/121911>.

of the products that become hazardous waste.⁶

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.⁷ 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.”⁸ 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.⁹ 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.’ ”¹⁰ This bill’s provisions apply equally to producers who manufacture a covered product and who owns or is the licensee of the brand or trademark under which that covered product is sold, offered for sale, or distributed for sale in or into the state. As such, the bill does not favor in-state businesses over out-of-state businesses. 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.¹¹ (*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 household hazardous waste, this bill would likely not be found to substantially burden interstate commerce in violation of the Dormant Commerce Clause.

d) *Access to 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

⁶ Sen. Environmental Quality Comm. analysis of SB 501 (2025-26 reg. sess.) as amended Mar. 24, 2025 at pp. 10-11.

⁷ U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3.

⁸ *National Pork Producers Council v. Ross* (2023) 143 S.Ct. 1142, 1152 (internal quotation marks and alterations omitted).

⁹ *Id.* at pp. 1152-1153.

¹⁰ *South Dakota v. Wayfair, Inc.* (2018) 138 S.Ct. 2080, 2091.

¹¹ *Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.* (1970) 397 U.S. 137, 142; *National Pork Producers Council* supra at fn. 6 at pp. 1162-1163.

Proposition 59 (Nov. 3, 2004, statewide general election),¹² 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)¹³ to further increase public access to government records by requiring local agencies to comply with the CPRA and the Ralph M. Brown Act¹⁴, 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 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 or a conditionally 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 financial or sales data in summary form only, so it cannot be attributable to a specific entity. Under the bill, producers and stewardship organizations are required to make their annual reports publicly available free of charge; however, the bill specifies that a producer or PRO may withhold from disclosure any confidential proprietary information (i.e. trade secrets or confidential information) as specified under existing provisions of the Evidence Code or the CPRA. As these provisions imposes a limitation on the public’s right of access to a public record, the bill provides the following justification for the limitation: “In order to ensure the effective solid waste management of, and viable markets for, products that contain household hazardous waste, it is necessary to protect the proprietary information of producers, retailers,

¹² Prop. 59 was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature. (SCA 1 (Burton, Ch. 1, Stats. 2004))

¹³ Prop. 42 was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature. (SCA 3 (Leno, Ch. 123, Stats. 2013))

¹⁴ The Ralph M. Brown Act is the open meetings laws that applies to local agencies. (Gov. Code §§ 59450 et. seq.)

wholesalers, and solid waste enterprises by keeping confidential the financial, production, and sales data reported by those entities.”

e) Antitrust immunity

As with most of the EPR schemes provided for in California law, this bill includes express exemptions from various laws regulating anticompetitive behavior and unfair competition and practices. The bill provides that certain activities engaged in by producers and stewardship organizations, including the creation, implementation, management, cost assessments, and structuring of a stewardship plan and the establishment, administration, collection, or disbursement of a charge associated with funding the implementation of this bill are categorically exempt from being considered violations of the Cartwright Act (California’s primary antitrust law), the Unfair Practices Act, or the Unfair Competition Law.

Concerns have been raised about the monopolistic possibilities inherent in stewardship programs, and strong government oversight is critical to ensure this regulatory scheme is operated in an evenhanded manner and results in the ambitious goals it sets out to accomplish. These laws are extremely important to ensuring consumers are protected and free and fair competition is fostered. Mitigating these concerns to an extent, the bill specifically provides that the exemptions do not apply to an agreement that does the following:

- fixes a price of or for covered products, except for an agreement related to costs or charges associated with participation in a stewardship plan approved or conditionally approved by the department and otherwise in accordance with the Act;
- fixes the output or production of covered products; or
- restricts the geographic area in which, or customers to whom, covered products will be sold.

This language is also similar to that found in other EPR programs.

f) Enforcement provisions

The bill authorizes DTSC to impose an administrative civil penalty on a producer, PRO, or importer manufacturer, distributor, or retailer that fails meet the requirements of the Act. The administrative civil penalty cannot exceed \$10,000 per day; however, if the violation is intentional or knowing the penalty cannot exceed \$50,000 per day. When assessing or reviewing the amount of a civil penalty to be imposed, a court is required to consider all of the following:

- the nature and extent of the violation;
- the number and severity of the violation or violations;

- the economic effect of the penalty on the violator;
- whether the violator took good faith measures to comply with this article and the period of time over which these noncompliant actions were taken;
- the willfulness of the violator's misconduct;
- the deterrent effect that the imposition of the penalty would have on both the violator and the regulated community; and
- any other factor that justice may require.

The bill specifies that DTSC may apply to the small claims court or the superior court, depending on the remedy sought, for a judgment to collect any unpaid civil penalties, restitution, or to enforce any other remedy authorized by the Act. The bill provides that the AG may, at the request of the Director of DTSC or upon the AG's own determination, bring an action in the superior court for an order enjoining an act, practice, or omission that constitutes, or will constitute, a violation of the Act. The court order may require remedial measures and direct compliance with the Act. Additionally, upon a showing by the director that the person has engaged in (or is about to engage in) that act, practice, or omission, the superior court may issue a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, as appropriate.

3. Statements in support

The National Stewardship Action Council, the Resource Recovery Coalition of California, and the Rural County Representatives of California, the sponsors of the bill, write in support stating:

SB 501 will require manufacturers of pesticides, aerosols, oxidizers, adhesives, lubricants, compressed gas, lithium batteries, and vapes to provide a free and convenient collection and management system for those products.

Household hazardous waste requires special handling and disposal because of the risks they pose to workers and the environment if improperly thrown in the trash, poured down storm drains, or released into the environment. Local governments are responsible for the operation of local household hazardous waste collection programs, which offer residents free drop-off opportunities for HHW. These programs are expensive and put serious financial pressure on both the programs and local governments that operate them. The cost for local governments to manage some types of household hazardous waste can often approach or exceed the initial purchase price that consumers pay at the point of sale.

Local governments and the solid waste industry have no control over which products will be introduced into the marketplace. SB 501 ensures that manufacturers bear financial responsibility for the management and disposal of the products they introduce into the stream of commerce. By compelling manufacturers to bear responsibility for these costs, and making proper disposal opportunities

more convenient for residents, SB 501 will drive manufacturers to improve product design to make those products safer and easier to manage at the end of their useful lives.[...]

In January 2025, the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to approve a motion that directed the staff to explore the feasibility of an EPR program for HHW and electronic waste as they are spending \$14 million a year on HHW management. Several local governments are considering drafting local HHW EPR ordinances, as well as several other states to reduce fires and increase safety throughout the waste management system. Failure to pass state legislation will likely result in a county-by-county approach which is not cost-effective nor best for California.

4. Statements in opposition

A coalition of various business organizations and associations, including the California Chamber of Commerce, the California Retailers Association, the California Manufacturers & Technology Association, and the Household & Commercial Products Association, write in an opposed unless amended position, stating:

SB 501 takes an overly broad approach by combining a wide array of dissimilar product categories under a single EPR program.[...] Treating all these products as a monolith risk creates inefficiencies and unnecessary complexity. The "one-size-fits-all" approach may inadvertently complicate the very systems it seeks to streamline, adding layers of bureaucracy without directly addressing the core problem: resources for local HHW programs.[...]

[A]pplying EPR to Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) collection presents significant challenges that make it an impractical and inefficient solution. Notably, only one state — Vermont — has enacted EPR for HHW, and the state has hardly begun implementing the program. Vermont's law is imperfect and has already proven challenging. In fact, the Vermont Legislature is now advancing a measure to pause the program and turn to a fee-based approach.[...]

To address HHW disposal more effectively, HCPA has put forward an alternative proposal centered on providing local governments with additional funding. Our approach calls on DTSC to identify the top HHW products by volume and cost pressure on disposal. Once these priority products are established, a fee would be levied on those items prior to their sale in California. The revenue generated would be directed to local governments to bolster their HHW collection programs as well as public education around source reduction and proper disposal.

This solution demonstrates our commitment to addressing the issue while maintaining a streamlined, targeted approach.[...]

Finally, California is currently implementing SB 54 (Stats. 2022), the most comprehensive and rigorous EPR program in the country, designed to manage packaging waste and source reduction. Regulations for this program have recently been delayed due to its complexity. Several of the companies impacted by the proposed program under SB 501 are also responsible participants in the EPR program under SB 54. To be successful, this program demands the resources and time of companies across diverse industries as well as the California Environmental Protection Agency staff and leadership. The program includes aggressive source reduction mandates, packaging recyclability rates, and requires producers to pay \$500 million per year for 10 years into a mitigation fund to support various environmental projects and programs established under the new law.

Considering the immense scale of implementation of the landmark EPR law, we strongly urge the legislature to allow existing programs to get underway before layering new EPR programs, regardless of the responsible agency.[...]

SUPPORT

National Stewardship Action Council (sponsor)
Rural County Representatives of California (sponsor)
Resource Recovery Coalition of California (sponsor)
5 Gyres Institute
7th Generation Advisors
Atrium 916 Creative Innovation Center for Sustainability
Ban Sup (single Use Plastic)
California Product Stewardship Council
California Professional Firefighters
California Resource Recovery Association
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
Californians Against Waste
California Public Interest Research Group
Center for Environmental Health
City of Roseville
City of San Jose
City of Santa Maria
Cleaneearth4kids.org
Climate Reality Project Los Angeles Chapter
Climate Reality Project Orange County
Climate Reality Project Riverside County Chapter
Climate Reality Project San Diego
Climate Reality Project San Fernando Valley
Climate Reality Project San Francisco Bay Area Chapter
Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors

County of Mendocino
County of Sacramento
Del Norte Solid Waste Management Authority
Facts: Families Advocating for Chemical & Toxics Safety
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Heal the Bay
League of California Cities
Marin Sanitary Service
Merced County Regional Waste Management Authority
Napa Recycling and Waste Services
Northern California Recycling Association
Plastic Pollution Coalition
Product Stewardship Institute
Recology
Republic Services
Rethink Waste
Sacramento Splash
San Francisco Baykeeper
Sea Hugger
Sierra Club California
Stopwaste
Swana California Chapters Legislative Task Force
Tehama County Solid Waste Management Agency
The Last Plastic Straw
Upstream
Western Placer Waste Management Authority
Zero Waste Marin Joint Powers Authority

OPPOSITION

American Chemistry Council
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
California Chamber of Commerce
California Business Properties Association
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Pool and Spa Association
California Retailers Association
Can Manufacturers Institute
Chemical Industry Council of California
Consumer Brands Association
CropLife America
Household and Commercial Products Association
Industrial Environmental Association
NAIOP California

National Aerosol Association
Redwood Materials, Inc.
Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
Western Plant Health Association

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: SB 561 (Blakespear, 2025) establishes an EPR program for the collection, transportation, recycling, and the safe and proper management of marine flares in California. SB 561 is pending in this Committee on the same day as this bill.

Prior Legislation: *See* Comment 2, above.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Environmental Quality Committee (6 Ayes, 0 Noes)
