

Overview of Household Hazardous Waste Program 1992-2013

Background and Overview of the HHW Grant Program

The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) has supported local Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) programs through the HHW grant program for over twenty years. Through this support, CalRecycle has helped fund hundreds of temporary collection events, outreach and education programs, and the construction of over 100 permanent collection facilities. Through these programs, local governments have collected over one billion pounds of HHW since 1992.

In 1990, CalRecycle (then the California Integrated Waste Management Board) assisted local government HHW programs by providing non-discretionary grants that were essentially reimbursements of program expenses incurred. The majority of these grants funded one-day collection events and outreach programs and helped with day-to-day expenses of HHW management.

CalRecycle's HHW grant program now awards grants based on specific project proposals, and bases the grant awards on the funding priorities established in 1993 by AB 1220 (PRC 47200(a)):

- New programs for rural areas, underserved areas, and for small cities;
- Expansion of existing programs to provide for collection of additional waste types, innovative or more cost-effective collection methods, or expanded public education services; and
- Regional HHW programs.

In addition to these legislative priorities, CalRecycle establishes priorities for each cycle that change to meet needs as expressed by jurisdictions.

Early Years

In the first decade of the HHW grant program, many grants funded the construction of permanent facilities to supplant more costly one-day events. Mobile HHW programs and door-to-door pick-up were also used to provide service to areas lacking access to permanent facilities. As more permanent infrastructure was built, local HHW programs slowly expanded their services to include conditionally exempt small generators and to accommodate new wastes such as sharps and e-waste.

Sunset of the Universal Waste Exemption

In 2006, the household exemption for landfill disposal of universal waste expired. The regulations imposing the landfill ban did not offer an alternative disposal method for these wastes, so local jurisdictions were faced with a huge volume of materials to be managed without a clear plan. In response to these new challenges, CalRecycle created two cycles of non-competitive "coordination grants" to assist local governments in planning strategies for both the funding and management of the new materials. The two main concerns expressed by local governments were: 1) providing the public with sufficient access to HHW management options, and 2) sufficiently funding HHW management. This led many jurisdictions to search for opportunities to partner with retailers to provide more collection points, and to explore the possibilities of extended producer responsibility (EPR).

Overview of Household Hazardous Waste Program 1992-2013

Extended Producer Responsibility and HHW

In February 2007, CalRecycle’s predecessor, the California Integrated Waste Management Board, adopted a set of Strategic Directives that included [Strategic Directive 5](#): Producer Responsibility, which seeks statutory authority to foster “cradle-to-cradle” producer responsibility and develop producer-financed and producer-managed systems for product discards. Consistent with these efforts, CalRecycle has awarded multiple grants in cycles 15-18 to pilot and research the use of selected aspects of an EPR approach for handling HHW. These included grants to develop educational workshops and materials for locals on EPR issues relative to HHW management, as well as development of local retail takeback programs in lieu of statewide EPR programs. CalRecycle also funded various projects in coordination with the Paint Product Stewardship Initiative to research the barriers to paint collection, collection infrastructure, and pilot retail collection programs. These efforts culminated with the passage of AB 1343 in 2010, which created a product stewardship program for the management of leftover paint.

Surveys

In order to ensure that the HHW grants address local governments’ key concerns, CalRecycle staff regularly conducts surveys of grantees that are then used to inform the priorities set for each HHW grant cycle. For example, a survey performed in 2012 led to the decision to design a program for fiscal year 2012/13 (cycle 20) that focused on grants for smaller projects. CalRecycle staff conducted a survey in July 2013 that, combined with input received at the HHW workshop, will help to inform the program priorities for the fiscal year 2014/15 HHW grant cycle.

Fiscal Year	Cycle #	Program Priorities	# Applicants	# Grants	Total \$	Max \$ for Regional	Max \$ for Individual	Average Award
13/14	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HHW facility construction or expansion • “Shovel-ready” construction projects 	13	TBD	\$1.5M	\$350,000	\$350,000	TBD
12/13	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Education and Outreach • Temporary/Mobile Events • Minor (non-construction) • HHW facility improvements • Personal Protection Equipment and training 	39	33	\$1.5M	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
11/12	^t	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharp Containers and Sharp Kiosks • Implemented via contract 	102	78	\$1.5M	As requested	As requested	
10/11	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HHW facility construction or expansion • Cost effective collection • Education and outreach • Limit funding of sharps to \$20K 	23	9	\$1.5M	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000

Overview of Household Hazardous Waste Program
1992-2013

Fiscal Year	Cycle #	Program Priorities	# Applicants	# Grants	Total \$	Max \$ for Regional	Max \$ for Individual	Average Award
09/10	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of Cycle 17 - applications from previous cycle with a passing score were funded. 	7	7	\$1.5	\$400,000	\$250,000	\$137,694
08/09	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct sustainable HHW collection facility(ies) Implement retail take back and EPR programs and initiatives. 	33	18	\$5M	\$400,00	\$250,000	\$250,000
07/08	16C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish overall coordinated county-wide strategy for sharps U-Waste coordination Product stewardship activities 	23 (for 27 counties)	23	\$0.5M	Maximum of \$15k per county-wide area w/ large population	Minimum of \$5k per county-wide area	\$7,000
07/08	16F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Permanent Facility Expand Permanent Facility to accommodate U-Waste Pilot targeted U-Waste Programs 	35	22	\$4.5	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$220,332
06/07	15C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish overall coordinated county-wide strategy for U-Waste Coordinate county-wide EPR/take-it-back program development Upgrade education materials to include U-Waste information 	33 (for 34 counties)	33	\$0.5M	Maximum of \$15k per county-wide area w/ large population	Minimum of \$5k per county-wide area	\$7,000
06/07	15F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Permanent Facility Expand Permanent Facility to accommodate U-Waste Pilot targeted U-Waste Programs 	42	19	\$4.0M	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$263,996
05/06	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish Permanent Facility Expand Permanent Facility to accommodate E-Waste, U-Waste and UWED Pilot targeted U-Waste Program 	26	21	\$4.5M	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
04/05	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not receive in last two cycles Establish Permanent Facility 	33	28	\$4.5M	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$170,165
03/04	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not receive in last cycle E-waste or u-waste collection 	44	21	\$4.5M	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$253,627
02/03	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not receive in last two cycles E-waste, u-waste or paint collection Education program targeting underserved populations 	53	15	\$3M	\$300,000	\$150k	\$281,255
01/02	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not receive in last two cycles Permanent Facility 	37	16	\$3M	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$167,430
00/01	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not receive in last three cycles Self-sustaining Permanent Facility Paint, e-waste, u waste, antifreeze P2 education 	39	16	\$3M	\$300,000	\$150k	\$250,303

Overview of Household Hazardous Waste Program
1992-2013

Fiscal Year	Cycle #	Program Priorities	# Applicants	# Grants	Total \$	Max \$ for Regional	Max \$ for Individual	Average Award
99/00	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green procurement policy • Did not receive in last three cycles • Self-Sustaining Permanent Facility • Collect additional waste types 	39	25	\$2.6M	\$300,000	\$120,000	\$93,744
	7B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 7A 		19	\$1.88 M	See below	See below	\$113,000
98/99	7A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not receive in last three cycles • Permanent Facility 	48 (7A & 7B)	17	\$2.98 M	\$300,000	\$120,000	\$110,855
97/98	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-sustaining Permanent Facility • Rural, underserved & small cities • Regional programs. 	42	13	\$1.5M	\$300,000	\$120,000	98,888
96/97	5	Permanent Facilities	96	34	\$3M	No	\$120,000	\$85,965
95/96	4	Permanent Facilities	66	36	\$3M	No	\$120,000	\$85,965
94/95	3	Permanent Facilities	42	41	\$2.96 M	No	\$120,000	\$81,323
93/94	HN4	N/A		67	\$4 M			\$59,701
92/93	HN3	N/A		60	\$3.9 M			\$66,420
91/92	2	Permanent Facilities	14	14	\$338k	No		\$21,503
91/92	HN2	N/A		58	\$3.6 M			\$62,652
90/91	1	Permanent Facilities	23	23	\$834k	No		\$40,000
90/91	HN1	N/A		44	\$3.1 M			\$71,926