

I support distribution of projects all around the state, so that there will be examples of these projects close to everyone in the state to see, to inspire more to be developed and the broadest base of political support for continuing this use of funds from Cap and Trade in the future. That could be done by dividing state into regions, and require evaluators to ensure that there are at least one project in each region.

The largest projects should not get most of the funds. CalRecycle should provide incentives for smaller projects and projects done on-site where possible (e.g. college campuses, large businesses or industrial parks).

CalRecycle should NOT fund thermal projects (technology processing materials at temperatures higher than 212 degrees F.), as those will likely get bogged down in siting disputes. In coordinating with CEC, be careful that their support for those technologies doesn't change your focus.

I love the preference for composting and A.D. and food waste reduction for organics. I would encourage you to allow food waste reduction projects separate from processing projects, as Food Banks need a lot of help and this could be helpful for their expansion, and get many GHG benefits and social equity benefits.

Preference should also be given to clean source separated feedstocks. The cleaner the feedstocks, the cleaner the outputs and the highest and best use will be made of those materials.

Life-cycle approach should include boundaries up-stream like the WARM model does for recyclables, and like CARB does for some of the up-stream benefits for greater use of composting. Boundaries should NOT just be the local solid waste system.

I support idea that training programs will be needed to properly roll-out these efforts. Other states require that facility operators must have Certified Recycling Professionals on staff. It would be good for grantees being encouraged to have Certified Professionals in Sustainable Resource Management as part of their staff expertise.

Gary Liss