From: Dan Holler [mailto:danh@cityofgrassvalley.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 3:54 PM
To: Climate Change CalRecycle
Subject: W M Sector Plan Workshop

Thank you for the reports, data and information. It has been very informative.

Concern in a few areas:

- Incentives are good, but it appears that much of the funding will come from tax revenues or increasing the cost of disposal (i.e. tipping fees). Has a significant impact on the rural parts of California.
- Economics will drive much of what is happening and the private sector has options that do not include subsidies but the permitting is a barrier.
- The use of "tansformation" should be allowed especially in rural areas – currently it is cheaper and easier to open burn then to use other options due to haul costs
- Technology will allow processes that do not "burn".
- The conversion of biomass and MSW to fuel additives and fertilizer that sequesters CO2 needs to be included as recycling.
- Processes can use "green wet waste" as well as other materials.
- Agree that the recycling process needs to end at "re-constituted" for other uses vs. "re-manufactured".

  Currently new technologies are doing much of the above and are being subsidized at the national level and locating outside of California due to current regulations. The current regulations tend to support the export of waste (including recycled material); technology implementation, and jobs. Creates the need to re-import materials.

Technology – Priorities

- Focus on ones that do not need government incentives or enhanced regulatory process
- Organics can be converted to fuels, both transportation and electric – this includes bio-solids.
- Disagree on the need for new rules and regs as being the means to achieve goals, this is not required. Technology necessary to get to 75% "diversion" is available today
- The process of how the material is re-used (transformed, converted) does achieve other goals – diverted from landfills, reduced reliance on fossil fuels, reduce GHG, etc. This can be done without government incentives. The current economics work.
- Process can be set up at current landfills – the material is still pre-sorted (at curb or MRF) – the 80%+ of remaining material is converted to marketable products.
- Maximize the use of current infrastructure - with limited or no changes – we can move to 75%
- The other factor faced in much of rural CA is biomass in the forest – how much is spent on fighting fires, what is the impact of open burning etc. If incentives are to be used, allow it to address this element of biomass, to get bigger bang for the buck.
- Biomass conversion can be subsidized by use of MSW to level out feed stock requirements and to create a private sector level subsidy of to do waste to energy (again can be done without "burning")

Dan Holler
City Administrator
City of Grass Valley