

**CalRecycle / Division of Recycling**  
**Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Program**  
 Program Reform - Focus Group Workshop # 6

Comments and New Ideas Capture

Workshop # 6 – October 25, 2012 - Comment Capture	
III. Improve Cash Flow / Reduce Payables	
<b>III.B: ) B. Topic: Reduce costs associated with CalRecycle administration of the CBCRP</b>	
III.B: 1.0) 1. Shift responsibility for paying redemption payments to dealers	
III.B: 1.1) This topic has been dialogued in Focus Group Workshops # 3 and/or 4.	
III.B: 1.2) This topic was presented to the audience for potential updated feedback. No Feedback was received from the workshop participants.	
III.B: 2.0) 2. Eliminate paper report processing	
III.B: 2.1) This requires legislation. Currently it is optional for program participants	
III.B: 2.2) DORIIS: 80% of processors are currently on DORIIS. It will require new legislation to make use of DORIIS for reporting mandatory.	
III.B: 2.3) DORIIS: Beverage Distributor and Beverage Manufacturers, 25% are using DORIIS. Approximately 36,000 reports are submitted annually by all Beverage Manufacturers and .Distributors.	
<b>III.B: 3.a.0) 3. Administrative &amp; Operational</b>	
III.B: 3.a.1) Administrative, civil and criminal judgments comprise the penalties received by the Department. It requires an appropriation for the department to access these monies.	
<b>III.B: 3.a.0) a) Contracts</b>	
III.B: 3.a.1) No comments received	
<b>III.B: 3.b.0) b) Payroll</b>	
III.B: 3.b.1) If savings are realized, the department should redirect the savings to additional staff in problem areas, e.g. out-of-state importers, and/or combating fraud.	
III.B: 3.b.2) Approximately 64% of recycling staff report directly to Jose Ortiz (deputy director) this is the 130 position versus 202 noted in the power point presentation.	
III.B: 3.b.3) On the pie chart the \$11,814,000 are the salaries and benefits for staff assigned to the Division of Recycling. The \$17,653,000 includes staff not assigned to the Division of Recycling, but throughout CalRecycle (department) that are engaged in supporting the CBCRP. This includes partial PYs and full PYs.	
<b>III.B: 3.c.0) c) Grant oversight</b>	
III.B: 3.c.1) CalRecycle staff responsible for CBCRF grant oversight are located outside of the Division of Recycling, they are located in the Materials Management & Local Assistance Division of CalRecycle (department). They do not report to Jose Ortiz (deputy director)	
III.B: 3.c.2) Question: how many positions are assigned to manage CBCRF grants? Answer: roughly 8-10 (per Howard Levenson).	
<b>III.B: 3.d.0) d) Enforcement oversight</b>	
III.B: 3.d.1) Enforcement oversight is not effective	
III.B: 3.d.2) The topic of Enforcement and Compliance activities/processes will be added to the November 19th public hearing expanding upon the original intent for the meeting, Out of State importers reporting.	

**CalRecycle / Division of Recycling**  
**Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Program**

Program Reform - Focus Group Workshop # 6

Comments and New Ideas Capture

III.B: 3.d.3) What was the cause of the surge in enforcements/investigations in 2010? The Department had a short term surge of staff field presence to perform the Recycling Inspection Process (RIP), this was primarily to address issues with excessive HDPE recycling rates. Many staff from multiple business units were redirected from their assignments to staff this effort. This redirection was not a sustainable model due to cost (e.g. travel, overtime, etc.) and the negative impact on non-enforcement and non-compliance activities.
III.B: 3.d.4) Dealer versus RC inspections in 2010 - what was the cause of the re-focus? Why was the quantity of dealer inspections so much larger than Recycler Center inspections? Prior to 2010 there were 2 separate inspection units, one for Dealers and one for Recycling Centers. With new Enforcement management in 2010, the two business units were merged and former dealer inspectors were redirected to RC inspections based on a belief that RC inspections were a higher priority.
III.B: 3.e.0) e) Certification / Registration oversight
III.B: 3.e.1) No comments received
NEW IDEAS FGW # 6
FGW6.New: 1.0) NA
FGW6.New:1.1) No comments received
END