

# California Illegal Dumping Workshops:

Addressing Root Causes and Growing Solutions

October 23, 2019 • The Port Workspaces • Oakland, CA

Illegal Dumping: Growing Solutions in Your Community

January 25, 2020 • Central California Environmental Justice Network 20<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference

College of the Sequoias, Visalia, CA





## Table of Contents

Introduction & Workshop Goals .....	2
Illegal Dumping Definitions .....	3
Conversation Prompts & Resulting Themes (October 2019 Workshop).....	4
Conversation Prompts & Resulting Themes (January 2020 Workshop) .....	8
Intervention Designs (October 2019 Workshop) .....	9
Intervention Designs (January 2020 Workshop) .....	12
Recommendations (October 2019 Workshop).....	13
Recommendations (January 2020 Workshop) .....	14
Conclusions.....	15
Appendix A. Participants List (October 2019 Workshop) .....	16

## Introduction & Workshop Goals

Illegal dumping is a serious challenge to the state of California, encompassing issues of pollution, economics, health and social justice. As the mattress recycling organization for the state of California, the Mattress Recycling Council (MRC) has been actively engaged in understanding and decreasing the problem of illegal dumping, recognizing that mattresses are just one element of a larger problem.

In the past year, MRC has hosted two workshops to address the causes of and potential solutions for illegal dumping in California.

The first was a one-day interactive workshop in October 2019 facilitated by Gigantic Idea Studio. Objectives of that workshop included:

- Gather and synthesize input from diverse expert stakeholders with different points of view on the illegal dumping issue.
- Consider the societal and economic causes of illegal dumping.
- Brainstorm solutions for addressing illegal dumping problem.
- Create opportunities for stronger cooperation among stakeholders.

Participants in the workshop were selected for invitation based on the goal of gathering experts who work with the issue of illegal dumping in a professional capacity, bearing in mind the need for representation of various geographic areas, demographic elements and areas of focus. The workshop aimed to elicit participants' experience and best thinking regarding solutions. Twenty-five people participated in the October 2019 workshop, including five MRC staff members. *(See Appendix A)*

In January 2020, MRC sponsored a second workshop held as part of a Central California Environmental Justice Network conference. Attendees of two 50-minute workshop sessions included local residents, activists, and representatives of nonprofit organizations and neighborhood groups with an interest in and activism regarding environmental justice in the Central Valley. There were approximately 20 attendees per session. The workshop attracted many dedicated community activists and volunteers of all ages who live in communities with high levels of illegal dumping. They were engaged and interested in sharing their experiences and providing their input on solutions.



During the January 2020 workshop, MRC was interested in gathering information from individuals at the local level to see what solutions might emerge specific to an underserved region of the state. The objectives of the second workshop were similar to those of the October 2019 event but were streamlined for the more limited time frame. The objectives included:

- Brief review of illegal dumping definitions created by participants of the October 2019 workshop to uncover any differences in content/emphasis in the Central Valley region and to make the connection between environmental justice (the topic of the conference) and illegal dumping.
- Gather workshop participants' input on specific illegal dumping challenges in their communities.
- Brainstorm illegal dumping interventions specific to workshop participants' local needs.

Findings from both workshops are presented in this report.

### **Illegal Dumping Definitions**

The October 2019 workshop started with a group discussion about the definition of illegal dumping to ensure that participants were starting with a shared understanding. A facilitator gave examples of various objects that might be discarded (sofa, chair, motor oil, mattress, cigarette butt) and asked where they fit in the definition. There was general agreement that a basket of items marked "Take for Free" or a cigarette butt might technically fall under the legal definition of illegal dumping but were generally outside the scope of the workshop's focus.

At the end of the day, participants were asked to reiterate a definition of illegal dumping and to translate that into a definition they would use with a neighbor or other layperson. The definitions below indicate that the intent of the person who discards an item (the act is intentional, while some other littering is not) and the location where items are discarded (i.e., unauthorized area) are the two primary factors in a definition.

#### **Definitions, End of Day Versions:**

- Illegal dumping is disposal of waste at a location not authorized to accept it.
- Illegal dumping is the intentional placement of materials at an unauthorized location.
- Illegal dumping is the intentional discarding of materials (in any volume or amount) at a location not designated for waste disposal that affects the quality of life for residents.
- Illegal dumping is the unauthorized dumping or disposal of unwanted materials.
- Illegal dumping is the intentional and improper placement of any item on public or private property not intended for disposal or dumping purposes.

#### **Definitions, Layperson's Versions:**

- Throwing away your stuff where it doesn't belong is illegal. (It's a crime!)
- Put trash in its proper place.
- Someone leaving their junk where it is not supposed to be for someone else to deal with.
- Disposing of your waste somewhere you shouldn't.
- Illegal dumping is putting trash (or an item) where it shouldn't be.

When presented with the definitions of illegal dumping created by participants in the first workshop, participants in the January 2020 event added or put greater emphasis on specific items that are illegally dumped (dead animals, used tires, etc.) and specific locations where they observe illegal dumping (farmland, "side of the road," etc.)







## **Map A: Describe the conditions that foster different types of dumping**

### *Participant summary:*

#### Lack of Enforcement

- Insufficient capacity and will to enforce.
- No significant penalties for dumping.
- No prioritization of illegal dumping enforcement.
- Insufficient judicial support.
- Little public awareness of enforcement and penalties.

#### Lack of Consistent Messaging

- Inconsistent policies.
- Resources differ widely from city to city.
- Lack of consistent, clear public communication.
- Lack of multilingual and multiplatform communication.
- Uninformed public.

#### Lack of Resources/Means/Alternatives

- Insufficient access to appropriate facilities and means to proper disposal.
- Insufficient access to information.
- Homelessness and encampments.
- Lack of consistent and sustainable funding to address this issue.
- Multifamily units/colleges (short-term, high-volume housing).

### *Facilitator summary:*

Themes emerging from participants' comments included a lack of education, communication barriers (literacy, language, etc.) and both insufficient messaging and insufficient accessibility (cost and location) to legal dumping options. Participants noted factors such as distant locations, low priority and a lack of deterrence as reasons enforcement may be difficult. The prevalence of the word "lack" in descriptions used by participants indicates that current approaches to the problem are under-resourced. Participants mentioned unhoused/homeless and multifamily dwelling communities as housing situations where illegal dumping occurs.

## **Map B: Describe the conditions that discourage different types of dumping**

### *Participant summary:*

#### Visual Aspects of Community

- Community involvement ("Everyone is involved!")
- Municipal maintenance (homeless encampments and illegal dumping)
- Incentivize cleanup

#### Monitoring, Reporting and Enforcement

- Cameras, community and police presence
- Security and lighting
- Enforceable, consistent and well-publicized laws
- Fines and convenient reporting mechanisms



#### Access to No-Cost Disposal

- Adequate funding
- Regular bulky item pickup
- Access to information or options

#### Community Events

- Local cleanups (work with NGOs for reuse)
- Zero-waste events
- Reuse/recycling events

#### Collaboration Requires Engagement of All Stakeholders (Municipalities, Communities, Businesses)

- “Buy less crap”

#### *Facilitator summary:*

Reuse was mentioned as an important alternative/mitigation to dumping, as was the importance of fostering community pride through beautification. The topic of fines/penalties triggered multiple, sometimes contradictory, responses. These first two maps focus on the challenges faced by low- and no-income individuals. One outlying idea was dumpster redesign. Participants mentioned expanded recycling and reuse services.

#### **Map C: Illegal dumping mitigation: Describe barriers/challenges (and for whom)**

##### *Participant summary:*

- Cost of labor/resources
- Cost/accessibility of disposal
- Open space with lack of oversight
- Access to convenient disposal/recycling programs with vehicles and pickup service
- Lack of education
- Lack of reporting methods
- Cultural norms/nomadic norms of dumpers
- Absentee landlords
- Ineffective (or lack of) enforcement
- Government seen as responsible for all cleanup

##### *Facilitator summary:*

Different stakeholders require different approaches. In this map, we see mentioned: multifamily, homeless, rural and absentee/heedless property owners, in addition to residential dumping. Participants also mentioned reporting methods. In this map, there also was a call for better coordination between abatement groups and haulers. Access, enforcement and resources continued as major themes.

#### **Map D: Illegal dumping mitigation: Describe opportunities (and for whom)**

##### *Participant summary:*

- Prevention vs. abatement
- Known dumping sites (property owners)
- Lighting, surveillance and barriers
- Education/marketing to consumers



- Social media campaigns
- Multiple languages
- Mobile phone apps
- Improved access
- Events
- Curbside collection

*Facilitator summary:*

Participants noted there is an opportunity to look for partnerships within communities/jurisdictions and to form new partnerships with schools/students, churches, community groups, businesses, haulers and the homeless. Participants mentioned messaging and media channels, especially using social media and apps. Participants also discussed more enforcement supported by staff, dedicated inspectors and a rapid-response unit. They also noted opportunities beyond environmental improvements, including job creation.

**Map E: Illegal dumping myths and misconceptions**

*Participant summary:*

- Somebody will pick it up. Trash fairies exist.
- If I paid a hauler, they took it to the dump.
- It only happens at night and in isolated areas.
- Jurisdictions have unlimited resources to handle this.
- The government doesn't care, only environmentalists care.
- All preventive measures work.
- Illegal dumping is not a crime. It doesn't hurt anybody.
- Companies and corporations always follow the law.
- Used commodities don't have value.

*Facilitator summary:*

The overarching theme for this map is "illegal dumping is someone else's problem." Sticking a "Free" sign on a dumped object seems to absolve some people of guilt if they think someone else might be able to use the item. The question of whether what is dumped has value, and for whom, was mentioned several times by participants. Across maps, participants noted the role the unhoused/homeless play in illegal dumping (e.g., leaving their belongings in encampments).

**Map F: Magic wand: Describe your "dream" interventions**

*Participant summary:*

Effective Education and Outreach

- Social media
- Multilingual
- Education of school-aged population through assemblies or classroom projects
- How to report incidences of dumping

Community Engagement

- Neighborhood pride
- Partner with community groups, churches, advocacy groups, etc.

Enforcement



- Geo-mapping of dumped items/allow public to report dumped items via phone
- Offenders participate in cleanup
- Fines high enough to discourage future dumping

#### Convenient Access to Disposal Options

- Multifamily
- Student move out/in
- Curbside pickup

#### *Facilitator summary:*

The “magic wand” interventions were less aspirational and did not deviate significantly from many strategies that currently are being used by many jurisdictions. Solutions included access to convenient, low-cost/no-cost collection and prompt enforcement. The audiences mentioned included renters, students and youth. Statewide efforts, including the geo-mapping project and ordinances, were mentioned to provide consistency across jurisdictions.

### **Conversation Prompts & Resulting Themes (January 2020 Workshop)**

Using the same conversation mapping technique used in the first workshop but reducing the number of questions for the limited time frame, facilitators of the January 2020 workshop provided two table prompts for participants:

**Map 1:** What are the challenges and barriers to fixing illegal dumping in your area?

**Map 2:** What are the opportunities and conditions that would fix illegal dumping in your area?

The prompts in were written in English and Spanish. Participants were encouraged to respond in either language.

#### **Map 1: What are the challenges and barriers to fixing illegal dumping in your area?**

##### *Themes included:*

- Ignorance of the law
- Ignorance of the long-term negative effects of dumping
- Lack of response to illegal dumping from law enforcement
- Lack of transportation to legal dumping facilities
- Lack of basic services
- Cost

#### **Map 2: What are the opportunities and conditions that could fix illegal dumping in your area?**

##### *Themes included:*

- Regular access to disposal of bulky items
- Community pride or pressure
- Education of adults and youths
- Increase enforcement

Participants in the January 2020 workshop also were asked to write examples of local problems and issues to share with the larger group in preparation for developing illegal dumping interventions. Major themes from this exercise included:



### **Problem Areas**

- Sides of roads
- Alleys
- Highways
- Empty fields near sensitive receptors
- Private property
- Rivers/waterways/recreation sites (including sewer lines clogged with trash and waste)
- Encampments of the unhoused/homeless

### **Types of Bulky Waste**

- Garbage (small items tossed out of vehicles)
- Unwanted household items, such as furniture, mattresses, kitchen appliances and tires
- Clothing
- Dead animals
- Food waste

### **Types of Hazardous Waste**

- Industrial dumping as more industries move in
- Dumping of car oil in yards or Dumpsters

### **Exacerbating Factors**

- Lack of access to proper disposal
- Lack of regular inspections and cleanups of illegal dumping sites

## **Intervention Designs (October 2019 Workshop)**

After the participants in the October 2019 workshop completed the conversation maps, they turned to creating solutions for the problem of illegal dumping. The suggested interventions covered a wide scope and range of actions, from policy design to operational improvements to education and community outreach. Technology, such as apps and portals/databases, were included as part of several interventions. In all, sixteen interventions were presented and participants were asked to vote on the most favored, innovative or effective options.

Following are the intervention descriptions, along with the vote tally (in parentheses.)

### **Services/Operations**

1. **Dump Coupon (0)** – This policy would allow any resident free disposal of a set number (or amount) of bulky items at a solid waste facility, with a goal of removing barriers to access and eliminating the cost of disposal for residents. This system would require coordination and contractual agreement between city or county and private operators, if applicable. For convenience, facilities could consider an electronic redemption process using QR codes or other online registration/redemption systems. This would have the added benefit of tracking and analyzing usage at multiple facilities. This program would be promoted through websites, text messages, social media (Facebook, Nextdoor, etc.), mailings and radio ads. Jurisdictions could partner with haulers and businesses to further expand access.
2. **My Beautiful City (3)** – This project would involve a regular community beautification day, with community stewards leading neighborhood cleanup projects, that would promote community investment by multiple stakeholders (local governments, businesses, property managers, religious



groups, neighborhood associations, etc.). Funding sources could include grants, public works budgets, local and corporate partners, developers, and others with an interest in clean neighborhoods. The funds would be distributed by city governments and used as an incentive and stipend for stewards to disburse. The funds also could subsidize quarterly curbside pickup that would rotate through neighborhoods systematically, as well as a designated drop-off location. The beautification day would be promoted by the city government.

3. **No-Cost, After-Hours Collection Centers** (2) – This effort would provide convenient no-cost access to recycling and disposal facilities for residents who can't drop off during regular working hours. The collection centers would be open from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. to accept municipal solid waste, recycling and bulky items. For this to be successful, local jurisdictions would coordinate with businesses, haulers and local nonprofits on locations, outreach, education and awareness. The funding source would be local property taxes and sources of recycling revenues.
4. **Nomadic Housing Cleanups** (3) – This intervention would collect used and unwanted materials from residents of high-occupancy, high-turnover housing to reduce illegal dumping from multifamily and transient dwellers. This project would provide incentives for landlords, tenants, and university and institutional housing directors to utilize existing services, with funding for services coming from initial housing deposits. Local jurisdictions and their partners in the residential community would collaborate to provide outreach and education and raise awareness. Another suggestion is to explore local opportunities to repurpose or reuse unwanted items.
5. **Regional Task Forces** (4) – This effort would form a regional group to coordinate anti-dumping and abatement efforts. The task force would be comprised of local governments and departments, state agencies, and law enforcement. The meetings would be open to the public, and businesses, schools, local institutions and residents would be encouraged to attend. The task force would assist with cleanup, beautification, community engagement, education and awareness, and would help with funding those efforts.

### **Apps/Websites**

6. **Clean Curb Hub** (11) – The Clean Curb Hub would share best practices and proven illegal dumping interventions in a universally accessible database. Government entities would be the primary contributors and users. The database would include project files on successful interventions and expected outcomes, based on demographics, geographical mapping of locations and other factors. The entries also would include costs, pro tips and points of contact. Clean Curb Hub would be maintained and promoted by city, county and state governments or a nonprofit entity.
7. **CleanCA.org** (3) – This project would develop a centralized campaign that would direct residents and businesses to local solid waste collection programs. The campaign would have a simple website, hotline and mobile app that would direct residents to programs in their area to prevent illegal dumping. The campaign would be heavily promoted throughout the state with a consistent message through a memorable slogan. The website would include template promotional materials for entities to use for education and awareness.
8. **Uber Junk** (17) – This intervention strives to offer immediate, on-demand bulky item removal for residents who want to dispose of items responsibly but lack the transportation or ability to remove items from their residences. This would be similar to ridesharing apps like Uber or Lyft and would be a commercial business with private funding sources. The app would offer instant price quotes by sharing pictures and description of items. The provider would not be paid until there was proof of disposal or recycling to prevent fly tipping. This effort would provide access to proper disposal for those in need and add jobs in the gig economy.



## Education/Outreach

9. **Clean Up, Clean Up, Everybody Clean Up (6)** – This project would bring educational programs to middle and high school students to raise awareness about illegal dumping prevention, by partnering with schools in neighborhoods affected by illegal dumping in the Central Valley. This would require an interactive presentation to be developed for student assemblies and classroom learning. There also would be a community cleanup project that would give students extra credit. This initiative would have a website with educational tools, presentations and webinars for teachers to use with STEM lessons. The effort would be promoted through partnerships with schools, cities, counties, CalRecycle and local nonprofits.
10. **Jury Duty Alternative Program (9)** – This intervention would require people not selected for jury duty to provide labor hours to clean up illegally dumped items or be held in contempt of court. This would provide necessary education to the public about illegal dumping and provide the labor necessary to perform cleanups.
11. **Starts at Home (2)** – This would be an education and engagement campaign to encourage communities to become stewards and advocates for clean neighborhoods. The effort would begin with a “teach the teacher” program through churches, civic groups and neighborhood associations to create awareness of how illegal dumping affects health and well-being. This initiative also would include working with local businesses, churches and schools to incorporate clean neighborhoods into their missions and foster community pride in keeping neighborhoods clean.
12. **Sustainability Curriculum Requirement (11)** – This intervention would establish a statewide sustainability curriculum requirement. The curriculum would include waste management principles, zero waste goals and lessons on the importance of clean neighborhoods.

## Policy/Enforcement

13. **Bulky Collection for All! (2)** – This effort would provide bulky item collection for each CA resident in a consistent manner. It would legislatively mandate that all waste contracts (residential, commercial and multifamily) include provisions for bulky item collection. The law would have a 5 to 10-year implementation period to account for existing contracts. There would be no surcharges for bulky item collection.
14. **Dumping Is a Crime! (7)** – This effort would legislatively mandate an increase in solid waste tip fees to fund enforcement of junk removal companies. The legislation would require a permitting system for all junk haulers, with reporting requirements, auditing procedures, and multilingual education and outreach. Junk haulers would be able to charge customers only with proof of disposal. Funding of this program would come from a \$1/ton surcharge on disposal tip fees.
15. **Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for Bulky Furniture (13)** – The goal of this illegal dumping intervention is to pass extended producer responsibility (EPR) laws for product categories commonly dumped illegally, including couches, shelving, other furniture and other large-item categories. The concept would follow current EPR programs, in which state government works with industries and manufacturers to pattern an EPR law for these items. The law would require funding for processing and remanufacturing/reusing. The proposed funding source would be a \$20 fee assessed at the point of purchase for each designated item.
16. **Prevent Contradictory Laws (0)** – The goal of this effort would be to prevent contradictory laws and regulations across different agencies and jurisdictions by appointing an illegal dumping advocate who would oversee and review all current and proposed regulations to prevent overlapping and contradictory regulations.



*Facilitator summary:*

Some of the interventions are realistic and already may be underway; others are more aspirational. Partnerships and education/outreach efforts dominate the interventions. Many interventions require state-level action, which implies the need for overall coordination or leadership by workshop participants or statewide decision makers. Further refinement of these interventions likely would alter which levels of government would be involved.

### **Intervention Designs (January 2020 Workshop)**

Participants in the January 2020 workshop discussed how the problems they named could be addressed in their communities. Due to limited time, the Intervention Design sheets were not always completed, but served to support and guide the conversations. Most of the interventions involve deeper cooperation and assistance from city and county governments to support community members working “on the ground.” Several interventions involve requests for meeting the minimum service level (e.g., getting bins delivered.)

#### **Services/Operations**

1. **Designated Landscaper Drop-off Location** – To address the lack of local access to disposal locations for yard and green waste, this effort would develop a community campaign to lobby local governments to designate areas where residents, gardeners and landscapers could legally dispose of green waste.
2. **Neighborhood Pride Days** – This effort would beautify neighborhoods by eliminating the blight of illegal dumping. Specifically, neighborhood groups would be formed to collaborate with city government and private haulers to provide no-cost curbside pickup days for bulky item disposal, ideally once per month. This would extend to rural areas where there is excessive dumping in open spaces and vacant lots. This intervention emphasized a need in Madera and Bakersfield (Kern County).
3. **Dead Animal Solution** – This project addresses the issue of widespread dumping of dead animals due to lack of access and economic barriers to other disposal methods, such as cremation through veterinarians. The idea is to develop a community campaign to lobby local Departments of Sanitation and public health agencies to pick up carcasses or provide no-cost legal disposal. This intervention was developed by residents of Stanislaus County.
4. **South Central Fresno Cleanup** – This targeted effort would create monthly inspections and cleanup in south central Fresno. The unhoused/homeless (or organizations supporting those groups) could be encouraged to participate for pay in the cleanup.
5. **Clean Up Apartments** – This project would adapt the Crime Stopper program model to illegal dumping. Local entities must enforce illegal dumping fines and, if an observer reports dumping in process, they would be compensated or provided a reward for the notification.

#### **Community Activity/Environmental Improvement**

6. **Welcome to the Park** – This intervention was developed by a group of high school students from Stockton who seek to improve the safety and decrease waste in a local Stockton park. Student groups, environmental clubs and local nonprofits would partner with private haulers to complete a weekend park cleanup project. Incentives and technical assistance would be provided for the weekend project.
7. **Clean 4 Tomorrow** – The Clean 4 Tomorrow project would require collaboration with Kern County government and other partners to provide containers, tools and equipment for illegal dumping cleanups and regular collection.
8. **Court Community Action** – This intervention, done in collaboration with judicial partners, would assign community service to local offenders to clean up illegally dumped items.



9. **Community Helpers** – This would be an outreach campaign via the youth group LOUD 4 Tomorrow and social media to engage local volunteers for a cleanup of parks and alleyways every two months.
10. **United for a Better Fresno** – This would be a neighborhood beautification project in which local volunteers would partner with nonprofits and others to clean alleyways of illegally dumped materials. After the alleys are clean, the local groups would pursue funding from government and private partners to beautify the alleys with plantings and murals to deter future dumping.

## Recommendations (October 2019 Workshop)

Major themes and key recommendations emerging from the October 2019 workshop:

### ***Theme: Technology***

Technology plays a key role in education and enforcement. There was interest in statewide geo-mapping of illegal dumping locations.

#### *Recommendations:*

- Evaluate web-based portal options that allow municipalities or other entities to enter and track data related to all forms of illegal dumping.
- Help participants stay up to date on the status of the geo-mapping project; draw pilot testers from workshop participants and others.

### ***Theme: Education/Marketing/Outreach***

Topics related to education/marketing/outreach were frequently mentioned. There was much discussion of the need for promotion of programs/behaviors and multilingual outreach, and the role of apps and social media.

#### *Recommendations:*

- Implement a statewide education campaign.
- Develop and promote bilingual outreach discouraging illegal dumping and the negative impacts on CA communities.

### ***Theme: Community***

The need to engage various interest groups and communities to foster community pride emerged as part of several discussions. In addition, the issue of the unhoused/homeless sparked conversation and may need more exploration.

#### *Recommendations:*

- Engage faith-based and community leaders and influencers to foster neighborhood pride through local campaigns and engagement.
- Local stakeholders develop network of neighborhood stewards to perform cleanups, identify hot spots, and advertise achievements and accomplishments.
- Host a similar workshop with a focus on assisting the unhoused/homeless.

### ***Theme: Enforcement***

Participants were interested in big-picture, statewide initiatives, especially for funding, policy and communication projects.





*Recommendations:*

- Pursue legislation or local ordinances to regulate small contractors and transporters to create accountability for proper disposal.
- Work to refine interventions within the participants' scope.
- Train and build a coalition among all levels of law enforcement and the judiciary on the societal damages caused by illegal dumping and the importance of penalties and, enforcement.
- Publicize penalties and violators to deter other illegal dumping.

### **Recommendations (January 2020 Workshop)**

There were noticeable contrasts in priorities and solutions between the October 2019 workshop participants and the January 2020 session attendees.

Major themes and key recommendations for stakeholders emerging from the January 2020 workshop:

***Theme: Access***

Attendees of the second workshop were more focused on the basics of providing, and in some cases improving, basic services, eliminating economic barriers to legal disposal and supporting community activism.

For example, several participants spoke about a lack of trash carts and bulky item pickup. It seems reasonable to assume that illegal dumping cleanup costs could be greatly reduced if residents had access to proper means of disposal, even if subsidized.

As might be expected, rural issues, such as a large number of dead domestic and farm animals, came to the fore at the January 2020 event. The issue of dead animals (not roadkill) is a significant one in the Central Valley, according to workshop participants.

*Recommendations:*

- Expand curbside bulky item collection.
- Develop multilingual communication on residential options for proper disposal.
- Partner with local veterinarians, animal groups and local governments to collaborate on economically feasible solutions to dead animal disposal.

***Theme: Community***

Participants in the January 2020 event spent less time discussing whether people “know” illegal dumping is wrong, and there seemed to be agreement that unsightly dumping was a blight on neighborhoods.

*Recommendations:*

- Develop neighborhood groups to monitor dumping and organize cleanup.
- Organize neighborhood beautification projects with local nonprofits, local governments and community leaders.

***Theme: Enforcement/Policy***

There were several comments around expecting and encouraging government to both enforce the law and clean up the problem. That said, there was general interest around having nonprofits and community groups lead the way in partnership with funders, haulers and civic officials.



*Recommendations:*

- Require offenders to clean up their illegally dumped items.
- Establish local illegal dumping task force to develop policy and actionable solutions.

## **Conclusions**

The experience of facilitating illegal dumping sessions in two different circumstances (full-day workshop in an urban setting with experts who work professionally on issues of illegal dumping vs. 50-minute sessions in a more rural location with residents, community leaders and activists) highlighted the complexity of the issue of illegal dumping. The results from both events indicate that because of the broad spectrum of illegal dumpers and dumping practices, multiple approaches are needed to reduce the problem. No one entity or approach will be able to solve the issue alone. It will involve legislative policy, government agency involvement, funding, evaluating solid waste collection methods, nonprofit assistance, education and outreach, community participation, behavior change and a collective commitment to collaborative problem-solving.

There are opportunities for MRC to take a role in tackling high incidences of illegal mattress dumping reported in local jurisdictions. The October 2019 workshop laid important groundwork for future efforts and a core group of stakeholders has begun to form. In the future, this group can provide feedback and refinement to illegal dumping interventions. MRC could assist by serving as a hub to distribute updates to the group

Future MRC efforts might focus on:

- Continue to promote the MRC's Illegally Dumped Mattress Collection Initiative to involve more organizations that govern and oversee the public right-of-way, such as special districts, CalTrans and nonprofits. Continue to aggregate and share the annual data from this program with CalRecycle and the participants of the initiative.
- Develop and promote bilingual outreach, not limited to social media, to promote the current and expanding free mattress collection sites and events listed on ByeByeMattress.com.
- Offer/sponsor professional development and training opportunities on specific topics, such as social media or behavior change marketing.
- Fund a behavioral change study in a geographic area identified as an illegal dumping hot spot.
- Opportunities to educate key decision makers on the issue of illegal dumping, with the goal of informing policy, regulation and funding of this problem at a statewide level.
- Share/promote more widely MRC's existing public-facing resources on dumping (billboards, PSAs, etc.). The messaging or templates could be offered to other organizations for use in their communities.
- Refine interventions from both workshops and determine if they can be applied to illegal dumping of mattresses in MRC-identified illegal dumping hot spots.



**Appendix A. Participants List (October 2019 Workshop)**

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Joseph Delgado	Sheriff	Alameda County Sheriff Dept
Joanne Brasch	Illegal Dumping Subcommittee Member	CA Product Stewardship Council Member
Stephanie Becker	Grant Manager	CalRecycle
Nicole Castagneto	Environmental Scientist	CalRecycle
Heather Beckner	Grant Manager	CalRecycle
Sharon Anderson	Coordinator	CalRecycle Illegal Dumping Technical Advisory Committee
Nayamin Martinez	Director	Central CA Environmental Justice Network
Maria David	Code Enforcement Officer	City of Antioch
Kenneth Roberts	Public Works Superintendent	City of Long Beach Dept of Public Works
Frank Foster	Operations Manager	City of Oakland
Mica Schuler	Management Analyst	City of Palmdale
Ed Ramirez	Environmental Services Specialist	City of San Jose
Thomas Wong	Senior Management Analyst	City of San Rafael Public Works Dept
Sergio Furtado	Manager	County of Kern Public Works Dept
Julia Lange	Homeless Advocate	Downtown Streets Team
Karla Ramos	Manager	Los Angeles Conservation Corps
Patrick Holland	Principal Engineer	Los Angeles County Dept of Public Works
Justine Fallon	Director of Operations	MRC
Liz Wagner	Program Coordinator	MRC
Abbie Beane	Consultant	MRC
Mark Patti	Program Coordinator	MRC
Mike O'Donnell	Managing Director	MRC
Dawn Carlson	Program Manager	Power Inn Alliance
Chris Lehon	Waste Crimes	Sacramento County
Rob Hutzel	President and CEO	San Diego River Park Foundation

###