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Methane emissions from landfilled food are fueling our climate crisis. In 2018, 34 percent of the waste stream to California’s municipal landfills was organic waste, such as food and green waste. Landfilled organic waste emits 20 percent of California’s methane. Also in 2018, an estimated 1.1 million tons of potentially donatable food were discarded in landfills. Yet, more than 250,000 households in Los Angeles (LA) County were food insecure (i.e., without reliable access to sufficient food) in 2021, and more than 66,000 individuals experienced homelessness. Although food waste and food insecurity are arguably caused by separate factors, California’s 2016 food recovery mandate, Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383), could make an important contribution toward mitigating the climate crisis and food insecurity. SB 1383 was passed in 2016 as part of California’s broader climate strategy. It aims to divert and reduce the disposal of organic waste and therefore reduce emissions from super-pollutants, such as methane, from landfills. This effort includes the recovery of edible food for human consumption. SB 1383 covers organic waste at food outlet and household levels; in this report, we focus on the logistics of recovering excess edible food from food outlets. We draw on past research, a review of SB 1383 government documentation, and interviews conducted in early 2022 with 38 stakeholders representing food recovery organizations (FROs) and food recovery services (FRSs); food recovery advocates; county, city, and state agencies; human services agencies (HSAs); edible food generators (EFGs); and waste haulers. In this report, we review food recovery in LA County and specific challenges relating to SB 1383 implementation, and we suggest ways in which the mandate could be turned into an opportunity for innovation and capacity-building.
What Is SB 1383?

To tackle climate change, California legislators passed SB 1383, also known as the California Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction law, in 2016. This unfunded mandate aims to divert and reduce the disposal of organic waste and thereby reduce the amount of methane emissions from landfills. Its statewide goals derive from 2014 baseline metrics of organic waste disposal, including reductions of 50 percent by 2020 and 75 percent by 2025. In practice, this means that any person who creates organic waste, in household or commercial settings, must collect and divert that waste according to local regulations. In addition, the law stipulates that “not less than 20 percent of edible food that is currently disposed of is recovered for human consumption by 2025.”

The law is being implemented through a progressive schedule by local jurisdictions, such as cities or counties. Jurisdictions are ultimately responsible for implementing edible food recovery programs and ensuring compliance. They also have the authority to charge and collect fees to recover costs incurred in complying with the regulations. In this report, we focus on excess edible food that is disposed by Tier 1 EFGs (e.g., supermarkets) and the role of FROs and FRSs, HSAs, government agencies, and jurisdictions (see Figure 1, which describes the Tier 1 SB 1383 participants). Our analysis focused on LA County, where SB 1383 is implemented across 89 jurisdictions (i.e., 88 cities and the county).

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFG</td>
<td>edible food generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRO</td>
<td>food recovery organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS</td>
<td>food recovery service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>human services agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1383</td>
<td>Senate Bill 1383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tier 1 Stakeholders in Food Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EFGs</strong></th>
<th><strong>FRSs</strong></th>
<th><strong>FROs</strong></th>
<th><strong>HSA</strong>s</th>
<th><strong>Government Agencies &amp; Jurisdictions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Edible Food Generators</em></td>
<td><em>Food Recovery Services</em></td>
<td><em>Food Recovery Organizations</em></td>
<td><em>Human Services Agencies</em></td>
<td><em>Department of Public Works &amp; CalRecycle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets, Wholesalers, Grocery Stores</td>
<td>Specialist Food Transportation Providers</td>
<td>Food Banks, Soup Kitchens &amp; Others</td>
<td>Emergency Shelters &amp; Social Services</td>
<td>Paid Civil Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>Mostly Volunteers</td>
<td>Mostly Volunteers</td>
<td>Mostly Volunteers (food)</td>
<td>Implement &amp; Monitor Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to Reduce Loss &amp; Cost of Waste</td>
<td>Focus on Food Sourcing &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>Recover Food, Prepare Meals, Transportation</td>
<td>Food is Only One of Many Services Offered</td>
<td>City or County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying Geographic Range</td>
<td>Varying Geographic Range</td>
<td>Varying Geographic Range</td>
<td>Locally Oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Tier 1 Stakeholders in Food Recovery
An Overview of What We Learned

Our analysis of the stakeholder interviews suggests that although the goal of the law has been generally accepted and is seen as an opportunity to innovate, the food recovery implementation process is complex. Interviewees agreed that tackling food waste and reducing landfill methane emissions is necessary and timely. However, many felt unprepared for the complexity of the mandate’s implementation, and the regulation was perceived to have inadequately accounted for several practicalities of food recovery. Data collected through this study indicate that SB 1383 is expected to bring the following three significant changes to food recovery:

• It will potentially increase the amount of donated food for recovery and distribution.
• It formalizes the relationships in this process through contracts or written agreements.\(^\text{12}\)
• It increases data gathering and reporting requirements for everyone involved.\(^\text{12}\)

How these aspects materialize will likely differ with each jurisdiction’s food recovery program. In LA County, for example, there are many kinds of EFGs, including more than 12,000 grocery stores and supermarkets, 2,000 convenience stores, and 90,000 restaurants,\(^\text{13}\) though not all meet the size criteria for edible food recovery requirements.\(^\text{12}\) There are also at least 800 FROs.\(^\text{13}\) Within each jurisdiction, some organizations must comply beginning on January 1, 2022 (Tier 1), while others have until January 1, 2024 (Tier 2; see Figure 2, which details some of the logistical characteristics in LA County and the specific criteria for Tier 1 and Tier 2 EFGs).

Capacity problems with food recovery predate SB 1383, including a dramatic variation in physical, financial, and human resources, so the ability and willingness to respond to the new mandate are mixed. The organizations that are affected by the mandate in LA County operate at different scales, sometimes with competing priorities and varying levels of interactions (see Figure 3, which gives examples of organizations in each category and the roles they may play at key stages in the food recovery process, from supermarket donation, to handling by food recovery organizations or services, to final distribution to recipients). Their traditional approach, based largely on personal connections and relationships, may be inadequate to meet the food recovery goals of SB 1383.
Tier 1 (2022): supermarkets (with gross annual revenues of $2 million or more), grocery stores (total facility size equal to or greater than 10,000 sq. ft.), food service providers, food distributors, and wholesale food vendors.

Tier 2 (2024): restaurants (250+ seats, or a total facility size equal to or greater than 5,000 sq. ft.), hotels with an on-site food facility and 200+ rooms, health facilities with an on-site food facility and 100+ beds, large venues, large events, state agencies with a cafeteria with 250+ seats or total facility size equal to or greater than 5,000 sq. ft., local education agency with an on-site food facility.
Although simple in principle, food recovery is quite complicated and involves considerable uncertainty. Unlike traditional food supply chains, which are driven by customer demand and profit, food recovery depends on available supplies, which determine the amount of demand that can be supported. Donations vary in size and frequency, making it difficult to predict volume. Food safety is of utmost concern, and donations require sorting by FROs or HSAs to ensure recipients get food that is safe to consume. Moreover, different food types, such as chilled, shelf stable, and cooked food, require different handling, transportation, and storage (see Figure 4, which charts logistical considerations from the moment donated food leaves EFGs to the point of delivery to recipients: i.e., HSAs and individual consumers). Organizational flexibility to collect, receive, store, sort, process, and distribute different food types is essential.

Additional capacity issues that could weaken implementation of the law include disincentives to collaborate (causing interorganizational competition), jurisdictional complexities and inefficiencies, a lack of public awareness and organizational training on SB 1383, variations in motivation across entities, systemic inequities in food recovery capacity, and limited organics recycling infrastructure. Without further capacity-building, SB 1383 may compound preexisting problems, thus weakening its implementation.
Figure 3

Stakeholder Roles in Food Recovery

**Edible Food Generators – EFGs**
Supermarkets, restaurants, etc.
Not all offer delivery or drop off

**Food Recovery Services – FRSs**
Specialist food transportation providers
Not all provide sorting or storing

**Food Recovery Organizations – FROs**
Food banks, soup kitchens, & other nonprofits
Some also prepare, cook, & serve food

**Human Services Agencies – HSAs**
Social services & consumers
may also pick up from FROs

**Food Insecure People**
Consumers may also pick up
from FROs & HSAs
Variations in Donated Food Add Complexity

**Fresh Food Is Time Sensitive**
Collection • Sort • Store • Sometimes Cook • Distribution

**Chilled Food Is Temperature & Time Critical**
Timed Collection • Sort • Store • Sometimes Cook • Timed Distribution

**Frozen Food Is Temperature Critical**
Refrigerated Transport • Refrigerated Storage • Refrigerated Distribution

**Cooked Meals Are Temperature & Time Critical**
Timed Collection • Human Services Agency Distribution
In this section, we describe eight common capacity challenges that at least one-third of Tier 1 study participants identified in their discussions about how SB 1383 might be implemented in LA County (see Figure 5). Below, findings are delineated by organization type, including statements indicating where findings apply to all stakeholders. Many of these challenges precede SB 1383, and some interviewees describe how these long-standing challenges might hinder the mandate’s implementation. We also cite evidence from past research in support of the findings from the interviews.
### Key Findings, Potentially Actionable Next Steps, and Recommended Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Challenges</th>
<th>Next Steps &amp; Recommended Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Physical infrastructure</strong>: Inadequate refrigerated transportation and cold storage</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Consider funding that is better suited to food recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Workforce</strong>: Inadequate staffing and dependence on volunteers</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Explore how funding models can incentivize interorganizational collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Fiscal resources</strong>: A patchwork of short-term funding streams</td>
<td><strong>Research</strong>: Expand logistics modeling and consider systemic solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Interorganizational relationships</strong>: disincentives to collaborate and lack of coordination</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Examine ways to better coordinate implementation across multiple jurisdictions (e.g., public-private partnerships).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Governance structure</strong>: an inefficient approach across numerous jurisdictions and among stakeholders</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Encourage innovation and help facilitate the impartial assessment of food recovery technologies. <strong>Research</strong>: Evaluate and compare food recovery programs across jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Information resources</strong>: limited awareness of the law and insufficient education about its complexity</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Continue to develop educational assets, such as CalRecycle’s webpage. <strong>Practice</strong>: Expand statewide awareness of SB 1383, with educational and training programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Organizational culture</strong>: motivational diversity</td>
<td><strong>Practice</strong>: Identify and reward jurisdictions and organizations that are innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. System characteristics</strong>: uneven capacity for food recovery and limited access to waste recycling and composting infrastructure</td>
<td><strong>Research</strong>: Examine preemptive waste avoidance at the food retail level. <strong>Research</strong>: Explore how to mitigate perceived negative byproducts of inadequate recycling infrastructure, such as transport emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
donations would be disruptive to the scale of existing workflows. Smaller organizations, on the other hand, are keen to accommodate smaller donations but often lack logistical support, such as refrigerated transportation and cold storage. Some of these smaller organizations suggested they had reservations about potential supply increases, in part because they or their distribution sites (e.g., food pantries, HSAs) lacked the physical capacity to distribute more food.

2 | Workforce: Inadequate Staffing and Dependence on Volunteers

Given the expected increase in donated food and the formal data gathering and reporting required by SB 1383, all stakeholders described staffing challenges, with some variations. FROs experience challenges with workforce turnover. However, FROs and FRSs also noted acute shortages of truck drivers and significant dependence on volunteers to reach organizational goals. This is consistent with prior findings. Although these are perennial issues, they were exacerbated by the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Staffing among FROs and FRSs ranged from 12 to 17 paid staff (full- and part-time), as well as hundreds of volunteers,
for each organization. Both interviews and past evidence suggest that this staffing model might create a host of organizational conflicts, including ambiguous roles, power imbalances, and reliability problems, because relying on volunteers can cause complications in efficiently matching available labor to workload demands. Finally, staffing shortages were also an issue for jurisdiction agencies, where staffing levels were perceived as not commensurate with the growing list of responsibilities under the mandate.

3 | Fiscal Resources: A Patchwork of Short-Term Funding Streams

FROs and FRSs are funded primarily through a patchwork of public grants and philanthropy. Interviewees pointed to three challenges that this model introduces. First, many grants vary in what costs they support. With a few exceptions, such as CalRecycle’s Edible Food Recovery grants, funding covers equipment, such as trucks or refrigeration, without supporting the operating staff. Other costs, such as maintenance or fuel, might be covered for the duration of the grant or not at all. Second, managing reporting requirements for multiple ongoing grants and seeking new funding can be especially burdensome for smaller organizations. Third, the grant terms are typically a few years, which was perceived to inhibit long-term planning and other organizational development.

Overall, the funding landscape creates a paradox: Organizations need more resources (e.g., staffing) to be able to compete for, acquire, and manage additional funding. There was agreement that more funding is needed to acquire capital assets and human resources; per statute, SB 1383 gives jurisdictions the authority to charge and collect fees to recover the local jurisdiction’s costs incurred in complying with the regulations. Several jurisdiction-level agency representatives explained that they were still exploring the optimal ways to fund FROs and FRSs to achieve the highest impact. Examples included targeting funding to organizations that can receive and manage it or empowering larger FROs and FRSs so they can support smaller organizations.
4 | Interorganizational Relationships: Disincentives to Collaborate and Lack of Coordination

Although stakeholders described collective efforts to share information and resources, we also heard about key systemic disincentives to collaborate, which is consistent with prior findings. Organizations with higher volumes of recovered food and distribution may be perceived to be more competitive for funding, although criteria and priorities vary across funders. Given that many FROs compete for the same funding sources, this was perceived to inhibit collaboration in three ways. First, it limits interest in sharing resources, such as transportation. Second, it creates competition for critical resources, such as trucks and refrigeration, resulting in inefficient duplication of efforts. Third, it may occasionally encourage opportunity hoarding (e.g., information on donations available for collection).

SB 1383 coordination efforts across FROs, EFGs, and jurisdictions were in the early stages at the time of our study (early 2022). Many FROs noted difficulties in establishing contact and building rapport with EFGs. Moreover, several FROs and industry representatives expressed concerns that SB 1383 implementation may be affected by the nature of existing agreements between EFGs and FROs that work with larger national FROs. These agreements were perceived to constrain the number of FROs with which EFGs choose to or can work. In turn, this was perceived to introduce inefficiencies into the food recovery process, as well as create waste. For example, an EFG may have agreements with only one or two FROs that can only collect excess edible food from that EFG one day per week, leaving the edible food available the rest of the time to go to waste.

5 | Governance Structure: An Inefficient Approach Across Numerous Jurisdictions and Among Stakeholders

In LA County, SB 1383 is implemented across 89 jurisdictions (i.e., 88 cities and the county). Data indicated considerable leeway in how jurisdictions
can become compliant with SB 1383,\textsuperscript{12} which introduces significant decisionmaking complexity. Each jurisdiction can design its own food recovery program that is consistent with its gap analyses and capacity assessments. In interviews, some jurisdictional stakeholders suggested they were taking the lead in implementing their food recovery program, including exploring opportunities to support FROs and FRSs and match EFGs with FRSs and FROs. Others were considering contracting with nonprofit agencies to run their food recovery program. Each jurisdiction will have its own local enforcement agency.\textsuperscript{12,20} This variation in program design and enforcement was perceived to affect FROs, FRSs, and EFGs that operate across jurisdictions and, in some cases, across multiple counties. For example, for EFGs, this is likely to frustrate a chain-level standardized approach to food recovery protocols and staff training. Finally, some respondents also expressed concerns about costs and resources to conduct enforcement in a timely and meaningful way, especially because inspections are defined as “site visits,”\textsuperscript{12} which some interviewees understood to exclude virtual inspections.

6 Information Resources: Limited Awareness of the Law and Insufficient Education About Its Complexity

SB 1383 was signed into law in 2016, the regulatory text was finalized in November 2020,\textsuperscript{12} and the law went into effect on January 1, 2022. Under the mandate, jurisdictions must educate EFGs about their food recovery programs and what they are required to do.\textsuperscript{12} Despite this extended period of preparation, interviewees suggested that, during the first three months of 2022, staff from EFGs, FROs, HSAs, and jurisdictions were still learning about the edible food recovery part of SB 1383, their responsibilities, and how to comply. Overall, discussions noted deficiencies in both public awareness about SB 1383 in general and stakeholder understanding of technical aspects of the food recovery regulation. Most were confused by the regulations, describing them as “obtuse” and “hard to understand and explain.”

These deficiencies were attributed to a lack of coordination in messaging across the many entities engaged in awareness raising (e.g., state and jurisdiction agencies, waste haulers, FROs, EFG industry representatives, and the media). Discussions pointed to significant ongoing education conducted independently by each organization for their specific audiences. For example, state and local agencies mentioned years of outreach efforts to various stakeholders to get buy-in and clarify roles and responsibilities, which were met with varying levels of receptiveness and understanding. These early educational efforts
decisions about the use of these apps to facilitate compliance or improve the food recovery process.

### 7 Organizational Culture: Motivational Diversity

Organizational motivations included waste prevention, waste management, cost-saving, serving people, and improving health outcomes, depending on the organization’s role in the food recovery system. Despite some overlap, important differences emerged, which may translate into conflicting stakeholder behaviors that could impede SB 1383 progress.

FROs and FRSs tend to be volunteer-based, nonprofit organizations with principal commitments to social and food justice along with equity, community well-being, and public service. For many, a core value is the distribution of healthy and nutritious food as a way to address health disparities and preserve client dignity. The final SB 1383 regulation text recognizes this value and does not prohibit FROs from refusing to accept edible food that may fall below their nutrition standards.

Most EFGs are for-profit organizations, making efficiency and profitability important. They may prefer waste prevention because it could help reduce the costs of acquiring, handling,
and disposing of excess food. EFGs are also reputation- and brand-conscious. Concerns about food chain safety once branded food products are outside their control can persist despite protections under state and federal Good Samaritan laws. Quality and safety concerns may limit the number of FROs to which EFGs donate. Although SB 1383 requires that EFGs prioritize edible food recovery over organics recycling services, interviewees suggested some EFGs might plan to manage these risks by accepting SB 1383 penalties as regular business costs.

Finally, jurisdictional agencies reported that their key motivation is to fulfill their SB 1383 responsibilities within their remit (most often, waste management). Some of the aspects of SB 1383, such as food recovery, were seen to be outside their traditional competence, requiring jurisdictional agencies to learn and understand the motivations of FROs and EFGs.

8 | System Characteristics: Uneven Capacity for Food Recovery and Limited Access to Waste Recycling and Composting Infrastructure

Stakeholders identified disparities in the capacity for food recovery and inadequate recycling infrastructure as key systemic issues. First, the food recovery infrastructure was perceived to be inequitably spread across the county. In some densely populated areas, the food recovery landscape is more robust, with multiple stakeholders (FROs, EFGs, waste haulers) operating in a small geographic area. Other regions are more sparsely populated (e.g., Antelope Valley), with fewer FROs and waste haulers operating there, thus limiting options for food recovery partnerships. This finding aligns with prior data showing some LA County communities have many low-income residents (e.g., Antelope Valley) and few FROs: i.e., fewer than four per 10,000 low-income residents (see Figure 2).13

Second, stakeholders expressed concerns that opportunities for waste reduction may be missed because of inadequate infrastructure for recycling inedible food. Although this was seen as a secondary issue for their operations, FRO representatives explained that some waste will inevitably result from sorting a higher volume of recovered food and disposing inedible food. This transfers the responsibility and cost of recycling or composting from the EFGs to the FROs, with a few FROs noting long distances to the nearest composting facility. The state’s infrastructure for organics recycling is perceived to be inadequate, particularly in Southern California compared to other parts of the state. Several participants, including local and state agencies, acknowledged ongoing efforts for market development at the state level and anticipated large investments, but they emphasized that these efforts take many years to complete.
What Are the Opportunities for SB 1383 Implementation?

This review of research and stakeholder perspectives from the early stages of SB 1383 implementation in LA County offers a glimpse into challenges and opportunities for innovation in meeting the mandate’s food recovery goals during the early stages of implementation. As the most populous county in California, with urban and rural features and governance through numerous and diverse jurisdictions, LA County could serve as a helpful example of the implementation issues that may arise in other counties. However, these findings also indicate that additional research may be needed, and some important questions may be better addressed later (for instance, once jurisdictions have fully developed their food recovery programs).

Although the limited time and geographic scope of this review may preclude a more robust set of recommendations, the data suggest the following potentially actionable observations at this time that all stakeholders should consider (see Figure 5):
• Consider funding models that are better suited to the needs of food recovery, such as joint funding of capital assets and human resources, and explore how funding models can incentivize behavioral change, such as interorganizational collaboration.

• Examine ways to better coordinate implementation across multiple jurisdictions, including public-private partnerships (e.g., consortia of local government agencies, human service systems, FROs, EFGs) that encourage consensus-building around food recovery best practice, encourage information-sharing, and facilitate FRO and EFG connections.

• Continue to develop educational assets, such as CalRecycle’s dedicated webpage, and promote far greater awareness of this comprehensive resource.

• Expand statewide awareness of SB 1383 with educational and training programs that are flexible and thus capable of incorporating local jurisdictional variations.

• Encourage innovation and help facilitate the impartial assessment of technologies that can streamline food recovery efforts.

• Identify and reward jurisdictions and organizations that are innovative, have effective education programs, contribute to broader statewide goals, and deliver exemplary SB 1383 compliance.

The complexity and fragmentation of the food recovery landscape in LA County, as identified in this initial exploratory study, indicate the need for further and more specific research. Using our findings of the current challenges, misconceptions, shortfalls, and weaknesses evident in the early stages of the implementation of SB 1383, we can suggest the following areas of research that could help with the implementation of Tier 1 regulations, as well as Tier 2 implementation in 2024.
The following recommendations could help with the implementation of Tier 1 regulations:

- Because we found dramatic variation in physical, financial, and human resources, we recommend examining systemic solutions and logistics modeling to understand how to streamline service provision and more effectively use existing resources.
- Because funding support is perceived to be misaligned with food recovery processes, we recommend additional research in how best to fund this process, including a cost-benefit analysis of various funding models.
- Considering that jurisdictions develop their own food recovery programs, we recommend strengthening the evidence base with program evaluations and comparisons, with a view toward establishing best practices in food recovery in the context of such statewide mandates.
- Because of the perception that the food recovery mandate may result in additional waste at the FRO level, we recommend an examination of preemptive waste avoidance at the food retail level.

Although we interviewed only Tier 1 participants, many of them will also be involved with Tier 2 implementation, including FRSs, FROs, HSAs, and jurisdictions. Some of their suggestions point to the need to better understand the next phase of SB 1383.

We identified the following Tier 2 and longer-term issues:

- Tier 1 EFGs may differ from those in Tier 2, so we recommend qualitative and quantitative analyses of future preparedness among Tier 2 donors, such as hospitals, hotels, and major event venues.
- Given perceptions that the statewide infrastructure for waste recycling is inadequate and may have negative byproducts, such as transport emissions, we recommend exploring how to mitigate these issues.

Combined, additional data and ongoing evaluations could provide evidence to better steer California’s food recovery programs to success in achieving the goals of SB 1383.
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About This Report

California’s 2016 food recovery mandate, Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383), could make an important contribution toward mitigating the climate crisis and food insecurity. SB 1383 aims to divert and reduce the disposal of organic waste and therefore reduce emissions from super-pollutants, such as methane, from landfills. This effort includes the recovery of edible food for human consumption. In this report, we review food recovery in Los Angeles County (focusing on the logistics of recovering excess edible food from food outlets) and specific challenges relating to SB 1383 implementation, and we suggest ways in which the mandate could be turned into an opportunity for innovation and capacity-building. This report may be of interest to legislators and public officials who serve in the state of California, as well as those in public, private, and nonprofit sectors who are engaged in food recovery and distribution.
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