



their interests and how to best communicate with them. A letter inviting their participation was mailed to about 3700 residents on Feb 7. SWD will share the results of the survey with MSWMAC.

### **WA Ecology Grant**

The Solid Waste Division has been awarded a \$36,000 grant from the Washington State Department of Ecology to fund an electric vehicle charging station at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill.

### **SCRTS (South County Recycling and Transfer Station)**

The division is nearing the 30% design milestone when major design elements are defined and scope, schedule and budget are refined. Part of that process is to evaluate recommendations from the Value Engineering Study. Those recommendations aim to improve the performance and cost effectiveness of the preliminary design.

The noise report is completed and found that any noise from operating SCRTS would be overwhelmed by traffic noise from West Valley Hwy and Hwy 167. The division continues to work with the City of Algona and others as we struggle with wetland impacts.

4Culture's Public Art Advisory Committee approved two artist opportunities for the site. One is for permanent, site-specific or site integrated artwork. The other is a site-based residency opportunity.

### **Emergency Proclamation**

The King County Executive is considering an Emergency Proclamation for the recent rains. The proclamation would allow the division to extend operating hours to process storm debris or allow the division to close stations should that be necessary. It would also allow the division to waive fees for storm debris disposal. MSWMAC members are asked to tell SWD if storm debris disposal is a challenge in their communities.

### **2020 Legislative Session**

The legislative session is a 60-day "short" session and is about halfway through.

**HB 2496: Providing for responsible environmental management of batteries:** This product stewardship bill is dead. However, it had support from the Washington Retail Association, the Washington Association of Counties, and the WRRRA. It even had support from Tesla. Proponents have a good understanding of stakeholder interest, support and concerns about the bill. There was no identified opposition but there was not enough time to address questions in this short session. Further stakeholder work is expected in the interim and the bill is in a good position for the next session.

**HB 2360: Establishing the sharps waste stewardship program:** This is a stewardship bill to manage unwanted medical sharps. There was an attempt to run an amended bill as a proposed substitute in Appropriations. The bill is now dead.

**ESSB 5323 Reducing pollution from plastic bags by establishing minimum state standards for the use of bags at retail establishments:** This bill passed out of the Senate and is still alive. The bill prohibits a retailer from providing a customer a single use plastic bag or a paper or reusable plastic bag that does not meet recycled content requirements. It requires a retailer to collect a pass-through charge of \$0.08 for each recycled content large paper or plastic carryout bag provided.

There are three bills related to product stewardship for solar panels.

**JB 2389 Establishing a comprehensive, statewide photovoltaic module recovery, reuse, recycling, and end-of-life program – Repeals the solar module stewardship law:** The bill states it is an act related to product stewardship but contains no system to implement that stewardship. The bill is dead.

**SHB 2645 Concerning the photovoltaic module stewardship and takeback program:** This bill would amend the existing stewardship law to fix several issues and keeps the current program on track. It was referred to Rules 2 Review on February 7, 2020.

**SSB 6622 Establishing a comprehensive, statewide photovoltaic module recovery, reuse, recycling, and end-of-life program (task force established, no repeal):** The bill delays by several years, existing requirements (per RCW 70.355). It would establish a task force to address the processing system and financing methods. A substitute bill has passed, and the bill was referred to Ways and Means on February 7.

**HB 1632 Reducing pollution from single-use plastic food service ware:** This bill was moved to House Rules “X” file meaning it is no longer eligible for consideration. There were many concerns about feasibility and what products were covered. The discussions needed would require more time than was available in this short session.

**SSB 6213 Concerning certain expanded polystyrene products:** Banning polystyrene has environmental benefits, however, this version of the bill reduces the list of covered materials to only packing peanuts and single use food containers. There is a lot of concern about the impact of the bill on business. It was referred to Rules 2 Review on February 11, 2020.

**ESHB 2722 Concerning minimum recycled content requirements:** This bill increases the percentage of post-consumer waste content required in plastic beverages containers and increases the pace. The bill is still alive and was sent to Senate Environment, Energy & Technology.

**SWAC update** – The SWAC meeting was a mirror of this meeting. There was significant discussion of the Arcadis study, and the committee discussed rate development. Kassoer noted the need to think more regionally rather than by jurisdictions.

### **Northeast Recycling and Transfer station (NERTS)**

The need for Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station was outlined in the 2019 Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan. The Houghton Transfer Station has been in service for more than 50 years and lacks the capacity to provide service for the expanding population. It also lacks Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) services and the full suite of recycling. The new station is set to open in 2027. It will be more convenient and address service equity. More services will be provided, and it will include more modern features allowing it to be a better neighbor.

This project is at the beginning of the planning process which begins with siting. Prospective host cities include Kirkland, Woodinville, Redmond and Sammamish which comprise our Core Cities team. Before any decisions are made, there will be a collaborative process between King County, the Core Cities, and the people in those communities. The Department of Local Services will also be included as they represent community members who live in unincorporated areas that may be impacted by facility siting.

King County is currently in negotiations with a consultant team to support siting, design and outreach. The selected consultant team is Jacobs Engineering and the public involvement subcontractor is EnviroIssues. There is a long conceptual timeline resulting in opening a station in 2027. SWD expects siting to occur in the next couple of years which will include environmental reviews and Environmental Impact Statements (EIS).

The Core Cities team began monthly meetings last November. The team has discussed preliminary site screening criteria based on the criteria used for South County Recycling and Transfer station. They also discussed a preliminary budget and approaches to community engagement.

No siting decisions have been made. The Core Cities will be very engaged before and during the siting process. The division will eventually convene a siting advisory committee and will be asking Core Cities to help determine members.

Each of the Core Cities was asked to complete a Community Profile Questionnaire to help the division understand demographics and community characteristics including what is valued by the residents and what issues are of greatest concern. The division is also interested to learn about what essential facilities are currently in the host communities as well as what, if any, major construction projects are underway or in planning.

The next steps are to convene a Core Cities Communication Subcommittee and begin to introduce the project to the community. There will be an inclusive, transparent, authentic involvement plan which will be reflected in the Equity and Social Justice Community Engagement plan. Communicating early helps to set the tone for the project and limit the spread of misinformation. It's also important to explain the basis for the project to avoid debating decisions that are past the point of influence.

Sweet asked who the division will be looking for as members of the Siting Advisory Committee. Kolb-Nelson responded that membership has not be defined. The division will work with the Core Cities and the consultant to make those decisions. She noted that the siting advisory committee is not the only way people can be involved. Other tactics and tools will be used to share information widely and gather input from many people and groups.

Ventrella asked how the four cities were selected and asked if it is a positive or negative for a particular city to be chosen. McLaughlin responded that the site will be selected in the regional service area which is defined by looking at the customer base; where they come from and what access they have to services. Sweet added that hosting a transfer station is great for the community. However, a newer facility than the current Houghton Station would better meet the community's needs. She has toured SWD's newer facilities. They are seen positively by the community. Others noted transfer stations encourage recycling. McLaughlin added that a transfer station in a community mean there are lower transportation fees for the haulers which result in lower curbside rates. Also, a transfer station with a complete suite of recycling mean the city doesn't need to spend money on recycling events.

In response to a question McLaughlin said the new Recycling and Transfer Stations are designed to be sufficient for forecasted population growth. They also focus on diversion and are equipped with compaction.

Schimek complemented the division on the open and transparent Core Cities Team meetings. The City of Redmond does have some concerns but is feeling heard. He reiterated that is it important to be clear why decisions are made.

### **2021-22 Rate Development**

The division currently offers a range of recycling services at transfer stations. Except for Algona, the stations offer recycling services for cardboard, plastics, paper, glass and cans similar to curbside collection bins. Expanded recycling services for materials like textiles, scrap metal, tires, plastic film, Styrofoam, bicycles and non-CFC appliances have been added to stations variously throughout the system. The division doesn't charge customers who use these services.

Though many customers believe the revenue from selling the materials collected exceeds the cost, “free recycling” services costs money. Those costs have increased from \$150,000 in 2017, to \$450,000 in 2018 and \$960,000 in 2019. Since the goal of Zero Waste of Resources means that these programs will be expanded, it is important to determine how they will be funded.

Rather than relying on the tipping fee to pay for “free” recycling, SWD proposes a Transaction Fee collected from each vehicle that crosses the scale. The preferred alternative of \$4 on every transaction would provide \$8M in biennial revenue. The impact on curbside customers would be about four to five cents each month. This would help to support free recycling, illegal dumping and Zero Waste of Resources activities.

Other items are recycled for a fee at some locations including CFC appliances (\$30/appliance), yard waste (\$75/ton with a \$12 minimum) and a pilot program for recycling mattresses (tipping fee).

The cost of the mattress recycling pilot exceeds the revenue generated. Currently the division charges the tipping fee for each mattress or box spring recycled and allows up to six pieces to be delivered. The division proposes to change the fee to \$30 per piece which is projected to raise \$300k in biennial revenue. This keeps the fee the same as is charged in the private sector. It’s not the division’s intent to become the preferred provider for mattress recycling.

In response to a question, Walsh said the transaction fee would be charged on all vehicles as they enter the facility. It applies to all transactions even if all the customer is bringing is free recycling. The only exception would be for ORCA lift customers who would be exempt from the fee.

Kassover said it’s hard to understand what difference it will make to people that don’t self-haul. Honaker responded that curbside customers will pay through an increase in monthly costs of approximately four to five cents per month. Self-haul customers paying the minimum fee currently pay \$25. Adding the transaction fee would change their cost to \$29.

Nelson asked why the division wants to separate transaction vs. tipping fees. Walsh said separating it into buckets makes it transparent to user that they are being charged for the services provided at the station. And, it calls out that “free” recycling services need support.

Sweet asked if the division intends to share that message via signage. The division responded that it would be a separate fee on the receipt. In addition, SWD would provide handouts for Scale Operators to share with customers.

In response to Van Orsow’s question Walsh responded that the Household Hazardous Waste fees are separated out on the receipt. The transaction fee would also show separately on the receipt.

A member asked if imposing a \$4 transaction fee would impact Recology’s bicycle recycling process. The division responded that it would be discussed at the upcoming SWAC meeting.

McInnis notes that recycling mattresses would be a higher cost to the customer than disposing of the mattresses as garbage. And, mattress recycling is not available at all locations so that doesn’t seem equitable. Consider banning them at stations that don’t have recycling. Another option would be to continue to accept them at \$30 per piece whether or not they are being recycled. Handle them similarly to CFC appliances.

In response to Ventrella’s question Honaker said the four to five cent charge would be the estimated cost to the average curbside customer.

Kassover said that adding the \$4 transaction fee to the \$30 cost for recycling a mattress makes the total \$34. Once the cost is more than \$30 it seems like a lot and it may be a disincentive. It seems that there are certain things we want to incentivize people to do.

Nelson said there are a lot of illegally dumped mattresses. Consider using the \$4 fee to bring down the fee of mattress recycling. Gaisford replied that the division wants to be at the market rate and does not want to be less expensive than the market. Sanders said she would not want to see the cost to customers to be more than \$30.

In response to a question the division said the transaction fee was under consideration before beginning the mattress recycling pilot. The fee, which is a component of the rate would be proposed for the next biennium. SWD will provide the rate to DNRP next month, then the Executive in May, and Council in July. It would need to be adopted by early September so we can notify cities and haulers of the increase 90 days before it goes into effect Jan 1, per the ILA.

Van Orsow asked if the fee applies to both the mattress and box spring. The division replied that it did apply to both equaling \$60 per set. In response to a question Gaisford said the majority of mattresses collected are able to be recycled. Only a small percentage must be disposed.

In response to a question Walsh said the division intends to make preliminary decisions by the end of the month. However, MSWMAC will see rate and fee information again and will have several months to influence the decisions.

The division proposes an increase in yard waste fees. Currently the fee is \$75 per ton which hasn't been changed for some time. Adjusted for inflation, the fee is \$90 per ton. To recover the actual costs the fee would be \$97 per ton. The division is proposing a \$100 per ton fee which compares with the City of Seattle fee of \$110 per ton.

In response to questions, the division said that the minimum fee for up to 300 pounds of yard waste is \$12 and most customers pay the minimum. The proposed fee would change the minimum fee to \$16. The division anticipates that the proposed \$100 fee will cover costs for the next couple of years.

Sanders said that with the addition of the transaction fees, the cost to the customer for a minimum fee for yard waste would change from \$12 to \$20. She recommended the division consider a hybrid tipping fee to smooth it out.

Van Orsow asked what portion of the current cost of \$97 per ton is the tipping fee, what portion is transportation costs and what is internally handling cost. Walsh responded that the cost at Cedar Grove is \$58 per ton. Where the division does the hauling, the cost of hauling is \$40 per ton. In some locations the division pays for the hauling services for a higher price which varies by location.

Thompson asked if the division had considered adding a per capita fee based on the relative wealth of the neighbors. Walsh responded that SWD will be looking at a new rate structure in the next biennium and may consider a per capita fee.

In response to Schimek's question, Walsh said the division heard concerns at the meeting today and that the advisory committee will continue this dialogue over the next few months. However, cities are welcome to follow up with an email or phone call if they prefer.

McLaughlin said this is the type of dialogue is needed to figure this out. Expenses must be covered somehow. It can be done per ton as has been done in the past or we can begin moving toward charging for the cost of a service and making those cost more transparent. The answer is probably a bit of both. It's important to consider how these fees will help move toward environmental goals. These fee choices will be part of a full rate proposal.

Kassover asked if the division is required to cover its own costs as opposed to requesting resources from the General Fund. Walsh said the division is an Enterprise Fund and one fund cannot benefit another.

In response to Nelson's question, Walsh said the ORCA Lift program will have the \$4 transaction fee waived. However, if the minimum tipping fee goes up the minimum ORCA Lift fee will also change, continuing to be approximately fifty percent of the minimum tipping fee.

### **ZWR Tour**

As discussed last month, the Zero Waste of Resources (ZWR) Tour will give provide a unique opportunity to see how other organizations are "focusing on the 70", and ways to incorporate and improve on those practices in our region. Gaining that insight will then allow the creation of a new regional vision for a future utility that manages waste by creating resources.

Travel has been planned to four areas. In order to make travel arrangements, participants need to confirm by the following dates.

- California – confirm by February 29
- Northeast – confirm by March 6
- Pacific Northwest – confirm by March 27
- Southeast – Confirm by March 27

King County is proposing that everyone covers their own costs. However, the division was going to book ground transportation. Participants are asked to cover hotels, airfare, meals etc. The division will do the trip planning and recommend hotels and flights. In addition to Advisory Group members, it is appropriate to invite elected officials. Waller will send an email with cost estimates by segment.

Ventrella suggested making a video of the tours to share the information while decreasing costs. McLaughlin responded that some of the information shared will be proprietary but when plausible, a video will be part of the report from the travel. Others also suggested videos or live streaming. High level itineraries follow.

Bay Area and Southern California – April 1 – 3

April 1

- Travel
- Blue Line Biogenic CNG Facility – Dry digestion faction: organics to biogas
- Recology MRG – Advanced optical sorting

April 2

- RethinkWaste – MSW organics to feed waste water co-digestion
- GreenWaste – This "Dirty MRF" pre-processes "wet" waste

April 3

- rPlanet Earth 100% post-consumer plastic packaging producer
- Titus MRF Services – Secondary MRF that processes residuals
- Return to SeaTac

## New York, New Jersey & Pennsylvania – April 26 - 29

April 26 – Travel

April 27

- Tour of NYC CORE – Organics – food waste use as a feedstock for co-digestion
- Newtown Creek Waste Water Treatment Plant – Organics – Food waste use processed in co-digestor

April 28

- Fabscrap – Textile recycling and reuse
- Terracycle – Zero-waste reusable packaging – partnering with P&G, Unilever, Nestle, PepsiCo, Coca-Cola

April 29

- City of Philadelphia Innovations – meeting with City officials on their innovation projects
- Return to SeaTac

## Florida & Georgia – May 10 – May 13

May 10 – Travel

May 11

- SWA Waste-to-Energy Plant – “Advanced and clean” waste-to-energy power plant in North America
- Afternoon – flight to Savannah, GA

May 12

- Georgia Pacific’s waste-to-paper pulp process – Post consumer waste paper processing with anaerobic digestion
- Shaw Carpet Recycling Processing Plant – Carpet recycling and market development

May 13

- Pratt Industries Recycled Paper Mill – 100% recycled cardboard paper mill.
- Return to SeaTac

## Pacific Northwest

May 28

- Drive to Oregon
- Arlington landfill
- Roosevelt landfill

May 29

- Covanta waste to energy: Waste incinerator
- Agylix: Polystyrene chemical recycling
- NORPAC paper mill – post consumer feedstock

## **Member comment**

Van Orsow expressed concern about the published workplan of the Regional Policy Committee which includes two planning topics around solid waste. He noted that the RPC doesn’t appear to be following the language in the ILA. Others noted that there appear to be parallel discussions in other venues. McLaughlin said he would gather more information and follow-up with MSWMAC.

Salamack said that the City of Shoreline has created a new interactive recycling guide and recycling quiz. Go to [Shorelinewa.gov/recycling](http://Shorelinewa.gov/recycling) for more information and to take the quiz.



Kassover announced the Green Fair at Lake Forest Park on Saturday, March 11 at 10:00 a.m.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 1:11pm.