



Most cities on MSWAC have grant contracts to support Haz Waste collection or education efforts, and city staff will be hearing more from Carpine-Cazzanti or Tristan Gardner in the next month as they set up their 2023-24 grant contracts.

Donati and Van Orsow were thanked for their continuation as city representatives on the Haz Waste Moderate Risk Waste collection group. City of Kenmore Councilmember Corina Pfeil was also thanked for serving another year as the Sound Cities Association representative on the Program's Management Coordination Committee.

Carpine-Cazzanti shared her email in the chat: [jcarpine@kingcounty.gov](mailto:jcarpine@kingcounty.gov).

After thanking everyone for working to get the compost procurement ordinances across, Wadley shared that the [EPA Recycling and Education Outreach Grant Program](#) application deadline has been extended to Feb. 15, and tribal applications for [Grants for Tribes and Intertribal Consortia](#) is not due until April 4. Tribes and intertribal consortia are also eligible for EPA's Recycling and Education and Outreach Grant Program. Regarding the Precycle Innovation Challenge, applications opened Jan. 2 and close March 13. This is being hosted by Seattle Business network and Zero Waste Washington. The supportive program starts March 23 with finalists doing a Final Pitch Event on May 15.

if you'd like to get involved, you're more than welcome to do so as they're looking for people to be involved.

There are three main ways to get involved:

1. Become a Community Partner and help people learn more about this opportunity. This will include promoting the program and live event. All well-fitting applicants are encouraged to apply, and others to participate.
2. Be a Sponsor by boosting with money or in-kind support.
3. Use your expertise – mentors and judges are being sought to support and rank teams. Many areas of knowledge are desired, including market analysis, energy, health care, litter, etc. More areas can be found at the [Precycle Innovation Challenge](#).

## **SWD Updates**

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

## **Monthly tonnage**

Our tonnage for 2022 was 872,584 tons compared to 880,766 tons in 2021 (-1%). The difference in the forecast was down about 2%. This isn't unexpected and not concerning financially at this stage. We made gains from commercial collections but lost about 20k tons from the self-haulers. In addition, regional direct was 9,000 tons lower in 2022 compared to 2021.

## **NERTS**

Progress continues with the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station (NERTS) project. We are in the scoping process for this, and we completed virtual and in-person scoping meetings in Kirkland and Woodinville. We had high engagement and are thankful to city staff for showing up and showing support. We will produce a draft EIS later this year and will engage in another public engagement process.

SWD staff continue to meet and discuss with "impacted" Councilmembers about the project's status and field any questions they may have. The rescheduled Kirkland scoping meeting took place this week, with about 70 persons in attendance. This was the last opportunity to attend a scoping meeting to learn more about the process and submit comments in-person.

## **In the news**

SWD has been highlighted in the media by Recycling Today, where a King County pilot shows potential solutions for recycling plastic wraps and bags. The pilot involved using drop-off bins at local retailers for plastic wraps and bags. The pilot project was sponsored by Dow Constantine, Nova, General Mills and PAC Worldwide through the American

Chemistry Council (ACC), Washington. It was directed by Return-It, a nonprofit recycling organization. SWD and Seattle Public Utilities helped promote the pilot. Project partners set up drop-off bins for plastic wraps and bags used for groceries, produce, bread, dry cleaning, and food storage at eight grocers in King County and two in Kitsap County. Of the 25 tons of material dropped off in the bins during the five-month pilot, 95 percent will now be recycled into new products. These were processed by Merlin Plastics in B.C.

Bonkowski asked in the chat where the material was recycled. Tan responded that they were processed by Merlin Plastics in B.C and provided more information on the [plastic film pilot](#).

#### **Re+**

Ockerlander provided this update.

The Re+ launch originally rescheduled due to snow, will now be a soft launch with News Release in January. We are working on developing a city “scorecard” to harmonize information about what each city is doing to move towards a zero-waste future. We will be scheduling additional cities for representations and following up with cities that have already had presentations and asking them to move the pledge through councils. The city of Clyde Hill became the third city to sign the Re+ pledge, along with Shoreline and Woodinville.

The team is preparing to launch city Re+ grants in 2023 and this is a result of working with cities to see their bandwidth. The cities in the King County waste system will be eligible to apply and joint applications will be encouraged. We are also engaging with the Re+ community panel to get further input on the grant program. You can email [circulargrants@kingcounty.gov](mailto:circulargrants@kingcounty.gov) with any questions. There is a legislation update that contains several Re+ relevant bills.

Ockerlander dropped the “[Re+: Reinventing the waste system, transitioning to a sustainable economy](#)” video into the chat.

McInnis asked Tan in the chat if he knew how the plastic bag pilot differed from existing plastic bag and film collection at the stores. Tan replied that the difference with the plastic bag pilot was that the material was able to be recycled into new plastic film and not decking materials.

Paston requested that final plan be sent out so that cities can work with their programs in support.

Giem wanted to know if there were any updates on the rate restructure. Walsh responded that he will be coming back next month to have a short conversation on it. We’ve asked Epicenter Services to come up with a report and we are just waiting on one of the reports. The plan is to send it out at the end of the month and have a conversation about it next month. Maple Valley is the only city that has an updated contract with their hauler, so we are still waiting.

McLaughlin added that we finalized the plan with [Juno](#), and we anticipate that we will begin sending Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) down to Oregon in a pilot program as early as next month. We want to organize an opportunity for everyone to see that process and we will communicate with everyone as fieldtrip details become more finalized.

Tan stated in the chat that the main sponsor of the plastic film pilot was the American Chemistry Council (ACC) and some of their members. It costs money to ship, sort and process material. The ACC is looking for ways to expand the pilot, but the Extender Producer Responsibility (EPR) would be able to provide such services for the long-term. Some of the grocery stores in the pilot are still collecting plastic film, but Tan is unsure whether the material is recycled into new plastic film. We may be providing some grant funding towards plastic film recycling, but the operating costs would still need to be covered by businesses.

#### **SWAC Update**

No updates.

## **2023 Legislative Update**

Tan and Scholes provided the 2023 legislative update.

For context, about 30 percent of materials currently going to the landfill is packaging and paper products. Most of these materials (e.g., paper, PET, HDPE, metal & glass) are readily recyclable and recycling rates have stagnated in the past decade. Households in unincorporated King County pay \$88-175 per year for recycling services, which has increased on average 36% in the past five years. Residents are confused and have started to distrust recycling.

The Washington Recycling and Packaging Act (WRAP), or HB 1131/SB 5154, would address some of these issues. The backbone of the bill would require corporations to fund and coordinate residential recycling in WA, shifting responsibility to the producers. This would provide sustainable financing to recycling, which would save money for local governments and residents. It would create a harmonized list of materials collected from residents across the state, helping to reduce confusion and improve access to recycling services to all residents across the state. Which would increase reuse and recycling rates; and ensure that materials are recycled responsibly.

On Jan. 5, 2023, HB 1131/SB 5154 was prefilled for introduction and there were hearings in both the House and the Senate on Tuesday, Jan. 17, which was available to watch online or in-person. The WRAP Act will include Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for consumer packaging and paper products (PPP), a Deposit-Return System (DRS) for beverage containers, and recycled content requirements for certain types of plastic packaging and products. This bill is being sponsored by Representative Liz Berry and State Senator Christine Rolfes.

This would work by beginning with a needs assessment that will determine changes needed to meet recommended recycle and reuse targets. The producers would form a PRO to coordinate and fund statewide recycling. The PRO would make a plan based on the needs assessment and the producers would pay fees based on the packaging and paper products they sell or supply in Washington. If the packaging is harder to recycle, they will pay more versus if it is easier to recycle. PRO will then collect the fees and reimburse local governments for residential recycling services. Rather than residents paying for the service, the PRO will pay for it.

There will be time for adjustments to be made and for the contracts to be adjusted for the PRO plan. There will also be an option for governments to opt out and have residents continue to pay for recycling. The Dept. of Ecology oversees the PRO program and there will be an advisory council that advises on the program with a diverse panel of experts.

Kassover wanted to know why the beverage deposit was included. Her city's current curbside seems to be doing a good job with beverage containers, so she was curious what the division's perspective was. Scholes responded that in certain parts of the state like Seattle, collection is very high, but in other parts of the state, it is very low. The beverage collection would include glass and there are a lot of places where glass isn't accepted in curbside at all. It is less convenient to take containers to drop off locations and this would enable reuse systems, so there will be more opportunities to reuse glass.

Tan commented that we are the only state on the west coast that does not have a beverage deposit system. There is a certain push to make this situation better and it has shown to be effective in reducing litter and we will be able to produce high quality plastic that's food grade approved. Scholes added that SWD is strongly supportive of EPR and of a deposit-system inclusion, but not as supportive if the deposit-system is stand alone.

Lam asked if the harmonized material list could be explained. Scholes replied that this would establish a state-wide list of recyclable materials so that it will be the same across the state.

Knight commented that she is supportive of the bottle return-system but has heard from people in her community about having this system and their thoughts about the transition in collecting it in the curbside and taking it back to the retailer will look like. There is also the issue of people combing through other people's curbside bins and wanted to know what the

discussion has been around this. Scholes responded that this has been talked about and this bill includes pathways for people who comb through these materials to work with non-profits. We currently do not have a strong solution for people going to resident's houses. Tan added that this is why it is so important that a Deposit-Return System works together with an EPR system because a DRS system could make it easier to collect these materials. More effort is needed to take containers to a collection point, so there are trade-offs being made. We've discussed this with our Re+ community panel, and there are some panelists who think that having an economic incentive to reuse is a good thing and that it might provide some opportunity to those impoverished. But it does pose other issues.

Knight followed up with the hope that there are conversations about this transitional period.

Best-Campbell wanted to know if there are other solid waste divisions in Washington that supports this bill and what outreach is being done to different counties. Scholes responded that King County is in a coalition with the Northwest Product Stewardship council. This is the main bill we are working on this year and there are decent number of local governments included in this work. Tan added that part of this coalition is the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) and the Washington State Association of Solid Waste Managers. There is a general support for EPR and continuing to follow the principles of not making things worse for the County and our residents. Tan stated that he hadn't heard about this being a key focus for local governments but some places that do not currently take plastic containers in curbside recycling, like Spokane, might be more open to this because they don't already have it.

Regarding SB 5144 EPR for Batteries, our Haz Waste program collects all types of batteries. Household batteries represent 18% of King County's hazardous waste collection. The main issue is the toxicity and corrosive materials which can cause fires in our waste trucks and facilities and there is evidence that shows that there is an increase of fire when these batteries are disposed of incorrectly. In 2019, 457 tons of household batteries were sent to the Cedar Hills Landfill. Only 12-15% of rechargeable batteries are recycled in the U.S. despite having a voluntary take back system. So, this is potentially a valuable source of recyclable metals and critical raw materials. There is a growing number of batteries expected to arrive on the market, and we need a system to manage these responsibly. The idea is to establish a Battery Stewardship Program for batteries that requires battery producers to fund and organize the collection and recycling of batteries in WA. SB 5144 EPR for batteries would establish a Battery Stewardship Program for batteries that requires battery producers to fund and organize the collection and recycling of batteries in Washington. As the program gets up in running, there will also be a ban in landfills.

Scholes added a link to the [Northwest Product Stewardship Council](#) page in the chat.

We will also be following the Right to Repair bill. Currently, manufacturers have reduced access to repair of digital electronic products and there are restrictions to parts, tools, and information about how to repair. There are many electronic products that could be repaired to extend their life and use but due to the digital divide, there is inequitable access to technology resources. This bill would require manufacturers of digital electronic products (i.e., those with a screen) to provide owners and independent repair businesses with access to parts, tools, and specifications. This will allow people to do their own repairs if they want. It hasn't been filed yet, but we are expecting that it will be filed soon. We saw that the governor of New York just signed their own Right to Repair Act and we will see how this goes in Washington.

Lam was curious if is this will be extended beyond household products. Tan responded possibly because there is a desire from the consumers, but it is a matter of getting there with industry. Lam followed up by wondering is this could expand to cars. Scholes replied that there is one state that has this bill with cars, so there is precedent.

The next policy we are waiting for is on compostable products – HB 1033 Compostable Products. HB 1799 established clear content on what can be labeled as compostable, but there are still many issues that need to be dealt with. Firstly, contamination in compost streams is a major issue because it is expensive to remove and can lead to plastic pollution. Secondly, composability of products and packaging and lastly, residents are confused with labeling and what's expected where. There is a stakeholder advisory committee being convened for HB 1033 that will make recommendations on the development of standards for managing compostable (plastic) products by organic management facilities.

Sweet wanted to know who is running the bill. Tan responded that it is being sponsored by Representative Leavitt.

Kassover asked if the outcome of this bill is to set up this committee or if it is to establish programs. Tan answered that this bill is to set up a committee that will provide recommendations that can be worked on or agreed on to move forward through legislation or other means to solve the issue. Kassover followed up with clarification on whether it will mandate any actions on communities or solid waste divisions across the state. Tan replied that it will not, but the committee might provide recommendations.

Sweet wanted to know why the legislature would do that. Tan answered that the recommendations are going to be to the legislature but none of this stops us from doing stuff on a county or regional level. Sweet replied that the bill doesn't feel ready. Tan responded that the focus of this is to convene people to try and figure this out. This is just getting folks together to come up with solutions.

Kassover wanted to know who is charged with setting up the committee and how does the division get involved. Tan answered that this will be set up by the Department of Ecology and there is a possibility for the County to be represented. And there will be a public period for all outcomes. Smith added that King County will participate in the process, and he will be reporting back regularly. Tan stated that the Dept. of Ecology must choose at least one representative from small and large counties.

We are also following HB 1085 Plastic Pollution Reduction which would require refill stations wherever drinking fountains are required in new buildings, phase out mini toiletries at hotels, and ban foam-filled docks and floats. When the foam docks get damaged, little pieces come off.

This bill had a hearing on Jan. 10, and it is available online.

Lam commented that most hotels are supportive of getting rid of those toiletries because of the cost. The problem is having the right type of bottles and attaching it to the shower, and there is the worry about contamination and a lot of it includes paying for large bottles that are not entirely empty. Scholes added that a lot of larger hotel chains have made commitments to doing the same thing.

Ockerlander added a link to [HB 1085](#) in the chat.

Another House Bill that was just passed is HB 1164, the EPR for appliances containing refrigerants. This would establish an Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for appliances such as refrigerators, freezers, air conditioners, heat pumps and dehumidifiers. The refrigerants and the foam can emit greenhouse gases and these appliances contain refrigerants and foams that contribute to global warming. The fluids need to be properly collected and managed to ensure that they are not released into the atmosphere. To drop one of these at our transfer stations, there is a \$30 fee.

Ockerlander added a link to [HB 1164](#) in the chat.

Lastly, we are tracking HB 1185 on Mercury Light Bulbs sponsored by Representative Hackney. This will entail phasing out mercury-containing light bulbs and updating the existing LightRecycle EPR program. Fluorescent lights are more energy-efficient than the traditional incandescent lights, but they do contain a small amount of mercury. LED lights are now more energy-efficient and less toxic. It will also include ways to recycle all different types of light bulbs and would remove the environmental handling fee, as well expand collection of these lightbulbs and outreach.

McInnis wanted to know if this would expand the existing EPR bulb program for LED lights. Scholes replied that it will and the phasing out of fluorescents.

Ockerlander added a link to [HB 1185](#) in the chat.

Tan provided brief information on SB 5287, concerning a study on the recycling of wind turbine blades. The bill would require WSU to study the recycling option of wind turbine blades in Washington. Scholes provided a link to [wind turbine blade \(SB 5287\)](#) in the chat.

### **Long-Term Waste Disposal Options**

Walsh and the Tetra Tech team provided the long-term waste disposal options section.

Walsh stated that we are seeking input on non-long-term disposal options from MSWAC and SWAC. We want to create a list of major policy related items to discuss further in 2023 and are trying to solidify things by March. The long-term option is on a separate track and is based on the study we are conducting looking at different long-term disposal options. This will help us map out discussions throughout 2023.

We previously sent out a list of what we think are some major policy items. Examples of MAJOR items include creating a harmonized recycling list, pursuing mixed waste processing, and updating for the rate restructure. Some examples of NOT Major items include updating visuals and graphs, adding updated information about new studies (e.g., waste characterization), and grammar corrections like “there” instead of “their.” We are trying to find out what members want to discuss in the second part of 2023.

Waller sent a review email in November and will resend the list. Walsh asked that members look at it and update it with decision makers in each respective city. Please return comments and suggestions to Waller by Feb. 17. SWD will review suggestions, collate them, and then present the updated list at the March Advisory committee meetings and finalize it.

Arbogast presented on behalf of Tetra Tech.

The prime consultant in this effort is Tetra Tech, a solid waste planning & engineering consultant with over 38 years of experience and have been doing a lot of work with clients throughout North America. They have about 600 staff and since 2010 have had a 400% revenue growth, with over 1,600 current solid waste projects, and were ranked Top US Solid Waste Consultants 8 out of the last 10 years by Engineering News-Record. They will be supported by three subconsultants because a lot of what is being studied will need expert matters involved:

- B-Town Consulting, a King County Small Contractor and Supplier (SCS) firm founded by Terrill Chang with 40 years of solid waste planning and Waste-to-Energy (WTE) experience. Their responsibilities will be WTE and Pyrolysis Analysis Support.
- WIH Resource Group, with 17 years of experience in solid waste planning, including waste-by-rail and waste export. Their responsibility will be Waste Export Analysis.
- Cascadia Consulting Group, a King County SCS firm specializing in environmental, social justice and public outreach. The responsibilities include Environmental and Social Justice Impacts Analysis.

The project overview began with the King County 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan which set forth policy to maximize the life of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill but did not specify what the County will do after the landfill closes. The goal of the study is to provide information to King County and other stakeholders (cities, haulers, residents) on potential long-term disposal options to pursue after the landfill closes. The County has identified 5 long-term disposal options that will be evaluated. The disposal options will be analyzed and quantitatively evaluated for six primary evaluation criteria and three tonnage scenarios provided by SWD. Tetra Tech will compare options against each other utilizing the six primary evaluation criteria scores and importance weightings for each criterion. A comparative analysis matrix will be developed for each of the three tonnage scenarios provided by SWD to rank options. This will also include meetings and presentations, and report outs.

The five potential long-term disposal options that will be studied are:

1. **Waste Export:** transporting MSW by train to a regional landfill for burial and landfill gas collection
2. **Waste-to-Energy (mass burn):** incinerating MSW to create energy, recover additional recyclables, and reduce volume, transforming MSW, using high heat, high pressure, and limited oxygen, into usable products – typically synthetic gas (syngas) that can be used as a fuel, industrial chemicals such as ammonia and methanol, fertilizer, and potentially a fill material for construction, roadbeds, etc.
3. **Gasification:** transforming MSW, using high heat, high pressure and limited oxygen, into usable products – typically synthetic gas (syngas) that can be used as a fuel, industrial chemicals such as ammonia and methanol, fertilizer, and potentially a fill material for construction, roadbeds, etc.
4. **Pyrolysis:** transforming MSW, using high heat, high pressure, and no oxygen, into usable products – typically oils, solid carbon or char (used as a solid fuel, soil amendment, and for industrial processes), syngas, and other chemicals.
5. **Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF):** MSW is shredded and mixed to a standardized size, inert materials such as metals and non-combustibles are removed, and dehydration is undertaken for remaining steam to increase and standardize the heating value of remaining materials.

There are six evaluation criteria that the long-term disposal options will be evaluated and quantified on. Those categories are:

1. **Environmental**, which includes human health, climate change, air quality, water quality (consider water consumption as well), energy production, resource conservation, and compatibility with waste prevention and recycling.
2. **Economic**, which includes capital cost, operating cost, revenue generated, and risk.
3. **Operating History**, which includes proven performance, safety record, environmental compliance, and compliance with regulatory requirements.
4. **Availability**, which includes capacity, operating life of facility, and siting, design, permitting and construction requirements
5. **Social**, which includes environmental justice, social justice and equity, and effects on livability and character of communities
6. **Contract and Operation Requirements**, which includes a minimum level of waste required, composition of waste required, waste not accepted/ability to handle special waste, residue disposal requirements, and compatibility with current collection and transfer systems.

The three tonnage scenarios given by SWD, depending on the success of Re+ plan are:

1. **Low Tonnage**, which reflects Re+ having major impacts. Tonnage expected to be much lower, about 300,000 tons annually, and waste characteristics dramatically different with much less attributed to organics (food, wood) and traditional recyclables (cardboard, paper, plastic).
2. **Medium Tonnage**, which reflects in-between scenario. Tonnage reduced to about 700,000 tons annually and the waste characteristics somewhat changed with lower organics and traditional recyclables.
3. **High Tonnage**, which reflects Re+ having minimal impacts. Tonnage expected to continue to be around 1 million tons annually with similar waste characteristics in 2019 waste characterization study.

The evaluation and comparative analysis that will be performed is quantitative. Each of the long-term disposal options will have a quantitative analysis to evaluate them. Following the evaluation, a qualitative comparative analysis will be conducted to compare and determine how each disposal option achieves established goals for specific decision-making criteria identified for the Study and for each tonnage scenario. Since the evaluation criteria are not of all equal importance, goal weights of importance for each of the goal evaluation criteria categories will be established by SWD and stakeholders. In determining appropriate category weights, the most important category(s) will be weighted the highest: 6 points and the least important category weighted the lowest: 1 point.

Finally, the Goals Achievement Decision Matrix (GAM) is where quantitative measures will be used where possible to define each goal and to determine how each option achieves those measures. Accordingly, a raw goal achievement measure or score will be allotted for each option and each criteria goal. The raw goal achievement measures may be

expressed in different forms (e.g., dollars, greenhouse gas emission reductions, vehicle miles traveled, etc.). To provide a common measure, goal achievement points will be assigned to each option in proportion to the percent of the goal achieved up to a maximum of 5 points (e.g., if an option achieves 100 percent of the goal, the option will be allotted 5 points). To complete the GAM, goal weights of importance are multiplied by goal achievement points to derive goal achievement scores. The option with the highest additive score for all the decision criteria goals would be considered the best at achieving the overall goals of the Study.

In terms of reporting, Tetra Tech will draft a long-term disposal options report which will include an options analysis and evaluation methodology, a comparative analysis matrices, stakeholder and decision-maker involvement, and study results for each of the scenarios.

Moldver asked via chat what the schedule is for the study and when the MSWAC members will have an opportunity to weigh-in on decision points. Walsh responded that the final version is looking at a September/October timeframe. We will be getting input from the committee on weighting in the next month and we are working on how to incorporate community engagement in this process which might push the timeline out a bit. We will have to figure out how to take MSWAC and SWAC's input and put it all together. Arbogast added that as they complete their analysis, they will have proposed check-ins for weightings.

Knight wanted to know about how the criteria and scenarios will relate to the proposed legislation that will potentially impact waste streams as they relate to recycled materials going through. Arbogast responded that a lot of the data given will be applied to the waste characteristics so they will get tonnage scenarios, like the low tonnage scenario which will have a lot of programs in the data that is provided to them. Walsh added that SWD had to include something about the productiveness of programs and some guesses were made.

Kassover followed up to Moldver's question and was curious what the goal is for the comp plan completion. Walsh responded that 2026 is when it would all be updated. The comp plan must go through a lot of reviews and the goal is that by the end of 2024, we will have a solid draft plan to start the bureaucracy of it.

Friedman had two comments. The first being that it seems that the goal of the study is to get out of the King County landfill and that he doesn't see a replacement option. The second comment being that the options that are presented seem like options that should be done today if feasible because what is trying to be done seems that it can be done as soon as possible with or without the landfill. Walsh replied that we are trying to maximize the life of the landfill through at least 2040, so we are already going down the path of keeping the landfill open through then. We also haven't had the discussion of what we are going to do after the landfill reaches capacity, so we are trying to decide that now so we can implement it before the landfill closes.

Gire thanked everyone for this presentation and wanted to know about the tonnage assumptions, and if the dates from there will inform the tonnage in the report. Walsh responded that we did make assumptions about when these items will kick in and how much materials will be taken out, and some of the numbers will change as we update the assumptions. It will be somewhere in the range of 300,000/400,000 to one million.

Moldver asked in the chat how many similar studies Tetra Tech has completed and if references can be provided to previous studies done for other regions so that MSWAC members can get a better understanding of what is expected in this study. Arbogast replied that they can provide that and will have to refer to the cumulative studies that the team has worked on. All of the disposal options have concerns more specific to the client, so they may not include all five of the options, but they will be in a handful of studies done by others.

Moldver followed up wanting to know if it was common to have new waste-to-energy facilities at former landfill sites to mine the facility. Arbogast responded that they have seen many options, primarily for space. They are going to have to have a very centroid location for the facilities, and they don't want to necessarily assume that it will be cited at the landfill. The focus was on the type of disposal options and not where it is going to go.

**2023 MSWAC Work Plan (draft)**

Waller led this section.

In Q1, there will be monthly state legislation updates, a Re+ single family organics/collection survey, a Re+ awarded grants showcase, the long-term disposal study kickoff, comp plan chapter update list, and rate restructure status check-ins.

Sweet commented that what might be helpful is to get an update on the current technologies that are being evaluated in the study. Walsh replied that over the next four months, they will come in every month with an update and by June, all the technologies should have been highlighted. Arbogast added that there will be an extra meeting for reviewing the technologies so the matrix might be done a little later than June.

In Q2, there will be a state legislation update with a closeout come April and May, monthly rate restructure state check-ins, and updates on three capital projects – the South County Recycling and Transfer Station Project (SCRTS), the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station project (NERTS), and the Cedar Hills development. There will also be a NextCycle and market development update, a preliminary evaluation matrix of all long-term disposal options, a Re+ future grants update (circular economy, city & potential schools), and a Re+ Mixed Waste Processing (MWP) pilot.

In Q3, there will be a draft long-term disposal study, rate restructure status check-ins monthly, preliminary evaluation matrix of all long-term disposal options, non-long-term disposal topics (e.g., harmonized recycling list), and a CompostWise/Ordinance work update.

Waller added that people can add topics throughout the year as long as there is lead time for staff to prepare.

In Q4, there will an update on the three capital projects mentioned in Q2 - SCRTS, NERTS, and the Cedar Hills development. There will also be updates on waste acceptance work, Construction and Demolition (C&D), non-long-term disposal topics (e.g., harmonized recycling list), and a preliminary evaluation matrix of all long-term disposal options.

Moldver wanted to know if there were more information on bonds. Walsh responded that we first need to finish this long-term disposal work before we can have the discussion on bonds.

Knight reminded everyone that in Q1, MSWAC needs to elect officers, so people need to need to be thinking about who they put forward as their Chair and Vice Chair.

Friedman asked in the chat if this plan includes an update on the steps being taken to implement Re+. Ockerlander replied that a lot of this work will help inform next steps for Re+ and one thing that we are doing is gathering information on cities with scorecards, and we will be sharing this information with the cities to help with next steps.

Waller will put this year update in a longer form and share it with the committees before the February meeting.

**Discussion: Rate Restructure Matrix**

A chart was shown on screen of a Rate Restructure matrix with possible milestones and timelines.

Possible milestones	Possible timelines
Begin Contract Negotiations	Q4 '22 – Q1 '23
Complete Contract Negotiations	Q1 '23 – Q2 '23
Introduce City Legislation	Q2 '23 – Q3 '23

An example of a Rate Restructure matrix in usage with the city of Maple Valley.

City (Hauler)	Began contract negotiations	Complete contract negotiations	Introduced contract amendments	Adopted city legislation
Maple Valley	Green/Yellow/Red	Green/Yellow/Red	Green/Yellow/Red	Green/Yellow/Red

Every month, the city statuses will be shown on the matrix based on a green/yellow/red progress.

Waller called on Shaw to ask about Maple Valley’s contract amendments. Shaw responded that they haven’t taken it to council yet, but it is ready for council. Their consultant is working on a few things, so they decided to hold off on taking it to council just yet.

Kassover wanted more information on the whole process of contract negotiations and the rate restructure and asked how the division is working with the cities that are working on contract negotiations. Kassover wanted to know if she should be alerting her city to get involved with these negotiations. Waller responded that he is directly sending emails to staff to start the process and see how it is going. Not every city in the system attends MSWAC and SWAC so he is responsible for communicating this process. Walsh added that hopefully staff can take the reports that will be sent out at the end of the month and use it.

Searcy reminded everyone in the chat that Enumclaw performs its own collection, so Enumclaw can be shown as N/A or Green in the matrix.

Gire wanted to know if it made more sense to make this more simplified. Every city could be a little different so some processes may not require council to make every city have the same process.

Nelson asked why SWD didn’t follow the point that LWAM did when they made their rate restructure. There is a lack of transparency in the process and because the haulers are talking directly to the cities, we will end up with several different methods and it seems that the smaller cities could get taken advantage of.

Sweet was curious if there had been conversations with the haulers. Walsh replied that we have presented a couple different options, and ultimately settled on the fixed charge. As part of the fixed charge, there is a requirement that cities and haulers spread the charge out amongst the constituents. The caveat with this fixed charge was also how to spread the charge out. Due to this, we hired Epicenter Services to come out with different templates for cities to use. It is not SWD’s place to say which option should be put into contracts for the cities. We have made ourselves available and have reached out to cities, but we’ve been providing more information than direction on how to spread out the charge.

Sweet followed up by asking if the intention of the templates was to give Recology options to work with. Walsh answered that when templates are received, you’ll be able to see the different options to spread out the costs. Walsh asked Moldver if Redmond has been able to come up with something with Waste Management.

Bonkowski responded that they were still working with Waste Management to figure out these issues, but it has been a struggle due to things like an additional 1% admin fee from Waste Management, which comes out to almost \$100,000. They are getting somewhere, and it may not look exactly like what it is Epicenter’s report, but they should be getting close to it. Bonkowski is positive they will get it done but is just unsure of what it will look like. They were trying to get the contract amendment finished by September and will ideally have it done by April council.

Sweet added that at SWAC, Wendy Weiker might be able to provide more information from the hauler’s perspective.

**Member Comment**

No member comments.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.