

SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

February 17, 2023 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

SWAC Members Present		King County Staff	
Taylor Atkinson, Vice Chair, Citizen Representative		Brian Halverson, SWD staff	
April Atwood, Marketing and Education		Elka Peterson Horner, King County PSB staff	
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer		Eliza Kruszynski, SWD staff	
James Borsum, Labor Representative		Patty Liu, SWD staff	
Robin Freedman, Waste Management		Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director	
Phillippa Kassover, Local Elected Official		Amy Ockerlander, SWD Staff	
Bill Louie, Citizen Representative		Hannah Scholes, SWD Staff	
Penny Sweet, Local Elected Official		Andy Smith, SWD staff	
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry		Adrian Tan, SWD staff	
Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry		Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff	
		Dorian Waller, SWD staff	
		John Walsh, SWD staff	
Guests			
Phil Allen, non-member citizen		Kazia Mermel, Sound Cities Association	
Jeanette Jurgensen, Epicenter Services		Diana Wadley, Washington State Dept. of Ecology	
Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association			

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Atkinson moved to approve the minutes. Louie seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment

Wadley shared information on a couple upcoming grant opportunities beginning with the Ecology’s Public Participation Grants. There will be more money available this cycle than last. It is a competitive process available to individuals and nonprofits mostly to facilitate public involved in the form of cleanup of contaminated sites. However, the grants can also be used to improve public space management practices. If you focus on traditionally underserved communities, it can help boost the applicants score. The application period is through March 2 to April 5. Next, the Governor’s budget for the Local Solid Waste Financial Assistance Grant is at \$24 million, which is the same for the current biennium and Wadley is unsure if the legislature will keep it at that funding level but is hopeful that it will stay the same. Under the assumption that legislature approves that rate and King County shares it as previously done before, it will be very similar to this cycle. That application period opens in early April and runs through early May.

Wadley gave a shout out to the Sound Cities Association for running the Feb. 10 meeting relating to Compost Procurement Ordinances reporting. Cedar Grove also helped put this together. Ecology was able to be a speaker and attendees heard from California entities that were implementing their own versions. Ecology has been able to get more clarity around who is in and who is out on needing to do Compost Procurement Ordinances and reporting, and this guidance is new.

Wadley dropped her email in the chat: diana.wadley@ecy.wa.gov for any questions about Local Solid Waste Financial Assistance, Compost Procurement Ordinances, etc. For more information on [Public Participation Grants](#).

Mermel provided a link to the [recording](#) of the city compost panel hosted by the Sound Cities Association and Cedar Grove that Wadley mentioned.

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

Monthly tonnage

Overall tonnage for 2022 was down by 1% compared to 2021. The tonnage received is continuing to decline, with tonnage from Jan. 2023 down 14% compared to Jan. 2022. At this time of the year, inclement weather can account for such variances and can mess with month-to-month tonnage. Some of the tonnage that was pushed into Jan. 2022 was not pushed into Jan. 2023. We do not anticipate a significant drop in tonnage and will see how this plays out.

Consultant team highlights SWD as “gold standard” in waste management

Metropolitan Group, a strategic and creative services firm in Portland, is working with Portland METRO’s Waste Prevention & Environmental Services to strengthen the governance structure at one of their waste transfer stations. Their client (Portland METRO) elevated King County’s Solid Waste Division as a “gold standard” and the Metro Group is looking to connect with a manager to gain insight on our transfer stations daily operations.

Green Lunar New Year segment on Fox 13

The SWD’s EcoConsumer public outreach program’s Green Holidays project added web pages last year for Lunar New Year and Ramadan, which we feature during those times. SWD partnered with Fox 13 for a live, in-studio Sustainable Lunar New Year TV segment on the Fox 13 morning news (“Good Day Seattle”). This segment directed people to that Green Lunar New Year web page and featured some of those tips. Lunar New Year (aka Chinese New Year, or Tết in Vietnamese) was on Sunday, Jan. 22. This was likely the first time “Green Lunar New Year” has ever been featured in local media.

South County Recycling and Transfer Station (SCRTS) Construction Bids

We received the bids for the South County Recycling and Transfer Station (SCRTS) and are evaluating them now. There are very competitive bids from reputable companies, and we are excited to ground break as early as May.

SWD GreenTools hosted Salvaged Lumber Summit

We hosted over 170 participants from over 11 countries, 24 states/provinces, and four King County cities at the virtual Salvaged Lumber Summit. This was a great virtual summit trying to create a more circular economy for lumber and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Lumber, like many things that end up in the landfill, is not waste and could have been diverted elsewhere. SWD employees showcased the existing elements of a circular economy for salvaged lumber, with an eye toward diverting the more than 60,000 tons of clean wood per year landfilled at Cedar Hills. More than 100,000 tons per year of King County generated clean wood is burned as fuel in industrial boilers and could go to higher and better uses such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified lumber framing packages and as feedstock for mass timber. There are a lot of opportunities to divert these resources to be treated elsewhere.

MSWAC/SWAC Update

Sweet noted that MSWAC was the same but there were different discussions.

Re+ Update

Ockerlander provided the Re+ update.

Momentum is starting to build, with the official launch happening in late January. We received a lot of good press like this [CBS piece](#), and staff were on hand to answer questions.

We've completed several Re+ city presentations and have more on the docket. Our goal is to present to all 37 cities by June. We have four cities that have Re+ pledges approved – Shoreline, Woodinville, Clyde Hill, and Snoqualmie. Carnation has the pledge on their Feb. 21 Tuesday consent agenda and Bothell expects to approve this once they get it on their schedule. Our goal is to have 12 Pledges by May and 25 by the end of December. This has been a good process to date.

The Re+ Team is developing city "scorecards" which will be an easy-to-read document that shows what each city is doing, current contract terms and known actions taken to increase waste diversion. When complete, this already public information will be posted online in a searchable and comparable database for easy access. We hope that this data will help spur more activity and give cities opportunities to learn from each other.

Kassover wanted to know if we are using the data from the contracts or if we are looking at city programs that aren't related to the haulers for the scorecard. Ockerlander responded that we are using a combination of both things which are easy to access and share with folks.

Blazey commented that the document was well done and wanted to know if SWD is looking at subscription rates and hauling frequencies for organics. Ockerlander responded that we haven't internally had the conversation for subscription rates, but it is a good conversation to have. Regarding hauling frequencies, we will look at what is in the contracts and see who has what. This will be a good opportunity for cities to bounce ideas off each other.

Organics Survey

Kruszynski provided this update.

Another Re+ initiative we are looking at is King County's single-family food scraps capture rate. The Re+ Organics Diversion & Public Engagement survey looked at King County's single-family households' yard and waste collection rates with a capture rate of 18%. We are looking to improve those numbers and have a goal to achieve zero waste in the landfill by 2030. To achieve zero food scraps to the landfill, we need to 1) increase subscription to organics service among those who do not already have it and 2) increase the use of the organics service bins for those who already have it.

Currently, unincorporated King County and 19 cities do not embed organics. This means that there is no contract with the hauler where organic collection is included in the rate and do not have it automatically included in their jurisdiction. If a household is interested, they must individually reach out to the hauler and pay for that separately. In these areas, an estimated 60,000 single-family households (about half) do not subscribe to food/yard waste collection.

We want feedback on a few policy options that have worked elsewhere in King County and across the nation.

The first option is requiring all households with garbage service to subscribe to curbside organics, which would create new subscribers. The second strategy would be to reduce garbage collection to every-other-week, including embedding the rate in the contract. The City of Renton has done this since 2008, which has reduced traffic and the cost of garbage service. They've also seen their recycling rates increase 27% and yard waste by 44%, while decreasing their garbage by 18%. The third option would be to implement a food waste disposal ban. The second and third option would encourage the utilization of the service. Looking at the City of Seattle proves that these options work. Their yard and food waste capture rate are triple what King County's is.

While this is very early on, we want to engage the public where they are at and get a better understanding of how residents currently manage and dispose of food waste. We also want to better understand other factors that impact curbside service use – understanding cost as a barrier and how to mitigate it; service perception and quality; and home composting.

Two other objectives of this public engagement include getting feedback on potential policy options and soliciting any other ideas residents may have for promoting food waste diversion.

We are launching our public engagement survey of King County residents on Feb. 22. This will be actively promoted in Spanish and English for three weeks but will be open longer than that. After the three-week period ends in March, we will look at initial responses and demographics, and use that information to host an open house focusing on concerns people have named so far so that we can discuss them. Beginning in Q2, we will share the results of public engagement and recommended action(s).

Trim wanted to know how we are going to frame the survey; and if we were going to frame it listing the benefits that people get from curbside organics like saving money and reducing greenhouse gases. Kruszynski replied that we want to have an honest discussion on cost and other policy options, like garbage collection every other week helping garbage costs go down; and talking about figures like the amount of food waste going to the landfill every month per household.

Trim followed up asking why there wasn't a discussion on reducing methane. Kruszynski responded that we could talk about methane reduction, but the current focus is to understand where people are at. There is a part of the that focuses on motivation on why and where people are at, and why they are and aren't interested in curbside organics. There is not a direct connotation about methane, but we can add that.

Smith added that we have general communication that we push out about the benefits of food waste, and we really wanted to see where people are at. We did not want to lead people to a particular answer but the open house is a way for us to see what we are getting back from residents so we can then shape the open house agenda and the focus groups. If we hear from people that they want to hear more about the greenhouse gas benefits, that is great. But the overall intent is to find out where people are at and then we can develop a communication strategy around this work that would include the open house.

Trim noted her concern about checking where residents are at. She agreed that it is important to include this but asking residents about policy options and for solutions without telling them the costs and benefits seems like two different things that are getting mixed up. Smith thanked Trim for her feedback.

Kassover asked if this survey will be pushed out to people or if it will be on a website that would require residents to take action to come to the website and fill it out. She also wanted to know what role SWD wants cities to play in encouraging people to complete the survey. Kruszynski responded that the survey will be on the Public Input platform, but we will be actively promoting it on social media and postings on Nextdoor to help reach those smaller areas and communities. There will also be a press release and a section in an upcoming Department of Local Services (DLS) newsletter, and we will be sharing a media toolkit with cities. Ockerlander added that we will ask the cities to share this with their constituents and their social media groups. We will be able to reach their community easier with simple Facebook posts and we will try to utilize existing resources with good access to a large amount of people to get feedback.

Kassover commented on the strategy of the public survey saying that this runs the risk of not actually gathering data from marginalized communities who do not have access to the internet and/or online platforms; or do not spend time thinking about these things and/or have lives that are not in a place where they would voluntarily fill out a survey. She recommended that SWD looks at how we are going to survey marginalized communities and communities of color because from her understanding, especially those that live in multi-family housing, this is where the most difficult and lowest collection of both recyclables and organics occur. Kruszynski replied that we thought about that when designing the survey and as far as the online ads, we will be targeting certain areas where we know we want to hear back from - especially unincorporated King County. Another reason why we are doing the survey first is to get an idea of who we have heard from and where they are from, and then target those groups with the open house and focus groups. There is the limitation of who is online and who might hear this messaging, but we will try to overcome that with the focus groups primarily.

Smith added that the demographics we will be asking for are voluntary, but we want to take that data and build the next phase and identify where the missing voices are in the data that we are collecting. We can then refocus our engagement around that, including the open house and focus groups. If there are suggestions on using that approach and/or using a different approach, we would love to hear feedback on specific suggestions.

Atwood wanted clarification on if this survey focused on single-family households or multi-family. Kruszynski responded that while anyone can fill out the survey, our policy strategies would focus on single-family households first. But we are interested in hearing from everyone.

Weiker commented from the hauler perspective that if we implement some of these policy options, it will require cities to re-negotiate with their haulers in terms of rates and services. While this is all great work, the work that must be done at the city level is going to be complicated, especially right now as haulers are reaching out to cities about the rate restructure. This alone has taken two and a half years. Weiker's request of staff and the committee, is to consider engaging and partnering with cities after the rate restructure work is done, which should be done by June/July. If cities are bombarded with too much, given Re+ and long-term disposal planning, etc., there could be solid waste overload. It's important to keep haulers involved along the way so they can help engage and further the conversation rather than confuse or complicate things with solid waste partners and cities. Kruszynski thanked Weiker for the feedback.

Blazey wanted to know what can be done to increase curbside organic participation. He noted that the trucks are already out and running, and it seems like something can be done that would not require opening the contracts. And since the trucks are out, it appears that we just need to get more people signed up and subscribed. Weiker noted that this was looking more at reducing garbage to every other week and thinking about HB 1799 direction coming from Ecology on the commercial side.

Smith agreed with Blazey stating that this is not just about structural changes but is also about encouraging increased use of existing services. We are developing and rolling out a technical assistance program for the commercial side this year. This a good conversation to have around what are other things that we can be doing. We tend to rely on campaigns and there are other things that we can be doing. Cart tagging is often highlighted as some of it is more targeted to specific households or groups. We want to be having that conversation, and this work is nested in a much bigger program of organics that we are working on.

2023 Legislative Preview

Adrian Tan and Hannah Scholes provided the 2023 legislative preview.

The 68th session of the Washington State Legislature is a "long" 105-day session that began on Monday, Jan. 9, 2023, and runs through April 23, 2023. This week marked the end of the 6th week of legislative session. Today is the cut off day of getting bills out of the first committee of introduction. There are two new bills that will be talked about at the very end.

As a reminder, the Washington Recycling and Packaging (WRAP) Act is the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for consumer packaging and paper products. It will also include 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. It has successfully passed out of the policy committee and on Feb. 15, the bill had hearing in Appropriations. This is the next committee it must get through. The next step is to get voted out of Appropriations by Feb. 24 and we expect an Executive Session to have that vote next week. McLaughlin, Sweet and Trim (and others) testified. There has been a lot of negotiations to get the right language in the bill. A substitute bill was passed out of the committees and there were many changes.

Kassover asked what the strength of opposition is to the bill and what is the chance of it passing this year. Sweet commented that this bill has become a topic of discussion, and there's conversation around the bill being too big. There

must major negotiations, and there are significant issues and major opponents like the packaging industry. Sweet is concerned that this bill may not make it out this year. Weiker noted that the haulers and processors are concerned mostly about the bottle portion because it does not build on the current system they have. They do not know what it is going to cost residents, rate payers, companies, etc.

The next bill, 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. It is scheduled for a hearing on Feb. 18 in the Committee of Ways and Means. A substitute bill was proposed, with main changes around electric vehicle batteries and an included ban on disproving batteries in the garbage. There are some concerns about the phasing in of electric vehicle batteries. There won't be any penalties for customers but those type of batteries will not be allowed.

Sweet commented that this is a relatively easy bill.

Atwood wanted to know if there are other states that have a battery bill. Tan replied many states have them, with California being the latest state to pass one. The bill that we are pushing for is modeled after something that was passed in Washington D.C. The EPR is complicated but compared to the WRAP Act, it is much simpler.

We are also following the Right to Repair bill (HB 1392/SB 5464) and it is being sponsored by Representative Gregerson and Senator Stanford. 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. It was passed out of the House Committee on Consumer Protection & Business and referred to Appropriations, with a hearing on Feb. 20. There is a substitution bill that includes negotiations with manufacturers and whittling down of language.

The next policy we are tracking is on compostable products – HB 1033 Compostable Products. This would establish a stakeholder committee, or task force, to make recommendations on the development of standards for managing compostable (plastic) products by organic management facilities. There is a substitution bill that added recommendations for home composting and expanded representatives of that stakeholder committee to include a representative from the hospitality business and interested tribes. The executive session was Jan. 26.

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. This bill is sponsored by Representative Mena. It passed out of the Energy and Environment Committee and passed out of Appropriations unanimously on Feb. 9. There is a substitute bill that narrows down what types of floating foam docks are covered in the bill and adjusts the deadline on the phasing out of toiletries, as well as eliminating requirements for shower caps and cotton swabs.

Another House Bill that we are tracking 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. There has been no movement, but it is scheduled for a public hearing on Feb. 16 in the House Committee. It is unclear if it will be moving forward.

Another one update is on 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. This bill had a public hearing on Jan. 23 and passed out of the House Committee on Environment & Energy on Feb. 16. It is on track to moving forward and there is a lot of debate on getting industries on board.

We are also continuing to track SB 5287, HB 1264, HB 1422 and two new bills - SB 5376 and SB 5484.

SB 5287 concerns a study on the recycling of wind turbine blades that would look for different options. It passed out of the Senate committee on Jan. 27 but no other movement.

HB 1264 encourages equitable solid waste collection rates by requiring counties and cities to have their solid waste collection rates for different types of customers (e.g., single home, multi-family, etc.) on their website. This would include figuring out what the balance is between the rates people are being asked to pay and the rate they are paying. There was a public hearing on Jan. 26 but no other movement.

HB 1422 would exempt certain types of reusable packing materials from sales and use tax, which was seen last year. Right now, the tax incentives don't line up with reusables. There was a public hearing on Feb. 2 and is scheduled for an Executive Session on Feb 22.

SB 5376 is about allowing the sale of cannabis waste. Currently, cannabis waste is classified as a dangerous waste and is often disposed of in the landfill. It must be rendered non-useable by mixing it with things like kitty litter. This bill is to allow cannabis with low rates of THC (less than 10%) to be used for other things and not disposed of as dangerous waste.

Lastly, we are following SB 5484 which provides technical assistance to farmers and food processors in support of improved voluntary environmental stewardship. This bill furthers the efforts of the established Sustainable Farms and Fields Grant Program. This grant program makes it easier and more affordable for farmers and ranchers to implement climate-smart practices and projects that increase carbon sequestration/reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This can increase use of composting.

Long-Term Waste Disposal Options

Halverson provided the long-term waste disposal options section.

We previously sent out list of long-term disposal chapter updates. The deadline is today, Feb. 17, to provide us with additional changes and we've already received several. If you think of something in the future, please send them to us. We need today's cutoff to get started on the list. This will help us map out discussions through 2023.

The ask is to review the briefing paper with the list of items SWD came up with and speak with your decision makers.

There are a lot of evaluation criteria that roll into the six large aggregate 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.

We will send out a survey.

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.

In the past, Tetra Tech has used the 1-6 scale, but they've also used a weighting system of percentages, which is what we will be using to fine tune the criteria better. In the survey we send out, we will have you provide feedback and examples.

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. The weights are what is really driving the score. We want to get input from the committee for which of these options is best. We are still trying to figure out the most equitable way to develop these weights which will have an impact on the final scores.

The scores will be more useful to us once the work has been done. The consultants will fill in the blue number. This is an objective decision, and we feel that this can come from the advisory committees to score which ones we as a group and system feel are most important.

If you have any major updates, please send to us by today. Head back to your decision makers and ask about the importance of the criterion and complete ranking survey when it is sent out.

Mermel wanted to know what the timeline is for input regarding the development on the relative importance of the evaluation criteria. Halverson responded that we are developing the survey right now, but we had not developed the deadline yet. There is a little bit of time on this, and we do not want to rush it. We are still working on finding out what the most equitable and appropriate way is. We will let everyone know when the deadline is.

Tan provided a link in chat for [EPR for batteries](#) in other states.

Member Comment

Weiker thanked the Sound Cities Association (SCA) and Cedar Grove for hosting the webinar on Compost Procurement Ordinances reporting. It was well attended and there was a lot of good discussion around figuring out how to go about this organics bill.

Sweet stated that she would love to see the recording of the webinar. Mermel added a link in the chat to the [event recording](#).

Blazey noted that Cedar Grove helped facilitate this webinar and knowing who has experience using compost in their cities is the goal. He appreciated the commentary that if we work together on this and can show that we are closing the loop and using the product they're creating, we can avoid what is going on in California. In California, there's a different bill with draconian requirements on cities to procure compost. This is a good time and opportunity to explore that more with the

cities. The webinar had a great turnout and the moderator for SCA, Kazia Mermel, was excellent. If people are interested in materials, reach out to Blazey or Karen Dawson.

Atwood asked McLaughlin what the implications are if Re+ is really successful, how will it be handled, and what can be done. If we change what is being done now, there will be impact but the situation we are in now is not sustainable. McLaughlin thanked Atwood for her question and said that we have been thinking about this for a while and is part of the reason why we staged a rate restructure. We believe that we are going to reduce tonnage and we can not rely on garbage coming across our scales as our primary funding mechanism. We also believe that there are important players in the marketplace that are not at the table and right now local governments and residents are bearing the cost of recycling. In some cases, those costs have increased dramatically, and it is why we think EPR is a powerful and an important component of our future system to bring in missing funding to our regional system. We also must really rethink what is our regional system. We have traditionally associated ourselves as an organization that helps manage waste; and we have been doing a lot of outreach and work with schools and have helped with very creative award-winning prevention programs. As you all know, we have a lot of tonnage as “waste” and so we are thinking a lot about this reimagining of what does our business look like in this Re+ world.

McLaughlin is currently having conversations about this very thing with his staff, and there has never been greater potential to transform our regional system and achieve zero waste. This is within reach, but it will require new policies, partnerships, and funding mechanisms. Our landfill is not going to go away, even when we stop putting substantial amounts of waste in it; and even when it fills up, it does not go away. We must look at the funding mechanism and we still need to transfer facilities. He believes that this is going to be a combination of our rate restructure; bringing in our missing players (like producers) to help fund the impacts of the products being brought into the marketplace; as well as opportunities for us to harvest resources out of our landfill, like through our gas sales and other environmental attributes associated with it. What will happen if we do this with food waste and put it in digesters to produce gas and sell it. We have other recyclables that are being recovered out of the waste stream right now. Maybe there will be other funding mechanisms as we partner with the private industry on an ongoing basis, which is never going to change. Our private partnerships are important and are part of the system. We are thinking about the implications but are not concerned about it because we know that we are heading in the right direction and have the right partnerships with the cities and the businesses we are working with to have a sustainable business model, even as it shifts to resource management instead of waste management.

Blazey stated that recycling residuals and flow control are potentially a good funding source for SWD, and this is a topic that the committee will probably hear more of as Blazey gains more information. Something that is being seen at Cedar Grove is hauling out of county and not returning the residuals. They do their best to return the contaminated items and garbage that is hauled to Cedar Grove and pulled out and pay the landfill rates to bring it to the landfill. There are some operations that aren't doing that and wanted to flag this issue. To add on to Atwood's comment, Cedar Grove is here for the County to help with the transformation and looking at numbers from last year, there is over 50,000 tons of capacity in Maple Valley to help move these things around and get organics out. There is even more capacity in Everett. This is a wonderful opportunity because it is hard to site a compost facility, especially a local one in King County. Cedar Grove is also looking anaerobic digestion and there's a small pilot that is not yet finalized, but we are always looking at that. There are exciting things happening in this space and wonderful opportunities to divert more organics.

Weiker added that Recology, Waste Management, and Republic all have Material Recovery Facilities (MRF) that have been working for decades. They can only process what people put in the right bin at homes and businesses. In current contracts recycling is embedded in the overall rates, so consumers don't see the true cost of recycling. A lot of the recycling depends on where the commodities come from when they come out of the MRF's. We need end markets for materials we collect and process, and that is one of the challenges. This used to pay for the system and now it is in between. Getting people to do the right thing and put things in the right place and getting consumers to realize what the costs are and how the systems work is complicated and dynamic. A lot of people are confused, so being clear about what is made of recycled materials, what can be recycled, where it can be recycled, and what is done with the materials so that producers can use it again is another complicated part of the work too.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:48 a.m.