

SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

March 15, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

SWAC Members Present		King County Staff	
April Atwood, Marketing and Education		Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff	
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer		Lauren Cole, SWD staff	
James Borsum, Labor Representative		Fanny Silverio Gonzalez, King County Public Health	
Robin Freedman, Waste Industry		Brian Halverson, SWD staff	
Amy Lam, Local Elected Official		Lindy Honaker, SWD staff	
Brett Lohrman, Labor Representative		Christine Kim, SWD staff	
Bill Louie, Citizen Representative		Eliza Kruszynski, SWD staff	
Leah Tischler, Public Interest Group		Patty Liu, SWD staff	
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry		Laila McClinton, SWD staff	
Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry		Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director	
		Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff	
		Hannah Scholes, SWD staff	
		Andy Smith, SWD staff	
		Chris Stubbs, Deputy Director	
		Adrian Tan, SWD staff	
		Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff	
		John Walsh, SWD staff	
Guests			
Alissa Campbell, Recology		Andi Parnell, Sound Cities Association	
Hans Van Dusen, City of Seattle		Tyler Pichette, Pacific Public Affairs	
Jeanette Jurgensen, Bin There Consulting		Rich Vahl, Waste Connections	
Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association		Diana Wadley, Department of Ecology	
Marty Mudd, Jacobs Engineering			

Call to Order and Introductions

After introductions, Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:39 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

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

Public Comment

Wadley shared two items beginning with that there is no universal symbol for reuse like there is for recycling (three arrow loop). Reuse is taking off in many places like with the r-cup program and [to-go containers](#) that are meant to be reused and brought back. As featured in the Sustainable Packaging Coalition’s February newsletter, the group PR3 is working to develop a universal reuse symbol and will be taking a vote on the top symbols that are either currently in use or being brainstormed. Vote on your [favorite symbol](#).

The second item related to contracting - in 2022, Ecology worked with the Evans School of Public Policy and Governance on a report, and it is just now [published](#). This report has to do with solid waste and MRF mapping. There will also be a workshop style session at the [WSRA Conference](#) about “Managing Your Solid Waste Contract” and will be hosted by Jeannete Jurgensen of Bin There Consulting. The session is on May 16, from 2:30-4:00 p.m.

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

BEW Update

We remain in a position that makes us continue to flare our gas and we do not have a timeline where that will change.

On Feb. 9, the US District Court ruled in favor of King County in response to claims made by BEW that its plant condensate is not solid waste under the Hazardous Waste Management Action, thereby dismissing the claim.

The court also ruled in King County's favor over BEW's claim that certain environmental compliance credits known as D-3RINS are owned by the BEW, and not the county.

Finally, the court ruled that BEW's declaration of force majeure was invalid.

NERTS Draft EIS Meetings

DRAFT NERTS EIS public meetings have begun. Our team and consultants have done an extraordinary job preparing for and executing this very important public access component of this project.

The first public hearing was held in person meeting in Kirkland on Wednesday, with an online meeting on Thursday evening.

The 3rd and final meeting was on Wednesday, March 13, at Woodinville High School.

There was great engagement from both communities, and we will publish a final decision later in the year.

NEW RES Unincorporated KC & Strategic Projects Manager

We would also like to introduce and welcome Christine Kim to the Recycling & Environmental Services (RES) section as an Unincorporated King County & Strategic Projects Program Manager. Christine will be leading our efforts on Unincorporated King County Collection work with respect to advancing some of our Re+ work on Single Family Organics - which Eliza is briefing on today but Christine will be taking over in the future. We're excited to see Christine bring new perspectives and drive to transform the experience of Unincorporated King County rate payers.

MSWAC Update

No updates.

Long-Term Disposal Engagement & Criteria

Walsh and Liu provided this update.

Prior to securing a consultant to study long-term disposal options, SWD engaged advisory committees for feedback. The RFP was issued March 2022, and the contract was signed December 2022.

- 2019 Comp Plan – cities agreed to include 38 criteria. We understood that 38 was a lot of criteria to consider so we worked to simplify it.
- 2021 Advisory Committees – discussed disposal options and criteria and asked for feedback. We wanted to make sure that the committees still agreed to the criteria before submitting the RFP.
- 2021 advisory committees – provided committees with a briefing paper containing this information.

There were six categories used for the evaluation criteria

- Logistics: is this method feasible?

- Operating life of facility
- Siting, design, permitting, and construction requirements
- Compatibility with current solid waste collection and transfer systems
- Implementation time

- Economics: is this method cost effective?
 - Capital cost
 - Operating cost revenue generated
 - Risk
 - Cost per ton

- Capacity: Can this method handle our waste?
 - Contractual requirements
 - Operational requirements
 - Minimum level of waste required
 - Composition of waste required
 - Waste accepted (special waste handling)
 - Residue disposal requirements
 - Volume flexibility

- Operating history: is this method dependable?
 - Proven performance with safety and environmental regulations
 - Ability to handle the County's waste
 - Safety record
 - Local and federal regulation compliance

- Social impact: Does this method impact livability?
 - Local job creation
 - Local traffic impacts
 - Other potential impacts (noise, odor, etc.)

- Environmental impact
 - Human health
 - Cancer potential
 - Non-cancer potential
 - Climate change
 - Global warming potential
 - Air quality
 - Acidification potential
 - Smog formation potential
 - Water quality
 - Eutrophication potential
 - Energy production
 - Total energy demand
 - Non-renewable energy demand
 - Resource conservation
 - Compatibility with waste prevention and diversion
 - Useable end products

Next steps:

- Complete design of partner engagement process (March 2024)

- Begin partner engagement (April 2024)
 - Share comparative analysis report
 - Host workshops to conduct deep dive discussion on long-term disposal choices/impacts
- In May, we will be going through the options in our advisory committee meetings

Lam wanted clarification that the comparative analysis will include the six categories. Liu answered that there will be an opportunity to compare the options. A memo with this information was sent out and can be resent. Lam asked if this is comparable to a city comp plan where there would be an overhaul and big update. Liu responded that the long-term disposal option is going into the 2019 comp plan that is currently being updated and is the biggest update that will happen.

Trim stated that Zero Waste Washington is very opposes to waste to energy and they are concerned that the metrics that the consultant is using are not good. There is shared concern that they would be making energy from toxic materials, because if we get that 70% out of the landfill stream, the remaining 30% are toxic and not easily recyclable or compostable. They don't believe that the criteria are correct and would like to see it reevaluated or redone down the line. Liu answered that we share similar concerns and have had conversations with our lawyers on how this will fit into our state law.

Lam commented that the SCA will most likely want briefings too. Liu replied that we are planning on reaching out to cities and the SCA to provide the briefing.

Weiker stated that timeline seemed to have been pushed back a bit, which allows more time for engagement with stakeholders. She asked that committee members read the packet that was sent out and can be talked about at the next meeting. Liu said that things did get pushed back because we heard concerns from the advisory committees about the lack of information being communicated and we wanted to address these concerns; as well as have enough conversation time with the committees and have face-to-face time with our consultants. We also realized that people will probably want to have the SEPA process in hand and that is taking longer than expected to receive. The priority is to make sure that the decision makers are informed and that there is not too much down time so important information isn't forgotten. We are trying to pace things out where they make more sense.

McLaughlin added that we have a real timeline to work towards to ensure that we do not lose the ability to manage waste disposal services for this region. We are also incentivized to move at a regional pace so that disposal options aren't taken off the table because we ran out of time. We need to approach this swiftly and we have been working towards this as a region for a while. We are going to bring our regional partners a refresh and deep dive of the waste disposal options and are waiting on the report. We are confident that we have reasonable alternatives and anticipate good discussions with the committees as we weigh the options. There will be more information to come.

2025 Rates

McLaughlin said that we are looking at the revenue and rate while we typically have a two-year budget, this upcoming year will be a one-year budget because the county is trying to sync the budget with elections. One of the things that we know when looking at rates is that it is really important for us to strive for a smooth and predictable rate pass. Most of what goes into our landfill does not belong there and we have made good progress this year to divert resources and believe this will continue. We know that the fixed annual charge (FAC) will be going into effect this year which will lessen the tonnage. Nonetheless, the tonnage predictions are putting upward pressure on the rates. The forecast for spending has been reduced which is good news, but we are also projecting reductions in tonnage. To recoup this money, the cost per tonnage must increase.

Honaker began by reminding members that many key inputs for the rate model are under development and are subject to change prior to final recommendation. In terms of actual rate model inputs, we are expecting lower tonnage near term while Re+ impacts lag. What you can see is that we have received a lot less tonnage. In the near term, we are expecting to

receive a lot less tonnage. In the out years of 2028+, we are expecting much more impacts from Re+. As you all know, extended producer responsibility (EPR) has been delayed so impacts probably wouldn't start until 2030. Mixed waste processing (MWP) was expected to start diverting tonnage in 2028, but now that we know more about the requirements about what a MWP plant may be, we are forecasting that the earliest we will see impacts is 2033.

Tonnage is down significantly from the 2023-2024 forecast. This is 200k over the 2023-2029 period. The dark blue bars are what we projected and the dark green is what we are actually projected.

Rate Revenue will fulfill 2019 Comp Plan Commitments:

- South County Recycling and Transfer Station (SCRTS) will replace Algona Transfer Station (opens in 2026).
- Northeast Recycling and Transfer station (currently in siting) will replace ageing Houghton Transfer Station
- Area 9 Development and Facilities Relocation will maximize landfill capacity. Local disposal was the most economic and had the least environmental impact of the options considered.

The cost of Capital Projects is projected to increase. The overall volume of spending has increased, and we have had several cost drivers during these projects – escalating labor and material costs.

The increasing debt service will impact OPEX. As we build those projects, we will increase debt, and this will cumulate over time. The cost drivers are increased capital costs and higher borrowing costs. This is something we have always known and anticipated, but it is coming in more expensive than we anticipated.

Walsh said that instead of focusing on the percentage of the per-ton-rate increase, we focus more on the revenue requirement. Under the old structure, people who came to the transfer stations paid the same rate regardless of if they were commercial or self-haulers. Under the new structure, we had to create a self-haul only per-ton fee, a commercial haul per-ton-fee and the FAC Charged. It was not apples-to-apples when comparing these news fees, so we shifted in how talk about this to be that revenue requirement. A revenue requirement is how much we need to generate that year in order to cover all of the expenditures for the year and have a healthy fund balance (this makes sure that our required reserves are full). An example of this fund balance is the 30-day rainy day reserve where we need to have 30 days of operating expenditures in our savings account.

The 2023-2024 rate forecast showed an average increase in revenue requirement of 9.6% each year. We were able to lower our costs and the current forecast shows an average increase of 8.2% each year, so it is lower. However, the tonnage forecast between 2023-2024 and now has dropped considerably. We forecast that we'll receive around 200,000 less tons over 2024-2030 period. Because of this tonnage drop, the rate increases we are now projecting (because rates are based on tons and we are collecting money on less tons) are much higher than what was projected in 2023-2024. In the 2023-2024 Rate, we were projecting annual increases of around 10%-11% each year.

Due to the drop in tonnage and the timing of spending on capital projects, there is a spike in the rate in 2026. The current forecast shows an 11% increase for 2025, 20% for 2026, 17% for 2027, and then drops down to 10% or below in the out years. This is because there is a bubble in spending in 2026. To be clear, this is a not a one-for-one exchange – a revenue requirement of 9.6% doesn't mean that the rate is going to go up 9.6% because if the tonnage comes in lower, the rate needs to increase in order to compensate.

We are working the numbers and trying to determine what other expenditures can be taken out to smooth the spike, and seeing what we can do within the model to make things work. If we are able to lower the height of the bubble, the rate will come down. We've done some analysis on what the smooth path is and that would be about 16-17% each year instead of the spike from 11% to 20%.

Louie said that the committee was recently briefed on the C&D rate and how that has not increased in a long time and wanted to know how that relates this to. Walsh replied that the C&D rate is part of its own program and the revenue that they generate pay for their own expenditures. This does not have an impact on this rate which means we can't take

revenue from the C&D program, and they can't take revenue from this rate. The C&D presentation was more to say that there has not been an increase in about 30 years, but our actions have, so we are seeking a rate increase.

Louie followed up asking how the C&D rate is separate. Walsh answered that the C&D program is funded by the \$4.25 per ton of residuals that come out of a C&D facility and the program is meant to be fully funded by its own rate and not by the solid waste rate.

Weiker said that people at MSWAC asked about the rate restructure, how it relates to this and why they weren't in alignment, and believed that Walsh said that the rate restructure accounted for 10% of the budget and asked for a recap for SWAC. Walsh stated that FAC is about \$20-25M a year and all of the revenue requirements are all around \$200M so the FAC accounts for about 10% of the revenue. The FAC is set up based on disposal vs. non-disposal costs and there is an allocation methodology there. Costs for the landfill and a lot of the transfer station work is disposal related, but other things like Re+ and comp plan work are non-disposal costs. If we build a big capital project that is Re+ related, like a MWP facility, and those costs start to be included in the allocation, that will increase the non-disposal portion. We will go from \$20M to something higher. The FAC is great and helps mitigate these impacts from lower tonnage but because it is such a small amount of the revenue collection, it will not overcome the 200,000 tons that we are missing. As we start to spend more money on the non-disposal work, there will be a greater impact on rate increases.

Walsh wanted to know where people stand with what they see now and if there is a preference for going with a spiky or smooth rate path.

Lam said that a smooth percentage increase is what she'd favor. The spikier the increase is, the more the expectations become unknown and that causes a lot of concern.

Weiker commented that people tend to like smoothing because don't like unpredictable spikes. Smoothing is easier to predict and at least the fluctuations won't be as significant.

Walsh that these are our costs and haulers and cities (whoever does the billing) take these costs and figure out how to put them into resident's monthly curbside bill. Out of the three haulers, two chose one way and the other chose another way. At the county, we don't have great insight into how this gets dispersed, and Walsh wanted to know if we could set up some meetings with the haulers to walk through and better understand it so if we get asked the question of what it will do to curbside billing, we can better answer it.

Weiker said that for Republic Services, disposal is half of the rate that they send to customers depending on the contract. They are UTC, so all of that would pass through and will be expensive for rate payers at the end of the line. When residents get the bill with the Republic logo on it, Republic receives the complaints, and they don't know that it is coming from the county. It is a challenging communication to explain to city leadership why garbage, recycling and annex rates are so expensive because it is the service and the disposal.

Freedman echoed Weiker's comments and added that they're part of many conversations on how to communicate on the invoice and the level of transparency. There's a balance between the county's agenda and elected officials who feel that all of the complaints come back to them, so they will probably have an extra layer of sensitivity. This will be quite similar to the rate restructure and appreciated that the haulers were being included but believed that there are a number of stakeholders that will be sensitive on how this rate increase is communicated to the rate payer.

Weiker said that with the FAC, WM and Republic imbedded it into the rate model and Recology did the line item on the bill. Communications and billing systems were all a part of that discussion. When there is a contract in the service side of the bills, they are limited to whatever CPI increase that they have so any unexpected economic increases fall back on that CPI increase. On the county side, there is a lot more flexibility in the dynamic of the disposal system. Walsh replied that the county is more so trying to figure out what the impact to curbside billing would be with an increase.

Freedman added that WM posts their rates and are available for everyone to see. Some cities have admin fees, and some don't. The county can probably get some of their information on the WM website and look by each city. City billed cities are different but there is a currently a lot of transparency on rates.

Campbell said that for Recology, the FAC was communicated by line items on ratepayers' bills, so the charge was listed as being billed from the county and not Recology. They've also provided additional information on annual guides that went out and had a blurb that was approved by the county and cities that provided a basic run down of what the increase/charge was for, and this has been pretty helpful. This messaging has been helpful for Recology's customer service when people call in with questions. The county's FAQ sheet is a nice resource to point people to and having something that consolidates the information would be really helpful in terms of explaining what the rate increase is for.

Weiker commented that all of the haulers are used to working with their cities on the changes and updates, and communicating often and concisely is key for the elected officials who are trying to figure things out.

Trim asked what the missing tons consisted of. Halverson responded it is really a mix of things. We are seeing significant reductions in self-haul tons and a reduction in regional direct tonnage. Moving forward, as the effects of Re+ begin to ramp up (in the forecast) and represent a range of different material types including (but not limited to) organics (commercial and residential) paper and other packaging products.

Re+ Organics

Kruszynski gave this update.

The estimated food waste opportunity by the numbers totals in 147,000 tons of food sent to the landfill:

- 58,000 tons food waste from single family homes + 65,000 food waste tons from non-residential + 24,000 tons food waste from multifamily

As a brief recap, the 2022 Organics Management Law (OML) requires businesses in these areas to divert organic waste from the landfill. The geographic area ("BOMA") is annually updated by Ecology in July based on proximity to compost sites and curbside hauling. This excludes multifamily residences and includes schools. This is specifically for businesses that generate a certain amount of waste. There will be a phased in approach with the OML.

- 2024 – 8 yards/week of organics waste
- 2025 – 4 yards/week of organic waste
- 2026 – 4 yards/week of garbage

As of 2/29, HB 2301 passed the legislature. If signed by the Governor, the 2026 threshold will change to .25 yards of organic waste/week (about 96 gallons). The weekly threshold is only when they are operating, so seasonal businesses will only have to meet the requirement if they meet the threshold during their short period of operation.

As a response, we have started the commercial organics resource (COR) program that will be working with consultants to conduct business outreach. The goal is to have 55 businesses in 2024 and will begin with unincorporated King County. They will prioritize BIPOC, LGBTQ+, women owned businesses, as well as businesses where English is not the primary language spoken by customers and/or staff. There will be a website updated that will have an explanation of OML, a visual reference of containers/thresholds, and high-level diversion strategies. The new intake inbox is at organics@kingcounty.gov. We are always seeking collaboration opportunities!

Kruszynski transitioned to provide a single-family organics update.

Every year, 8,428 tons of organics from unincorporated King County single-family residences to the landfill. If composted, we could save:

- 4,970 tons of CO2 = 1,076 cars off the road

If ten KC cities also collected organic waste from single-family households currently going to landfill, together we could divert:

- 10,740 tons of CO₂e every year = 2,325 cars off the road

The policy options that were under discussion in 2023:

- Require all households with garbage service to subscribe to curbside organics. This would create new subscribers.
- Reduce garbage to every-other-week. This would encourage utilization of service.
- Implement a food waste disposal ban. This would encourage utilization of service.

An average household could divert 40-70 lbs. of organic waste each month.

In 2023, we did a lot of outreach and engagement to figure out where residents are:

- Survey advertising and awareness campaign
- 8 cities shared using social media toolkit
- 9+ features in newsletters and local news outlets
- Over 3200 respondents, largest jurisdictional group UKC
- Four focus groups held with 52 participants total from key demographics
- Public meeting held
- Four advisory group briefings where we shared survey data tailored to each city
- Recommendation presented to SWD leadership

Overall, support is high for policy change despite variable cost concerns across the county.

HB 2301 - Residential Service that passed:

- Beginning in April 2027, source-separated organic solid waste collection service are required to be provided year-round to all residents
- Beginning in April 2030, source-separated organic solid waste collection service must be provided to customers on a non-elective basis
 - Exemption if customer certifies they're already managing organic waste on-site or self-hauling
- Beginning in April 2030, jurisdiction's source-separated organic solid waste collection service must include acceptance of food waste year-round
- Beginning April 2030, all persons, when using curbside collection for disposal, may use only source-separated organic solid waste collection services to discard unwanted organic materials
 - By April 2027, Ecology must adopt standards under which jurisdictions may exempt persons from requirement if organic materials will be managed through alternative mechanism that provides equal or better environmental outcomes

Some exemptions based on jurisdictional population, population density, annual solid waste tonnage, and/or urban growth area designation.

Next steps since the bill passed the legislature:

- Require households with garbage service to subscribe to curbside organics:
 - If HB 2301 passes: shift focus to supporting transition toward 2030
 - If HB 3201 does not pass: work with 5-10 cities and unincorporated King County to agree collection requirements
- Implement a food waste disposal ban
 - If HB 2301 passes: change King County code to align code/acceptance policies to ban food waste in 2030
 - If HB 2301 does not pass: continue with discussion in 2024 to seek agreement on a ban
- Continue to explore garbage to every-other-week through comp plan process in 2024-2025

Lam asked where multi-family fits into all of this. Kruszynski replied that multi-family homes are a unique audience and she believed that there are some areas in the law regarding this and we are continuing to outreach to those audiences. Lam followed up asking if there would be continued discussion about every other week garbage collection. Kruszynski said yes. Lam said that in Sammamish, they are really looking at this and if it comes from the county level, they don't need to individually pursue it and wanted to know if there will be more information on that this year. Kruszynski answered that she believed that there would be, but if not this year, then next year because it will be part of the comp plan. Lam commented that she asked because it will require Sammamish to amend their contract with Republic so the more time they have, the better.

Smith added that we have heard from the Re+ community panel and they are really interested to talk more about multi family, and we will be bringing that to the city's recycling and coordination group for more discussion on what we can do in King County because state policy has not addressed multi-family in the same way it has for single-family and commercial. We are particularly interested to hear from cities about the challenges surrounding multi-family around code, space, etc. That conversation will happen this summer. In terms of every-other-week garbage collection, we are interested in exploring that and are interested to find out which cities want to explore that this year, so it was great to hear that Sammamish is interested and we will also be talking about this with the recycling coordinators group. We want to elevate every-other-week garbage collection as a potential policy lever and the compound process won't determine that for the county but will be a place for us to have those discussions.

Blazey wanted to know what the county efforts are towards BOMA compliance. He received a report from Cedar Grove's sales group and have seen a lot of interesting things with the bill in effect – a large chain restaurant is trying to reduce the amount of organic waste that they create and there are large plaza type customers that are saying that none of the tenants produce 8-yards, so they are not required to comply. There is also a large entertainment venue that is saying that they don't consistently produce that much organic waste in a week, and there is a lot of interpretation on the yardage. It will be important moving forward to have an aligned compliance program because they haven't seen any additional diversion and eight yards a week is a big number to start.

Kruszynski said she interested to hear more, especially on the venue, because when they have events, and they meet that weekly threshold, they will be required to comply even if it is just for the week. There has been some Q&A with Ecology, and she is happy to help direct to those resources. Blazy said that while Cedar Grove tends to agree with this, for entities like the venue, they see it as an additional cost and more labor. Due to this, Cedar Grove can't be the enforcement on that piece. Kruszynski replied that we can coordinate and collaborate on messaging with partners, so it doesn't sound like haulers are trying to sell more because it is required by the law.

Trim believed that when we move to the lower number next year, we will start to see more diversion, but we do need Ecology to determine if a landlord would be in charge for the entire businesses or if it would be by individual tenants. In regard to Lam's earlier multi-family question – it was in HB 2301 and was taken out near the end due to intense lobbying near the end and we are going to be looking at this again for next year. This summer, there a number of things for 2301, which is the next OML, and they will be doing a series of focus topic stakeholder groups so instead of one big group, there will be one on various topics and multi-family will be in one of those. Trim asked Kruszynski if she knew how many cities in King County currently are requiring mandatory organics collection. Kruszynski said she has numbers but not in front of her and will get back to her. Trim asked if Kruszynski could email her the list of the cities.

Kruszynski replied to an earlier comment from Trim saying that Ecology has come back with guidance on who is responsible in landlord-tenant relationships like in strip malls, and it is whoever holds the contract with the hauler. In many cases, that is the landlord or the property owner. Ecology has also addressed situations like yard waste and landscaping services and said that through the contract of service, it is the landscaper's responsibility to dispose of the yard waste. If it is disposed on the property, then it would be up to the property to divert.

McLaughlin shared his appreciation for the questions raised and wanted to encourage the cities to not wait for the county to explore difference actions and Re+ options. We are prepared to support the cities as they elevate the strategies and think that these are best practices that will move things forward in a measurable way. We don't have the luxury of time to really begin making a difference on diverting these resources from being buried at the landfill.

Blazey wanted to know if Trim could provide the complete story on multi-family and the heavy lobbying against it and the why. He will check with her later.

Weiker said from a hauler perspective, multi-family is fraught with contamination in the recycle bin and from what she's seen, there is not from for an added container for organics and there is the risk of contamination. This is different customer base than single family and commercial, and the turnover of residents participating in these programs. Weiker added that she'd love to have a conversation with Lam about every-other-week garbage and this is also fraught with contamination if people don't feel that the bins are being serviced enough (they will put their garbage in the recycle bin). We'd have to make sure that the messages and communication are clear, the pricing is clear, and stay within weights for the truck routes. There are many different factors that go into changing service from every-week to every-other-week, especially with bigger cities like Sammamish.

State Legislative Update

Scholes and Tan provided this update.

The 2024 legislative session started on Jan. 8 and concluded on March 7. This was a shorter session of 60 days.

There are several bills that made progress this session and are currently awaiting the governor's signature. He has 20 days to sign them and can veto them/pieces of them. Once signed, they will become law.

- HB 2301 - Organics Management Pt. II
- HB 1185 - Mercury Light Bulbs
- SB 5376 Allowing the Sale of Cannabis Waste
- HB 2207 - Unlawful Solid Waste Dumping

Many of the bills that we had been following did not pass this session.

- HB 2049 - ReWRAP Act. This is the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for packing and paper products
- HB 2144 - Deposit Return System for beverage containers
- HB 1900 – Improving Recycling
- HB 1933 – Right to Repair
- HB 2401 – Responsible Management of Refrigerant Gases
- HB 1935 - State Green Schools Program
- SB 5844 - Recreational Vehicle Disposal Program

HB 2301 is part II of the Organics Management Law (HB 1799). This bill is aimed at reducing methane emissions coming from food and organic decompose in the landfill. There have been some changes from the original text:

1. Provide funding via grants for food waste prevention, food rescue, and organics collections and processing. This is a big part of this bill, and we hope it will be well funded.
2. Require residential food and yard waste collection. There are exceptions for some rural areas throughout the state. Most residents in King County would be impacted.
3. Study compostable producer stickers.
4. Study food donation by businesses

Light Recycle, launched in 2015, is the statewide EPR program for fluorescent tubes, compact fluorescent lights (CFLs) and high intensity discharge lights (HID)s from households and small quantity generators, and is due to sunset in 2025. This was carried over from the last legislative session and the scope is reduced. This bill would:

1. Limits the environmental handling fee paid by consumers. We call it EPR, but it is more extended consumer responsibility.
2. Ban most mercury-containing lights by Jan. 1, 2029.
3. Extends the existing product stewardship program for mercury-containing light to 2035 or earlier, if determined by Ecology

SB 5376 is the bill that would allow the sale of cannabis waste. Currently, cannabis waste that is not designated as dangerous waste must be rendered unusable prior to disposal by mixing it with other inert materials. Cannabis waste can be repurposed for various materials and products such as animal bedding, packaging or construction materials. This bill would allow a licensed cannabis producer or processor to sell cannabis waste (under certain conditions).

HB 2207 is about the unlawful solid waste dumping. It is unlawful to abandon junk vehicles or dispose of litter on public or private property. This bill would change the penalties for littering according to the amounts of litter. The penalties can cover the actual costs of cleanup.

Two other bills that were passed were [HB 1551](#) that would reduce lead in cookware and [SB 5931](#) that addresses 6PPD in tires, which has been shown to be very [effective at killing off salmon](#). There were also two budget provisions that would provide funding to investigate PFAS in products.

Department of Commerce asked for funding for circular economy items. Those funds are dependent on the repeal of the climate commitment act.

Member Status Update

Ockerlander led this.

If your term is expiring or expired, and if you don't have the financial disclosure form on file, your nomination will not be forwarded. Thank you to everyone that has submitted their documentation, and all have been submitted to the Executive. When the Government Relations position gets filled, one of their first priorities will be a long-term recruitment plan.

Member Comment

No member comment.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.