

topics with Diane Yates by the end of January. The next edition will be emailed at the end of February.

There are four provisos on the 2015/2016 budget:

1. Restricts \$50,000 from being expended or encumbered until transmittal of a plan to stabilize post-closure landfills. The plan is due Jan. 31, 2016.
2. Restricts \$1.7 million and 9.0 FTEs until transmittal of a report on the resource recovery program. The report is due June 30, 2015.
3. Requires \$150,000 to be expended for study of increasing diversion of waste from multifamily generators. No due date has been set for this study.
4. Restricts \$5 million from being expended or encumbered until transmittal of a report on a review of the ILA. It is a requirement to ask cities for recommended revisions to the amended and restated ILA. MSWMAC members should review the ILA and share suggested amendments with the division at the January meeting. The report is due Aug. 1, 2015.

SWAC

[SWAC meeting minutes](#) will be shared in lieu of an update from SWAC liaison Jenkins.

Transfer Plan Review Update

Chair Eggen restated the purpose of the Nov. 17 workshop and provided a brief overview of the information presented. Minutes from the workshop are forthcoming and will be posted on the website. All other materials are available now on the [website](#).

Bylaws: Review and Action

A motion to accept proposed changes passed unanimously.

Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan Presentation/Discussion/Feedback

Severn presented the revised redline version of Chapter 7: Finance. Comments from the first review at the November MSWMAC meeting were taken into account. Comments included:

- A table of contents for the chapter was included for reference during the review process, but will not be included in the final Comp Plan.
- “Customer classes” have not yet been defined. The division will continue to update MSWMAC as steps are taken.
- Consider making connections between the policies and recommendations clearer.
- During the review process, consider adding “no changes made” notes when changes are discussed but not made.
- Consider making it clearer that Recommendation 6 sets a deadline for establishing not just the process but the formula for calculating rates for any cities that wish to enter into the new ILA after January 1, 2017.
- Consider making FIN-7 broader to allow the division to consider revenue streams other than transfer station or landfill fees.

- Some topics in the Comp Plan may include more detail than others. For example, the “Construction and Demolition Debris Surcharge” box includes more detail. The level of detail needed for topics may change at a later time and appropriate edits may be made.
- The C&D disposal surcharge fee is set to cover the cost of administering the program rather than to encourage or discourage C&D disposal.
- Consider removing “currently” from the Comp Plan as much as possible given that the Comp Plan has an extended life and “currently” does not indicate a clear timeframe.
- Given the time it takes to update the Comp Plan, the policies currently being discussed will likely not go into effect for nearly three years. New considerations will continue to arise and updates will continue to be needed.
- When naming factors that may affect debt service, consider adding a clarifying phrase such as “regarding debt service” to “Additional factors that may be considered...”
- Consider changing “to analyze the costs, benefits and terms of a latecomer city’s entry” to “to analyze the costs, benefits and terms for a latecomer city’s entry.”
- In the Waste Prevention and Recycling section, consider adding language that acknowledges the participation of cities in the development of a sustainable financing model.
- As it becomes available, consider adding more information about alternative ways of financing programs not directly related to waste disposal such as waste prevention, recycling and illegal dumping programs.
- Discussion of how cities are using grant funds to increase recycling may be included in the Recycling chapter.
- Consider clarifying that the grant funding for cities is non-competitive.
- Consider replacing “some cities also charge a utility tax” with “some cities may also charge a tax that helps fund their solid waste programs,” because utility taxes may go to the city’s general fund rather than a fund specifically for solid waste.
- Cities are encouraged to share information about how their solid waste programs are funded so that the “Funding for the Cities” box is accurate.

The comments provided will be considered for inclusion in the Draft Comp Plan, which is anticipated to be complete in September 2015.

2015 Work Plan: Review and Action

Division director Pat D. McLaughlin shared a chart demonstrating that King County’s progress in moving toward the 70 percent recycling rate by 2030 has stalled over the last three years and remains at 52 percent. McLaughlin pointed out that the commercial sector has made the most significant progress over the last eight years and has the highest rate, but has not progressed in the last three years. Single-family households showed some improvement over the last eight years, but again, have not made progress recently. Multi-family household recycling rates have made small increases, but remain well below commercial and single-family household recycling rates.

McLaughlin suggested adding the 70 percent roadmap as a standing agenda item at MSWMAC meetings. All members were in favor of adding the item.

One member noted that often absent from discussions are the significant contributions of community groups that organize and participate in lending libraries, where items are continually resourced and reused. This is a growing trend with a large impact on waste reduction that is not being measured.

Another member noted that it is important to remember that the goal should not only be to increase recycling rates but also to reduce waste generation.

A subcommittee will be formed to create a plan for developing a tool box of policies and programs that will help cities increase recycling rates and reduce waste generation. The subcommittee will bring the plan back to MSWMAC for further consideration. New subcommittee members will include MSWMAC members Stacia Jenkins, Paula Waters, Rika Cecil, John McGillivray, Mary Jane Goss, Carol Simpson as well as Assistant Division Director Kevin Kiernan. Yates will email all members asking if others would like to join the subcommittee.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.