NOTES
Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting
May 19, 2021

Call to Order & WebEx Meeting Instructions
Troy Lautenbach called the meeting to order at 9:32.

Budget Update
Laurie Davies - Cell: 360-704-0807, laurie.davies@ecy.wa.gov

The Governor signed the budget yesterday. There were no vetoes and the assumption is that everything is as anticipated. We have not been fully funded for 13 years. It is exciting to do work that was on the backburner.

Local Solid Waste and Financial Assistance (LSWFA)
A key highlight was the addition of $14M for LSWFA, moved from the capital to operating budget last session. This prevented having to compete with the Model Toxics Control Account (MTCA) every two years. We created a project list and in budget negotiations with the legislature, the amount changed from a $20M request to $10M. Once the money is in the operating budget, it is difficult to raise the base without a policy bill requesting an increase. Ecology and the Washington Association of County Solid Waste Managers (WACSWM) worked hard over the last two legislative sessions to restore funding to the originally requested amount of $20M. Ecology requested an additional one-time amount of $15M, and WACSWM requested the full amount of $24M, and met with budget negotiators. The amount in the Governor’s budget was $20M, $20M in the House, $24M in the Senate, $10M one-time, and $10M ongoing. The consensus budget came out with an additional $14M and $24M ongoing. Barring any dramatic cut in state budget and revenue sources, we will have $24M ongoing for grants, and funding will be more stable.

Other budget increases
- Public Participation Grants received 1% from MTCA for non-profits to participate in cleanup decisions and implement waste reduction and recycling programs. An additional $1.3M was received.
- We requested 0.6 FTE and $620,000 for sustainable recycling for the Recycling Development Center. That is the difference in the balance that we received from the legislature and the fiscal note tied to it.
- Biosolids has historically been underfunded and received an additional 1.2 FTE for biosolids permitting and a $268,000 increase in the fiscal growth factor for fees.
- We asked for an additional FTE for the air operating permit and received a 0.7 FTE and $218,000.
- The Senate Bill 5022 passed with 4.4 FTEs and $847,000 portion from MTCA. We will use MTCA funds to support staff work.
- We have a small role in two main areas or the capital budget: a set amount for the waste tire pile cleanup, the remainder of funds is $8M, and we receive $1M off the top with the rest going to Department of Transportation (DOT). We compete and have the ability for remedial action funding.
- The Lillyblad abandoned wastewater treatment plant received $2.3M.
- Washington State University (WSU) received one-time funding of $331,000 through a proviso from the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account (WRRLCA) to conduct an organics study.
There is a need to study the level of carbon sequestration from land application, resulting in a proposal for soil amendments and composting. The plan is to conduct work through the Center for Sustainable Agriculture. The group will conduct a study and deliver a report to legislature by December 2022.

**Legislative Update**

**Julie Robertson - Cell: 360-763-2728, julie.robertson@ecy.wa.gov**

Session ended April 25. Most bills go into effect 90 days after session on July 25. We will update web pages, share info on implementation, and continue to work with stakeholders.

**New Laws**

- **5022** was signed on Monday. The bill was introduced by Senator Das as a companion bill to 1118. It was originally an extended producer responsibility bill for paper and plastic packaging and was substituted early in session to include minimum recycled content for plastics requirements. It changed in committees several times with each moment including many changes. It requires Ecology to implement and enforce postconsumer recycled content, an expanded polystyrene ban on certain products, and a requirement for food service businesses to provide single-use items to customers only on request.
- **SB 5022:**
  - Establishes minimum postconsumer recycled content requirements for “covered products”.
  - “Covered products” include beverages that use plastic beverage containers, plastic trash bags, household cleaning and personal care products in plastic containers, and a separate date of 2028 for dairy & little wine beverage containers (2028).
  - Bans certain expanded polystyrene with some exceptions.
  - Requires customer request for food serviceware with some exceptions.
  - Creates a stakeholder advisory committee and directs Departments of Ecology and Commerce by July 1 to pick a neutral facilitator and participate with 30 representatives. The committee will report recommendations not covered by this bill to the legislature by 2025.
  - The chasing arrow requirement is removed.
  - Requires the state purchase compliant trash bags.
  - Requires Ecology conduct a plastic resin markets study. If Ecology receives the funding, the study must be completed by May 2029.
- **1145 Nonwood renewable fiber:** the Governor extended the plastic bag ban delay by emergency proclamation until the end of the COVID emergency. The bill amends the plastic bags law, with new wheat straw definition, and a compliant bags change. Shannon Jones is the lead and is working to implement details and outreach efforts. The bill goes into effect July 25.
- **5040 Litter control on state highways:** includes grants for reimbursement for local government litter cleanup on state highways.
- **1393 PV module stewardship and takeback program:** Includes a two-year delay. Plans are due July 2024, selling to WA by July 2025, and reports are due April 2026.
- **Washington State University (WSU)** received one-time funding of $331,000 through a proviso from WRRLCA to conduct an organics study.
- **5345 Industrial waste coordination.** Coordination program administered by Commerce, local projects, regional administration, competitive grants. Ecology will collaborate.

**Bills that did not pass**
• 1118 Extended producer responsibility
• 1488 Plastic packaging materials
• 5219 Plastic packaging materials
• 5174 Recycling wind turbine blades
• 1212 Fair servicing “right to repair”
• 1518 Standards of paper products/purchasing
• 5286 Organic waste management goal
• 5429/1501 Pick It Up WA

Other new laws
• 1161 Modifying the drug take-back programs
• 1050 Reducing GHG emissions
• 5141 HEAL Act – Healthy Environment for All
• 1091 Clean fuel standards
• 5126 – Climate Commitment Act

There will be presentations on the three climate bills and HEAL Act at the July SWAC. Programs responsible for bill implementation were not able to come to this meeting.

Litter Campaign
Amber Smith - Cell: 360-688-4957, amber.smith@ecy.wa.gov

This is an exciting time for the campaign. The development process included collecting feedback, doing a survey, and messaging and testing with audiences. A pilot launched last week, and the materials development phase will wrap up at the end of June. The quantitative survey included 1100 participants with benchmarks for diversity, males, pickup drivers, and smokers. A lot of demographic data was collected.

The umbrella brand concept replaces “Litter and it Will Hurt” with all litter prevention messaging, and campaigns. Three different brands were tested, starting first with a behavior change campaign around securing loads. We plan to add another campaign next biennium, probably targeting cigarette butts. In the meantime, there will be mini campaigns folded in. Brands tested were in English and Spanish.

Message testing methodology included a qualitative-quantitative approach using “ask your target market” survey platform. There were almost 200 participants. Overall findings were that “We Keep WA Litter Free” was top ranked in both languages. There was clear consensus that participants liked the word “we”. Even though there was not a state outline, it had a similar feel to the state with the road adding relevance. Feedback was good and indicated the message was clear. The “Live Litter Free” was the second most popular. Participants liked the bright colors, but missed the word “we”. The “In WA We Can” seemed incomplete and some associated it with recycling. The tagline overall findings were that “Secure Your Load for Safer Roads” performed best in both languages. The tagline was very literal, rhymed, was catchy, short, simple, to-the-point, and memorable. It reminded people of real situations they experienced.

We are developing a partner tool kit and website for state agency and local jurisdictions, which will be ready by the end of the week. A pilot program for cargo net giveaway events will begin in four counties.

Advertising plan and timeline: Next Monday May 24, statewide advertising will launch on all channels (tv, radio, social media) and will run through June 17. Partner team kits will be distributed, with a PR event on June 4 and National Secure Your Load Day on June 6. Department of Transportation (DOT) will do emphasis patrols and cargo net events Friday – Sundays for 4 weekends in row. Secure Your Load advertising link: www.secureloadswa.org. A video of a commercial was shown, and a new one just came out this morning.
Questions: Heather Trim stated that this is absolutely fantastic and exciting. For the next campaign, she asked what the plan is for surveys. Will the same approach be used? We will continue to use the social marketing best practices framework. Information was collected via the survey that will help guide a few more campaigns, and we have research that laid the foundation. We won’t need to heavily invest in upfront research since we were able to do it as part of this contract. Troy Lautenbach asked if there is outreach for drop box, transfer stations, and MRFs? How can we participate? We will send a listserv email with the partner tool kit to share with their audiences. We will work with commercial haulers next biennium. In the next phase, we also plan to expand partnerships and sponsorships to help continue the program over the next couple of years.

**WSU Compost Air Emissions Study**

**James Rivard** - Cell: 509-731-5163, james.rivard@ecy.wa.gov  
**Megan Rounds** - Cell: (509) 385-8497, megan.rounds@ecy.wa.gov

James Rivard gave an introduction and historical information. There were some difficulties with expanding compost operations due to air quality restrictions. Now there are other facilities having issues with restricting regulations. Washington has history of promoting waste reduction and in recent years, promoting diversion to landfills to reduce greenhouse gasses. The problem is that air quality federal regulations are restrictive, and state and local authorities must follow those regulations. Some methodologies are problematic.

Permitting process: Our air program follows the federal regulations, as do the local air agencies. We work with local air programs to stay on the same page. The problem on the west coast is that there are no well-documented studies. We are using a California study from years ago, which is the best information available. There are some differences between California and Washington. Many believe we are being overly restrictive. The California study was published in 2010 and based on windrow composting. Most facilities in Washington are using aeration. The California study had differences in feedstock and what went into the material, and the climate is different. There are many variations. We may need our own emissions factor to regulate facilities. By doing a Washington study, we may be able to show how best practices can reduce emissions better. If evidence provides the foundation we need, we can use better data for facilities to accept more material, and be more restricted to accept less material. If emissions factors are less, they will have more operational and expansion opportunities. In the California study, the sampling methodology takes samples from a small area of a pile, so it could over estimate emissions. There is also a difference in compound solubility and differences when samples are taken. We may not get accurate representation by this method. We would like to repeat this to show that best management practices in Washington could change or improve, by taking continuous samples and in different areas of a pile.

Megan Rounds gave an overview of the partnership with Washington State University (WSU). The goal is to establish Washington emission factors that are scientifically defensible, obtain continual samples to show changes in emissions, establish a sampling system that composters can use with different types of composting piles. Pictures of aerated piles, a sampling van, and a flux chamber were shown. We are working with stakeholders and contacted the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding a study to see what they want. They want a model developed, and testing done using method 25.3 (same as California) which must be compared to that method, and sampling across state. We also contacted composters and Washington Organics Recycling Council (WORC). They see the benefit and want to help. This was presented at an air permitting meeting with the Air Quality program, local air agencies, and Region 10 EPA representatives. A successful study will be transparent, and address air permitting and composting concerns.
Future studies and next phase of the study: EPA wants us to control the climate. It will be moved into a building so conditions can be controlled. A picture of the building, map, and layout was shown. We will have an aerated pile and windrow being tested side by side to show differences in the California study. A picture of a machine that does continual testing using the SRI method was shown. This will be used with a flux chamber to show the difference. We hope the machine can be used in the field. We will send results to California to do testing using a portable sampler, and obtain a relationship between the two methods. The composting material contents will be varied in piles, green waste, food waste, and biosolids. WSU will do a report to show a correlation between sampling methods, variations in emissions due to varying materials, and controlled environmental conditions due to the building. Next steps are to change the environmental conditions by changing the location.

Questions: Heather Trim asked if there is a report that can be shared. We have the report from the beginning that showed some problems with the flux chamber. James Rivard is not sure if we can release the report, and will need to look into it. A few years ago, one of our engineers took samples and WSU found significant differences between food and green waste. We have preliminary reports, but this new study will be more scientifically defensible. The other report only provides a clue. We need to have it be defensible and give a clear picture of emissions across the state to demonstrate our emissions profile is different.

Heather asked if the previous report can be sent even though it’s incomplete, and also asked what the timeline is (what we have done, where we are now, where we are going). Marni Solheim stated that the report is still a draft. James stated that we are early in the stakeholder process, and will have a kickoff meeting soon with regulators and composters to get input on our vision. Most of the work will be done by next biennium. WSU received a grant and has one year to do the testing. After that, they want to do more testing because the grant does not include changing materials (it’s only for the machine). That will take the next biennium and they may also be able to do it across the state during that time, but the timeline is unknown. Jeff Gaisford asked if compostable paper and packaging are included in testing. James does not believe we have discussed that yet, and will need to talk with air authorities and composters.

**Member Roundtable**

Laurie Davies: The status of our remote working is in flux. We will continue through June and probably for most of July as government moves toward opening. It depends how we move back to the office and how quickly. There will be a form of a Modern Work Environment from the Governor’s initiative to increase the amount of remote working. A decision has not been made on when the building itself will open. We will keep you updated. The contract and hiring freeze has been lifted. The Solid Waste program has a 12% vacancy rate and is very rapidly in the process of filling vacant positions and getting fully staffed with new positions. We hired grant/planners in the southwest and northwest regional offices. Both new hires are beginning to attend SWAC meetings. Hopefully the section managers have sent information out introducing the new staff. We are recruiting for two biosolids coordinator positions in the eastern and southwest regional offices. Dan Weston is the annual reporting and recycling data lead, and his position is being recruited. Two temporary managers were hired due to retirements and both have moved to recruitment. We are moving as fast as we can, but may potentially have a backlog. Ecology and Commerce are tasked with hiring an independent facilitator/mediator by July 1. Our proposal solicitation was posted yesterday to the DES master contract list. Proposals are due by June 14.

Heather Trim: We want to engage stakeholders over the summer to work on organic waste for next session. If you are interested in participating in a potential 5286 stakeholder group and you are not already on the list, please email her and she will add you to list. We hoped to having a hearing, but there wasn’t enough time.
Troy Lautenbach: The WSRA virtual conference is on Monday, May 24.

**Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

**Attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Department of Ecology Solid Waste Management Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay Blazey, Cedar Grove</td>
<td>Dave Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chelminiak, Waste Management</td>
<td>Beth Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Clow, Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>Peter Guttchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Crosby, Local 20/20</td>
<td>Lacy Kooiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Davies, Department of Ecology</td>
<td>Peter Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Gagnon (temp for Quinn Apuzzo), Recology King County</td>
<td>James Rivard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Gaisford, King County Solid Waste Division</td>
<td>Megan Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Green, Waste Connections Inc. LRS/Silver Springs Organics</td>
<td>Amber Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Holm, Washington Food Industry Association</td>
<td>Marni Solheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Lautenbach, Lautenbach Industries</td>
<td>Steven Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Major, Spokane Regional Solid Waste System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich McConaghy, City of Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan McKinnon, Kitsap Public Health District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becci Piepel, Douglas County Solid Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Robertson, Ex-Officio Member, Department of Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Whittaker, Washington Refuse &amp; Recycling Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interested Parties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested Parties</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Cox, Stoel Rives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Crosby, Port Townsend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Lovaas, Washington Refuse &amp; Recycling Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti Stacey, Kittitas County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jewell, Washington State Association of Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>