**Committee Members & CAC Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present?</th>
<th>SPU Staff &amp; Guests</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinn Apuzzo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Idris Beauregard</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping &amp; Graffiti Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Della</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Tim Croll</td>
<td>Solid Waste Planning and Program Division Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Dyer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Sally Hulsman</td>
<td>Solid Waste Compliance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Grace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Socorro Medina</td>
<td>Community Recycling &amp; Engagement Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Griffith</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>David Christensen</td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Kennedy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Emily Newcomer</td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Lee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Levy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Proctor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ringold</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Toman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Fischer, CAC Program Support</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sego Jackson, Policy Liaison</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Shapiro, Program Manager</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION ITEMS FROM MARCH SWAC MEETING:**

- The Chair suggested that SWAC begin planning for this year’s field trips soon.
- Sheryl will explore the possibility of SWAC members visiting the Call Center.

**Regular Business**

- Committee members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.
- Meeting notes from February are approved.
Overview of Multi-Family Plan for 2016, Socorro Medina, SPU Community Recycling & Engagement Coordinator

- Socorro joined SPU’s community recycling program five months ago. She began her presentation by giving some information about her background.
  - Socorro was a Sustainable Business Senior Associate with the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle, where, among other things, she conducted outreach to immigrant communities and multifamily properties in King and Snohomish Counties and provided technical assistance to property managers.
  - She’s from Mexico, and has worked with the Spanish speaking community in particular.
  - She is familiar with the challenges and opportunities in growing recycling programs.
- Socorro referred to a power point presentation. She will be speaking today about the multifamily recycling rate, the overarching goals for 2016, and the 2016 work plan.

- Multifamily Recycling (MF) Rate
  - The recycling rate is the percentage of the waste diverted from the landfill by recycling and composting.
  - Socorro showed a graph of the yearly rate since 2003.
    - The rate has been steadily increasing.
    - The 2014 was 35%.
    - This rate is considered by other recycling program managers to be strong. Some municipalities have much lower rates.
- Our Solid Waste Plan sets a goal for the multifamily recycling rate of 54% by 2022.
  - Rates need to increase faster than in the past in order for us to reach that goal. The past average annual increase has been 1.3%. We need a 2.3% increase each year.
  - In the single family (SF) sector, the recycling rate is 71%. This is considerably higher than the 35% rate in the multifamily sector. While there are differences between the MF and the SF audience, it is hard to believe that the motivation and interest in those two audiences is fundamentally different.
  - In fact, recent outreach projects in Puget and other areas have shown that MF residents care, are interested, and even know a lot about recycling.
  - However a very significant difference between those two audiences is how convenient is the access to recycling and compost bins.

- 2016 Goals and Work Plan
  - One of our goals is to find ways to increase recycling’s convenience in multifamily properties.
  - Another goal is to divert food waste and compostables from the landfill.
    - While some of the landfill-bound material is recyclable, a larger amount is compostable material, in particular food waste.
    - We want to find out about barriers to food waste collection.
      - We want to interview property managers and residents to identify and address these barriers.
- We plan to use community based social marketing and social and behavior sciences to encourage more composting.
- We plan to offer technical assistance to the largest multifamily buildings.
  - There are 4,846 multifamily buildings in Seattle, and 143,028 units.
  - We plan to offer targeted technical assistance to the 270 buildings that have more than 100 units.
    - We’re targeting those buildings because they provide the best opportunity for cost effective impact. The largest 269 buildings account for 34% of all the multifamily units in the SPU’s service area.
- We also want to develop a multifamily property database.
  - We have an existing database, but it’s not comprehensive.
  - We’d like to use our existing commercial database as a model.
  - More data will enable us to target outreach more effectively.
- Seattle continues to experience population growth. We want to engage new residents (and people moving locally) to help them participate in recycling and composting.
  - We plan to provide welcome packages for new multifamily residents with information about city ordinances, flyers to help sort garbage, recycling, and compost, and a food waste collection bucket coupon.
  - We also want to continue to provide resources and incentives for property managers and existing multifamily residents.
    - Our Friends of Recycling and Compost (FORC) Program offers a $100 credit on a property’s solid waste bill if certain conditions are met.
    - Properties can access direct technical assistance from SPU in complying with recycling and composting requirements.
    - SPU gives out food waste collection buckets.
    - SPU does direct mailings to residents and on-site presentations.
      - We are working to provide these in various languages, and to offer transcreated materials (these are high quality translations that also incorporate cultural considerations, created by working with the intended audience).
    - We also want to partner with solid waste inspectors to reach out to properties that do not put their food waste cart out for collection.
- Socorro summarized the program’s overall goals for 2016:
  - Find ways to make it more convenient to dispose of waste in multifamily properties
  - Divert food waste from the landfill
- She then summarized the work plan for 2016:
  - Provide on-site technical assistance to the 270 largest properties
- Develop a more comprehensive multifamily property database
- Create welcome packages for new multifamily residents
- Provide resources and incentives for managers and residents
- Conduct outreach to properties not setting out their food waste cart

Socorro then asked for any questions or comments.
- One Member asked who would be deployed to do the education work, which seemed to be quite a large undertaking.
  - Socorro responded that the program has a team and a consultant that works with SPU. She and her team also work with Waste Management, Cleanscapes, and Seattle Tilth. She added that some buildings have recently received educational services and would likely not need to be visited again.
- One Member asked why a pilot program on smaller buildings won’t be conducted first.
  - Socorro responded that the main driver of these efforts is the City’s goal to recycle or compost 60% of its waste. Targeting the largest buildings better supports that goal. Buildings of all sizes will be supported with flyers, mailings, posters, on-site presentations, and other outreach efforts. Only the Technical Assistance component will be focused on larger buildings.
- Another Member asked whether the targeted 270 large buildings are concentrated downtown or are located throughout the City.
  - Socorro answered that many of them are in the downtown and surrounding areas. Probably most are not in the south end. We do need to map them.
  - (Socorro later mapped the data and found that while most of the buildings are in the downtown and surrounding areas, there are large buildings distributed all over the city: north, southwest and southeast.)
- Another Member asked whether the larger targeted buildings tend to be newer, and if so, whether a different approach was planned for older buildings.
  - Socorro answered that regarding the waste infrastructure about half of buildings with 100 units have recycling and garbage chutes on every floor. Only a handful have food waste chutes on each floor. Only about 15 buildings have garbage, recycling, and food waste on every single floor. Most of these buildings have a trash room, and we will look at ways to adapt them to add recycling and compost.
- Another Member asked whether new construction must meet certain solid waste requirements.
  - Sally Hulsman, Solid Waste Compliance Director, answered that they must meet requirements that specify square footage per unit for solid waste facilities, but contractors can use their own designs in terms of strategy and operations.
  - Socorro noted that part of the 2016 work plan is to make recommendations on Best Management Practices for new buildings.
- Another Member asked whether contamination of recycling and compost in multifamily properties is a factor impacting tonnage.
Socorro responded contamination is a big issue in multifamily solid waste, and our economists and other specialist are gathering last year’s data now.

- Another Member noted that older multifamily buildings usually do not have a designated recycling room, and instead have outdoor recycling bins that often get contaminated with garbage.
  - Sally Hulsman noted that even though locking outdoor bins can be inconvenient, SPU does recommend locking them to prevent contamination.

- Another Member noted that she was excited about the focused efforts on larger buildings to improve recycling and compost rates.

- Sheryl Shapiro, the CAC Program Manager, asked about outreach to senior housing.
  - Socorro answered that her program has done numerous on site presentations at senior housing properties, and the residents are very interested in recycling and compost.

- Another Member asked about the challenges of working with property managers.
  - Socorro responded that the property managers are very busy. One benefit of working with the larger buildings is that it’s relatively easy to find the property manager. We are also coordinating our efforts with solid waste inspectors.

- Another Member noted that the expanded database sounded promising, and she was interested in how the non-private information might be shared with hauling contractors to better serve customers.
  - Sally Hulsman noted that we are trying to gather data that allows us to see the big picture of a property’s solid waste needs.

- Another Member noted that some buildings give compost buckets to residents, and some give coupons that may be redeemed for a compost bucket. He asked whether SPU has data on whether one approach results in more composting than the other.
  - Socorro responded that this is a good question but we haven’t measured this yet. As we gather more data, we may be able to compare the results of each approach.

- Another Member asked how long it will take for SPU to do the planned outreach to the 270 largest buildings.
  - Socorro responded that the goal is to do it this year.

- Sego Jackson, SWAC Policy Liaison, noted that SWAC Members can decide when they would like to invite Socorro back for an update on the Program.

**Illegal Dumping Program, Idris Beauregard, SPU Illegal Dumping & Graffiti Program Manager**

- Idris began by noting that numerous stories about illegal dumping have been in the news recently.
- Idris referred to a power point presentation.
- The Illegal Dumping Program:
  - Conducts inspection and investigation of illegal dumping incidents
  - Coordinates cleanup of dumped debris on street rights-of-way, roadways, alleys, and under bridges
Note that the Program coordinates the clean up on public land. Sometimes there is confusion between public and private property.

- Contracts with the State Department of Corrections (DOC),
- Partners with community cleanup events to promote a clean city, and provides cleanup support to other SPU programs such as Spring Clean, Adopt-A-Street

Idris explained the problem.

- There’s been an increase in the number of Illegal Dumping Customer Reports in the City of Seattle.
  - There are several ways to report illegal dumping in the City.
  - We’ve recently added our “Find it, Fix it” app, which has been very successful.
    - Users can take a picture and click submit. Then SPU will take action.
- Now that it’s easier to report illegal dumping, more reports are made and wait times have increased for removal.
  - We still have only 3 full time illegal dumping inspectors for the entire city.
- The City is also seeing an increase in homeless encampments, a rise in heroin drug use and hypodermic needle waste, and an increase in population.

Idris showed a map that plotted illegal dumping reports.

- Some industrial areas along Interstate 5 had a lot of illegal dumping.
  - Illegal dumping in these areas often occurs late at night. For example, a graveyard of tires will show up suddenly one morning.
- The University District also showed increased illegal dumping.
  - Students are a transient population, moving in and moving out often, which results in more illegal dumping.
- Hazardous materials are also sometimes illegally dumped.
- Televisions, heavy duty appliances, and mattresses are sometimes dumped illegally.
  - mattresses are dumped illegally quite often.
    - The transfer station was not accepting mattresses for disposal in the past, but they are now.

The budget for this program is increasing.

- 2013: $826,238 (Spent).
- 2014: $830,129 (Spent).
- 2015: $932,330 (Budgeted).
- Source of funding for the program is based on transfer station tonnage tax.

The Program’s 2016 Priorities are:

- Homeless encampments
- Hypodermic needles
- Rapid removal of illegal dumped material
  - Especially anything that is hazardous or is obstructing a road.

The number of requests for cleaning up illegal dumping activity has gone from 5,956 for 2014, to 11,063 for the corresponding period in 2015.

- That’s an increase of 75 percent.
From January through December 2015, SPU’s illegal dumping program removed and disposed of **1.1 million pounds** of illegal dumping materials and our inspection team responded to 11,063 illegal dumping service requests.

- 32 percent of those complaints were inspected within 10 days.
- 67 percent were abated within 20 days or less.

Idris noted that while the number of requests for illegal dumping cleanup increased significantly from 2014 to 2015, the amount of illegal tonnage collected was consistent with previous years, and we do not expect a significant increase from 2015 to 2016.

- One Member asked whether inspectors are sent to every report of illegal dumping.
  - Idris responded that first we determine whether the property in question is public or private, and whether the dumping is indeed illegal, and then dispatch the appropriate team.

- Another Member asked how many reports made are about the same location.
  - Idris answered that approximately 25% of the reports are duplicate locations, but are not necessarily about the same material dumped at that location.

- Another Member asked whether any data was available about how much of the illegally dumped material was recyclable.
  - Idris responded that we are working on getting these metrics.

- Another Member asked whether SPU was considering having events where people could drop off items for disposal.
  - Idris replied that we are considering this, and may focus these events on particular communities or for particular needs.

- Another Member asked whether there was any data on what kind of illegally dumped items are collected.
  - Idris answered that we are in the process of going through the data manually to get that information.

- Another Member asked about enforcement of illegal dumping laws.
  - Idris responded that the fine for illegal dumping is up to $5,000. It can take one to two months to track down illegal dumpers. We are looking into alternative enforcement strategies, like cameras that record license plates.
    - Another Member noted that her block had asked their community police officers for cameras in high crime areas, but they declined, citing the public’s concern for privacy.
    - Idris agreed that privacy rights must be respected.

- Idris showed a flow chart of illegal dumping activity.
  - He explained that with the increased reports, response times have extended from 10 days to 20 days.
  - If the dumping is on private property, the report is forwarded to Seattle’s Department of Planning & Development (DPD). They dispatch inspectors and work with the property owner. The owners may pay for disposal, and/or we may assist them by researching resources to subsidize the cost of cleanup.
• If it’s on public property, the report is sent to the Department of Corrections.
• If it’s hazardous material, it’s sent to our hazardous materials contractor and reported to the Washington State Department of Ecology.
• If it concerns a homeless encampment, we coordinate efforts with SPU, the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Multi-Disciplinary Outreach Team (MDOT).
• One Member asked what happens when a report is made of an alley overflowing with garbage.
  o Idris answered that we notify Sally Hulsman’s team of solid waste inspectors and they address the problem.
• Idris reviewed the Department of Corrections (DOC) 2014 Work Summary:
  o Removed and disposed of 1,839,042 pounds of illegally dumped materials
  o Picked up litter from an estimated 826 miles of city streets
  o Removed and recycled 98,797 pounds of illegally dumped materials
  o Cleaned approximately 8,768 illegal dumpsites in our communities
  o Picked up over 5,424 bags of litter from city streets
  o Converted 4,160 jail days into productive work and service to communities
  o Provided 9,964 hours of Correctional Officer Supervision to offenders in the community
  o Saved taxpayers over $354,110 for bed costs not used
  o Provided over 33,284 unpaid hours of community service in lieu of jail time
    • Idris noted that there was a recent story in the Seattle Times about the DOC’s work. SPU spoke to the people working for the DOC as waste collectors and asked them how they felt about the program. (They are people who have been diverted to community service rather than to jail.) They reported appreciating that it allowed them to continue working regular jobs, be with their families, and help their communities.
• Idris explained what the Program hopes to achieve:
  o 7-10 day turnaround time from customer complaint to removal
  o Reduce illegal dumping backlog
  o Create a status map for customers to track their illegal dumping complaints
  o Coordinate cleanup of homeless encampments.
  o Increase volunteer engagement opportunities
  o Public Education and actions surrounding ways to proactively deter illegal dumping
  o Improved Technology
• Idris explained the actions taken to improve the Program:
  o Successfully investigated and resolved illegal dumping backlog by 80%
  o Reallocate staffing and resources to address in increase in demand
  o Working cooperatively with inter-departmental illegal encampment and Sharps team.
  o Creation of public interface status map
  o Supporting City Departments with illegal dumping cleanup program.
  o Provide transfer station coupons for income eligible customers
• One Member noted that she notices a lot of televisions dumped illegally in her neighborhood, and suggested that perhaps people are not aware that they can take them to the transfer station for free. She also suggested that fewer people have access to cars, which may also play a role in increased illegal dumping.

• Another Member asked whether it slows down the process to submit reports more than once on “Find it, Fix it.”
  o Idris reported that it does not speed up the process and may slow things down.

• The Member also asked what kinds of reports might get handled more quickly.
  o Idris explained that the goal to collect sharps (used hypodermic needles) is 24 hours. This sometimes extends to 48 hours depending on resources.
  o Hazardous waste is also handled more quickly.

• Another Member asked whether it slows down the process to submit reports more than once on “Find it, Fix it.”
  o Idris reported that it does not speed up the process and may slow things down.

• The Member also asked what kinds of reports might get handled more quickly.
  o Idris explained that the goal to collect sharps (used hypodermic needles) is 24 hours. This sometimes extends to 48 hours depending on resources.
  o Hazardous waste is also handled more quickly.

• Another Member noted that Belltown residents have asked if there’s any training or resources they can use themselves to clean up illegal dumping.
  o Idris replied that the best thing to do is to sign up for the Adopt a Street Program, which can be accessed here: http://www.seattle.gov/util/environmentconservation/getinvolved/adoptastreet/

• Idris reviewed the Program’s next steps:
  o Continue to work the action plan and provide course correction.
  o Improve communications with customers and other City Departments
  o Increase community stewardship around coordinated cleanups
  o Education and Outreach
  o Identify and implement improved technology

• One Member asked whether SPU knows what kinds of items are collected for disposal by private garbage services.
  o Idris responded that the Seattle municipal improvement districts (MIDs) collected 600 sharps last year.
    ▪ SPU works with the MIDs and the business improvement districts (BIDs). We support them with grants to do graffiti removal and we would like to increase that funding.

• Another Member asked if bed bugs were a factor leading to increased illegal dumping of mattresses.
  o Tim Croll, Solid Waste Planning and Program Division Manager, explained that transfer station staff visually inspect mattresses brought for disposal.
  o If has signs of bedbugs, it’s wet, or it’s been outside a long time, it goes to the landfill.
  o Other mattresses may be sent to recyclers.

• Another Member asked whether data was available on which neighborhoods are using the “Find it, Fix it” app.
  o Idris answered that data is not yet available. We are collecting data on the items that are reported most often.

• One Member asked whether SPU had plans to offer the “Find it, Fix it” app in other languages.
Idris noted that that was a great suggestion. The app had a problem with location accuracy which we are addressing now. After we do that, we will be working to offer it in more languages.

- One Member asked whether the Program had plans to add a fourth or fifth inspector.
  - Idris responded that we are currently considering a hybrid solution of doing business differently to free up more inspector time, but adding inspectors is still an option.

- Sego noted that on March 24th, the Washington State Recycling Association will be sponsoring the first Washington Recycles Every Day (WRED) event of 2016: an in-depth look at the recycling of carpet and mattresses and a behind-the-scenes tour of Spring Back Mattress Recycling NW and Carpet Processing & Recycling LLC. The event and lunch will be hosted by Murrey's Disposal in Fife.

---

Solid Waste Strategic Outlook for 2016, Tim Croll, Solid Waste Planning and Program Division Manager

- Tim referred to a handout that listed 10 topics that the Solid Waste Line of Business intends to focus on this year.
- The first is outreach to increase compliance with the composting requirement.
  - We continue to work on this in the single family and commercial sectors, but our special focus will be on the multifamily sector. We have doubled the budget for outreach in this area to multifamily, and will be providing the following:
    - On-site technical assistance to 270 largest properties
    - Develop multifamily property database
    - Welcome packages to new MF residents
    - Resources and incentives for property managers, on site presentations
    - Outreach to non-compliant properties
- The second is illegal dumping. We hope to:
  - Reduce the response time to reports of illegal dumping.
  - Provide support for encampment cleanups
  - Possibly develop program to reduce “demand” for illegal dumping
    - We are evaluating some options to make legal disposal easier, including price breaks at the transfer station.
      - For example, right now every vehicle bringing items to the transfer station is subject to a minimum charge which covers up to a certain number of pounds. But since we are now weighing every vehicle, we could charge based on actual weight, which could be less than the current minimum charge.
      - Also, we currently offer a limited number of coupons for free disposal at the transfer station to people who meet low income requirements. We may consider offering a limited number of these coupons to everyone, regardless of income.
However, the cost of the coupons would have to be reflected in regular collection rates.

We also need to consider who is engaging in illegal dumping. Homeowners may not be the largest demographic, so providing coupons for free disposal may not reduce illegal dumping.

With regard to items left at the curb for special “bulky item” pickup, we might consider disposing of the first item at no additional cost. We could easily keep track of this in the billing system.

The third is finishing the North Transfer Station and opening it for public use. This may in itself help to decrease illegal dumping.

- We are tentatively planning to open it in later summer.
- We want to divert reusable items from the landfill.
- We will also monitor noise at the new transfer station in accordance with our community agreement.

The fourth item is the design of the space formerly used for the old south transfer station. This project is called STS Phase 2.

- This process includes working with the community stakeholder group.
- We are including the possibility of a new materials recovery facility (MRF) on the site.

The fifth item is our solid waste rate proposal.

The sixth item is the Strategic Business Plan (SBP) revision (which overlaps with Solid Waste Rate Proposal).

- We will be actively participating in SPU’s SBP revision.

The seventh item is a new plan for solid waste contract procurement.

- We are working on a plan to procure new solid waste collection and landfill services.
- SWAC may want to comment on this item.

The eighth item is possible food service ware ordinance changes.

- We considered this last year but did not go forward. We may go forward with some of these changes this year.

The ninth item is possible restriction of dumpsters in Pike-Pine/Capitol Hill area.

- This area is crowded. Some businesses have dumpsters in the street, which is a safety issue.
- We want to propose restrictions on dumpster placement, possibly off the street and onto private property.
- This program is different from the Clear Alleys Program (CAP), implemented in other parts of the city. With CAP, dumpsters are replaced with large bags that get collected frequently. CAP is not well suited to the Pike-Pine/Capitol Hill area.

The tenth item is the New Customer Information System (NCIS).

- We’d like to implement this new billing system in 2016.
- We are working with City Light on this project.
• SWAC Members should let Sego know if they would like more information on any of these items.
• The SWAC Chair commented that many of these items are already on the 2016 SWAC Work Plan.

Legislative Developments, Sego Jackson, SWAC Policy Liaison

• Sego referred to a PowerPoint presentation.
• The current short legislative session is ending soon.
  o March 4 is the last day to pass bills from opposite house, except budgets and matters necessary to implement budgets.
  o March 10 is the last day of regular session.

Sego discussed the status of several bills relating to solid waste.

o SB 6605 – This bill was an attempt to address the issue of potential apple maggot contamination in compostable material. In the original bill, the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) would review solid waste management plans of jurisdictions that prohibit the disposal of food waste and compostable paper as garbage. Solid waste facility siting criteria would include status under quarantine and WSDA would review facility permits.
  ▪ However, apple maggots move in yard waste, not food waste or compostable paper. That was addressed and a substitute bill passed out of Senate 48:1. An amendment passed out of House Environment Committee. The bill is now in Rules committee for potential vote by House. The bill adds “agriculture” to the list of representatives to be included in local SWACs.

o HB 1571 would establishes Paint Stewardship Program.
  ▪ This bill passed the House with a vote of 60:38
  ▪ There was very positive testimony about it in Senate Energy, Environment, and Telecommunications (EET) hearing.
    • Kitsap testimony
    • Miller Paint wants to locate paint processing facility here
    • ACA and paint store retailers fully support
  ▪ However, it died in the Senate EET Committee and was not brought to a vote. It’s unclear why.

o HB 2346 would extend the solar/renewable incentive program and require manufacturers to establish recycling for solar modules through a stewardship approach.
  ▪ This bill passed the House with a vote of 77:20
  ▪ There was very positive testimony about it in Senate Energy, Environment, and Telecommunications (EET) hearing.
  ▪ However, the following text was added to nearly every section:
    • “Each section of this act expires immediately, contingent on Ecology adopting, adopting with revisions, or enforcing the proposed Clean Air Rule or adopts or enforces a rule that establishes a statewide program to set a limit, cap, or emissions standards designed to control the
amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Ecology must provide notice of
the expiration date to affected parties, the chief clerk of the House of
Representatives, the secretary of the Senate, the Office of the Code
Reviser, and others deemed appropriate.”

- The bill is now in the Ways & Means Committee. It has to pass through this
  committee due to its fiscal impacts.
- Sego thought the bill still might pass. However, the House and Senate versions
  would be different, so the way forward is not clear.
- The bill’s passing would be significant.
  - SB 5800/HB 1525 would establish that the restriction on pull-tabs would not pertain to
    beer or other malt beverages.
    - This bill passed the House Environment Committee, but died in the Rules
      Committee.
    - Sego noted that it would be helpful to do outreach to the beer industry to
      explain why removable can lids are a problem from a solid waste perspective.
  - SB 6570 would cut $33 million from the Local Toxics Control Account. This doesn’t
    impact Coordinated Prevention Grants (CPG), but Public Participation Grants (PPG)
    would be cut.
    - A substitute bill passed out of the Senate EET Committee
    - The bill is now in the Senate Ways & Means Committee. It has to pass through
      this committee due to its fiscal impacts.
    - If the bill passes, 35 positions with the Washington State Department of Ecology
      will be cut.

- Sego closed by noting that the next legislative session will be a long session (105 days) rather
  than a short session (60 days).

Public Engagement and Outreach, Sheryl Shapiro, CAC Program Manager
- Sheryl distributed a handout to the Committee members listing upcoming outreach events.
  - Anna expressed interest in the GoGreen event. Members can contact Pat Kaufman for
    free passes.
- Sheryl noted that she would like to update the existing chart of Committee Members’
  connections to community groups at next month’s meeting.

Around the Table
- The SWAC Chair thanked the Program Coordinator, Heidi Fischer for her service supporting the
  Committee. This is her last SWAC meeting.
- David noted that Waste Management (WM) is recruiting summer interns for Recycle Corps
  2016.
  - This fast-paced ten-week internship will teach twelve college students the latest
    strategies in engaging the public and businesses in waste reduction and recycling
    behavior change. The program provides students with hands-on experience in the field
    as recycling educators. WM Recycle Corps interns represent the company in various
public venues, on a variety of outreach projects. These projects include assisting with
on-the-ground recycling education campaigns for businesses and multifamily
communities, staffing the WM Recycling Information Station at community festivals, and
the potential for assisting with special projects.

- Sheryl reminded Committee Members to save the date of March 30th for an all-CAC meeting,
  which will feature a big picture orientation to SPU including its connections with City
government. The meeting will be from 5:30 – 8:30pm. Members can contact Sheryl if they have
suggestions for meeting refreshments.
- Sego reported that he had the interesting experience of participating in a tour of SPU’s Call
  Center. Each participant was paired with someone taking calls. The Call Center’s staff scope of
knowledge was impressive and Sego learned a lot. SWAC Members might also find the
experience useful.
  ✓ Sheryl will explore the possibility of SWAC members visiting the Call Center.
  ✓ Chris suggested that SWAC begin planning for this year’s field trips soon.
- Quinn noted that Recology Cleanscapes continues to offer a public tour of their materials
  recovery facility (MRF) from 11am – 1pm on the third Thursday of the month. Contact them
  ahead of time if you plan to attend.

Meeting adjourned, 7:27pm.