



**SPU Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)**

March 1, 2017 Meeting Notes  
 Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue  
 Room 4901  
 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm  
 Chair: Holly Griffith  
 Vice-Chair: Quin Apuzzo

Committee Members	Present?	SPU Staff & Guests	Role
Quinn Apuzzo	Y	Ken Snipes	SPU Deputy Director, Solid Waste LOB
Anna Dyer	P	Susan Fife-Ferris	Division Director, SPU Solid Waste Planning and Program Management
Holly Griffith	Y	Brian Medford	SPU Strategic Business Plan Lead
Jamie Lee	Y	Melina Thung	Office of Utility Services Deputy Director
Heather Levy	Y	Michael Davis	Director, Environmental Justice and Service Equity
Emily Newcomer	N	Sego Jackson	Solid Waste LOB Liaison
Chris Toman	Y	Sheryl Shapiro	CAC Program Manager
Colin Groark	Y	Natasha Walker	CAC Program Coordinator
		<b>Guests</b>	
		James Subocz	Guest
		Alan Garvey	Guest
		Marilyn	Guest
		Amelia Fujikawa	Guest

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- When sharing proposed rate in the future, it would be helpful to see Solid Waste separated out from DWW.
- Melina thanked Committee members and reminded them that it would be good for the CRP to hear their thoughts on the cuts, particularly on the diaper and pet waste and the change in billing cycle. If you have concerns or don't have concerns, that will be helpful to the CRP to hear. They are going to be interested in the CAC input on both the Action Plans, and the proposed cuts.
- Michael suggested CACs have a dialogue around expanding the ways that the CACs operate to allow other communities (such as Somali and Filipino) to participate.

**1. Regular Business**

SWAC Chair, Holly Griffith called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM

- Meeting notes from January were approved.

- Sheryl indicated emergency exits, bathrooms, and noted that she would be following up with more details concerning emergency supplies and procedures at a future meeting.

## 2. Solid Waste Updates & Legislative Updates

SPU Solid Waste Planning and Program Management Division Director Susan Fife-Ferris and Solid Waste LOB Liaison, Segó Jackson, provided a few Solid Waste line of business and legislative updates.

- **Mayor's Pathways Home Initiative, Seattle's plan to reduce homelessness in our City.** Susan addressed Bridging the Gap, an interim Action Plan, which includes addressing garbage and trash around the City. She described it as an enhanced, inter-agency approach involving Solid Waste and SPU, WDOT, SDOT, Parks, Department of Neighborhoods, and a large cross-section of different departments. She said SPU is engaged with them on a daily basis to see if we can clean up the City.
- **2016 Tonnage Reports.** Susan said SPU is at 102% (slightly up) compared to 2015. This includes all sectors. Recycling tonnage was up about 103% compared to 2015. This includes residential only. Susan said they are working on developing the data and will bring back to SWAC once they have more info.
- **Organics RFP.** Once it's finalized, Susan will bring it back to SWAC.
- **Solid Waste handling regulations.** SPU has provided comments on proposed changes to the WAC 173-350 rules related to solid waste. This is the second time Ecology have sought comments prior to developing their final revised rule proposal; Seattle commented last year too. SPU's biggest concern is with soil and sediment rules, would have a direct impact on SPU pipes (emergency utility digs). The new proposed regulations would have a significant cost impact. Hoping to meet with Dept. of Ecology on their goals, and explore other ways to achieve their goals. Anticipating other jurisdictions would have the same concerns.
- **SW Management Plan.** SPU will be meeting with the Department of Ecology and proposing a timeline for the update. Susan will return with more updates.
- **Legislation updates.** Segó provided a bit of background about the process. He explained that it is the first year of a 2-year biennium. What this means is that bills that are introduced this session, but do not prevail, are still alive and work can continue on this in next year's session. Often this means they can be taken up at the same point in which they "made it" in the 1st year of the biennium, though if in Rules, usually does go back to "committee of origin." Segó explained that there will likely be a strategy at play with that, and what he thinks is likely to happen with most bills of interest is they are going to be held in the House and not pass over to the Senate, due to current Senate make-up and issues. He walked Committee members through the important cut-off dates:
  - February 17. Most bills have to pass out of committee of origin, for instance, House Environment Committee, by February 17.
  - Feb. 24. Bills necessary to implementing the budget have a different time line. Out of Fiscal committees by Feb. 24.
  - March 8. Must pass out of House of Origin by March 8. For Instance, must pass through vote of House of Representatives.

- April 12. Last day to consider bills from opposite House (some exceptions)
  - April 23. Last day of Regular Session.
- **SHB 1047 Protecting the public’s health by creating a system for safe and secure collection and disposal of unwanted medications. Rep. Strom Peterson.**
  - Passed through House Committee on Health Care and Wellness
  - Passed through House Committee on Appropriations
  - In Rules committee and eligible to be pulled to the floor for a vote.
- Some of the language that allowed grandfathering of existing programs (like ours in King County) has been changed so is still ok, but not as protective of our interests. Done to gain support of retail pharmacists.
- Three very harmful amendments by Representative Schmick will be up for vote if the bill is brought to Floor vote. Messages have gone out asking legislators to oppose all amendments.
- **SHB 1376 Concerning Paint Stewardship Rep. Strom Peterson**
  - Passed through House Committee on Environment (1<sup>st</sup> substitute)
  - Passed through House Committee on Appropriations
  - In Rules committee and eligible to be pulled to the floor for a vote.
- **SHB 1824 Concerning electronic product recycling. Rep Strom Peterson**
  - Passed through House Committee on Environment (1<sup>st</sup> substitute)
  - Passed through House Committee on Appropriations
  - Passed with vote in House today (55-44)
  - The bill proponents have in part meant for the bill to responded to the illicit export of harmful products by Total Reclaim. However, while the substitute bill is much improved from the original bill it probably won’t effectively address illicit export concerns.
- **HB 1048 Promoting a sustainable, local renewable energy industry through modifying renewable energy system tax incentives and providing guidance for renewable energy system component recycling. Rep. Jeff Morris (Rep. Norma Smith)**
  - Passed today in House Committee on Technology & Economic Development.
- Sego also provided an update on the **Bag & Packaging Stakeholder Meeting** today: A meeting of stakeholders to talk about the new bag regulations that were passed by Council in late 2016. . Attendees were mostly bag/packaging companies and packaging distributors. This is part of the process of making sure stakeholders and retailers are well aware of the revisions to the existing bag ordinance and other City packaging rules. Sego said they were asked for their feedback on collaborative efforts they’d like to see, including what additional support they need from the City and what they can offer themselves to address ongoing challenges.

### 3. Strategic Business Plan (SBP):

a. **SPU Finance/Budget Overview for 2018-2023 SBP and Overview of SBP Action Plans:** Melina Thung, Office of Utility Services Deputy Director

Melina Thung introduced herself, noting that Finance Director, Cameron Findlay, was unable to attend tonight. She explained that tonight's presentation would be a condensed version of the presentation given to the Customer Review Panel (CRP) about one month ago. She said they would be inviting members of the Community Advisory Committees to join the next CRP meeting on 3/22 to share CAC input on the topics in this presentation today.

The purpose of the presentation is to provide a look at SPU's rate path options for 2018-2023. The following topics were covered:

- Financial overview
  - Review the rate path options and main components
  - Understand the baseline and financial assumptions
  - Action Plans overview.
  - Savings overview
  - Options to reduce the rate path
- **Committee member comment:** (In regards to MOVE Seattle): That's a big surprise. \$120 million is a big surprise.
    - **Answer:** We knew it was coming when the levy passed, but now those expenditures are being compressed within a 3-4 year time frame. It's putting a fair amount of pressure on our rates.
  - **Committee member question:** Can you explain what you mean by baseline?
    - **Answer:** Baseline: Defined as "what does the rate path need to be to meet status quo + any new regulatory requirements."
  - **Committee member question:** (Regarding Action Plan investments) This is the .7% from the previous slide?
    - **Answer:** Yes.
  - **Committee member question:** Is there anything in the cuts that we would care about?
    - **Answer:** Yes, but not in the 5.6% rate. Only in the 5.4% and 5.3%. The \$171m savings were primarily deferrals on the capital side, not cuts.
  - **Committee member question:** The slide with the combined rate path, if you were to separate out Solid Waste from Drainage and Wastewater (DWW) and Water, would they track out similarly?
    - **Answer:** No, and we can share that with you. What you'll see is that it's mostly DWW. So much of what happens in the DWW is regulatory and out of our control.

b. **Overview of SBP Cuts / deferrals:** Ken Snipes, SPU Deputy Director, Solid Waste LOB

Ken Snipes spoke to the Solid Waste Line of Business (LOB)-related proposed cuts and deferrals (#1-#4 on the cuts list). He explained that the Solid Waste LOB is in good shape, and one of the reasons they do not have a lot of Action Plans in the update is because almost all SW efforts are already in the baseline. Ken explained that it is possible these cuts/deferrals could be refused by

the Mayor's office and/or CRP. These are proposals and are what we are putting on the table. He also clarified that with the proposed 5.6% rate path, all of these things would happen in 2018-2023.

- **Committee member question:** I don't recall us talking about diaper and pet waste composting on any of our past agendas.
  - **Answer:** It's in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Plan. It was adopted and approved in 2013. It's one of the strategies to get to the 70% goal. It would have been discussed awhile ago, and as it wasn't scheduled to be launched for a number of years, it has not been discussed by SWAC in recent years. If it moves forward, it will be ramped up so we could discuss how we would launch that program. If it is delayed, we would push that discussion past 2023.
- **Committee member question:** Is there a sense of how much waste diversion diapers and pet waste would contribute?
- **Answer:** About 1%. It's 8-9k tons per year at the height of the program.
- **Committee member question:** Can we decide if we should reduce the above ground rats versus below ground rats?
- **Answer:** It would be a reduction on the amount of money we pay King County to implement the rodent control program.
- **Committee member question:** What's the main benefit of billing after the fact?
  - **Answer:** It's easier on the customer service end to bill after, especially when you're dealing with changes in the account. For most folks, it's a standard practice to pay for what you use. Also, It generates a tremendous number of adjustments for us. There's some audit concerns as well. Note that this wouldn't change the 2-month billing cycle.
- **Committee member question:** Because we haven't actively talked about any of those 3 topics in my recent memory, I'm reluctant to say if I have heartburn about these cuts. A ton of questions come to mind related to diaper and pet waste. I don't feel well informed enough. I am curious how much appetite exists in the Committee to dig deeper into these.
- **Committee member question:** What's the process that the CRP will be doing to do the picking and choosing of Action Plans / Cuts.
  - **Answer:** We are going through each of the 13 Action Plans in a fair amount of detail with the CRP. Last week we only got through 6 of them. Then we go through every single one of the reduction options that comprise 5.4% and 5.3%. They are going to need to see this all collectively, and then in April we'll be looking for their overall feedback. I do think that they will pick and choose.
  - **Answer:** Much like the CACs, they will be writing a letter in support or not in support of the SBP Update.
  - **Committee member comment:** The reason I ask about the process is that I appreciate being asked for our input, but I guess I defer to the folks who are going to sit and look at those options in detail and who have signed up to absorb all that info and weigh in on it. If other folks were interested, I would happily look at the more detailed summaries of the cuts. I'm willing to completely abdicate, or look at the more detailed summaries.
- **Staff question:** Are you asking SWAC if, after seeing this presentation, if there is a sense if 5.6% is a reasonable rate (versus 5.4% or 5.3%).
  - **Answer:** If Committee Members have feedback about the individual Action Plans or cuts, we'd love that. But general feedback about the rate is helpful too.

- **Committee member comment:** I am a big fan of the way our City doesn't have many rats now. I am very pro of continuing whatever we are doing on that front.
  - **Committee member comment:** I am a fan for the opposite reason. I would like to see fewer rats.
    - **Committee member comment:** I second that.
- **Committee member question:** Sitting here, all of these programs sound great. Nobody is pro-rat. Everyone likes diaper composting. But they all strike me as rounding errors. We're talking about tenths of percent here. When we're talking about a 5.4% vs 5.6% increase, I'm disposed to the higher rate. But to Heather's point, it's tough to make a very informed decision with the level of details we have here.
  - **Committee member comment:** I think if you showed 5.4% and 5.3%, people will see it's not that much more in terms of dollars per month.
  - **Committee member comment:** When you get down to the actual customer cost, it would be good to show to the customer what a .2% increase looks like.
- **Committee member comment:** Both when you look at the magnitude of these numbers, but then when you're talking about tenths of percentage, it's hard to reconcile the magnitude of these numbers. But it's really about the customer and we need to communicate in a way that is helpful to the customer – such as the extent to which they will feel the absence of these services/actions, and the benefits of these as well.
  - **Answer:** Next week, we will be sharing the detailed cuts with the CRP, and we can certainly share these with SWAC. Then we'll leave it to you guys to decide if you want to pull some comments together.
- **Committee member question:** I think it's worth the blip (initial cost) to get in arrears, versus bill-in-advance. I say this both from a customer versus operational standpoint, having been on the other (operational) side. Instinctually it makes more sense to me. Customer service calls will be less about fixing errors that you created, and more about solving real problems. And we're not about waste here!
- **Committee member question:** I'd be curious to see what folks at the community meetings said about the \$5 (.2%) change.
- **Committee member question:** I'm curious what the diaper composting program would look like.
  - Ken is meeting with some folks in Minnesota who have a diaper composting program.
  - **Answer:** I anticipate an RFP for folks to propose what technology would be used. Success would depend on outreach/education/how many babies there are. There's also the double-win with pet waste regarding stormwater.
  - **Sego:** It's also good to have context. Do you remember the residential composition waste stream? Of what is continuing to be disposed as garbage, #1 is food (29.9%), #2 is animal by-products (10.7%) and #3 is diapers (7.4%). Diapers are also in the top #10 of the commercial industries. They are 2% of the total commercial stream.
    - **Committee member comment:** The bulk of the weight is in the diaper, not the waste. I'm curious about the wastewater implications and the trade-offs between the two.

Melina thanked Committee members and reminded them that it would be good for the CRP to hear their thoughts on the cuts, particularly on the diaper and pet waste and the change in billing cycle. If you have concerns or don't have concerns, that will be helpful to the CRP to hear. They are going to be interested in the CAC input on both the Action Plans, and the proposed cuts.

c. **SBP Community Meetings Debrief:** Michael Davis, Director, Environmental Justice and Service Equity Division; CAC Members

Michael reviewed the SBP engagement methodology and provided a draft overview of the SBP Outreach results. He will be returning to provide more details on the outreach results in the future.

Michael noted that a Committee member requested more messaging about the Advisory Committees Program at these meetings. Michael said they had the opportunity to mention the Committees at a couple meetings. He also noted that he'd like to see the CACs discuss expanding the way that they operate to allow other communities (such as Somali and Filipino) to participate.

- **Staff comment:** At the 2 sessions I was in, folks chose the 5.6% rate path option, specifically because of the pet waste component.
- **Committee member comment:** The customers I spoke to were really invested in SPU. They were supportive of expanding SPU functions. When they were looking at the sacrifices SPU would need to make, they were very supportive. They were also very supportive of touching communities that really need SPU services.
- **Committee member comment:** It was a good engagement. Not a ton of people, but the number made it so most people could be heard. Active, older community very focused on Thornton Creek and water quality. In today's meeting, it has been very neat to hear the broader perspectives of SPU customers.
- **Committee member comment:** I was at the Langston Hughes event. There was a large Somali, Spanish and Vietnamese population. I was a greeter. I was super impressed that there was such a great turnout in non-ESL that they let me leave early. It was cool experience to see the community turnout and pleased with the outreach you did to make that happen. I was very impressed with the Somali Public Engagement Outreach Liaisons (POELs). In case other Committee members did not know, they had headsets for the non-ESL community. Even basic things, like getting their nametag and sign-in, there was no English. It was very helpful to have the POEL involved at all stages of the interaction.
- **Committee member comment:** I was at El Centro, where there was a large Filipino and Spanish community. Went home early because they did not need more English facilitators, which was great because it was targeting communities of color and non-English speaking. Even families with children were engaged.
  - o **Answer:** It was really interesting because we had the complete opposite of our results in 2014. The Magnusson meeting was the largest English speaking, but most of the other meetings had multiple languages being facilitated at the same time. We are so pleased with how it turned out. Can't say enough about our community partners and the work they did. It also speaks to the importance of being proactive in getting people there (vanpools, carpools, neighbors picking up neighbors).
- **Committee member comment:** There were some technical difficulties with the headsets.
  - o **Answer:** We resolved this once we discovered that some of them were on the wrong channel.

- **Committee member comment:** How did the community members react to the presentation itself? When I did the run through (for facilitators), it was real boring. I was worried it wasn't going to hold people's attention. Wondering how the feedback was on Joe, the presenter?
  - o **Answer:** By the time we got to El Centro, we had staff facilitating. Community partners always facilitated the facilitation piece, but for some of the later meetings we had the community partners present the SPU portion as well.
- **Staff comment:** Food really helped families be there.
  - o **Answer:** Depending on where it was at, we provided childcare and allowed the community groups to select the food. We tracked our budget on this, and will use it to plan other outreach events in the future. It was really valuable for them to have a place for their kids to go to.
- **Staff comment:** There was a lot of interest at the table with the translated materials. I didn't see anyone engage with the LOB posters that were mounted. The stuff on the tables was popular, but not the LOB posters. The other thing that I thought was unfortunate is that there was that there was only one of the kitchen top food scrap containers. A number of participants were interested in having one for their food scraps, but we hadn't brought any to give them.
  - o **Answer:** We've given out thousands of them, but we want to promote other ways that folks can store their food waste – Tupperware, old containers, etc. Our community partners work is not stopping and we'll be continuing to work on discussions related to food waste and composting.
  - o **Additional statement by Michael:** Folks were really focused on not just they wanted or thought was right, but their neighbors too. They wanted to make sure we were taking care of their neighbors.

#### 4. Around the Table

- A committee member noted that Amazon launched the GiveBack box. Take any Amazon boxes after they are delivered, print a Goodwill label, and ship off your Goodwill donations. Chris will email out instructions.
- April meeting:
  - Natasha will poll folks to see if an earlier start time is possible.
  - Natasha will follow-up to see if there will be more activity in the NTS if the meeting begins earlier.
- Membership Updates
  - Heather staying on a little longer
  - Emily Rothenberg has resigned as of March.

**Adjourned 7:35PM**