

APPROVED

Skagit County
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 11, 2015

Members Present

Diana Wadley
John Doyle
Kevin Renz
Leo Jacobs
Sandi Andersen
Scott Sutherland
Tamara Thomas
Todd Reynolds

Representing

Ex-Officio, Department of Ecology (present by phone conference)
Town of La Conner
Skagit County Public Works/Solid Waste
City of Sedro Woolley/SWAC Chair
Vice Chair/City of Anacortes
City of Mount Vernon
District 2 Citizens
Skagit Steel & Recycling, Recyclers

Members Absent

Brian Dempsey
Britt Pfaff-Dunton
Tim Crosby
Not Represented
Not Represented

Representing

City of Burlington
Skagit County Health Department
Haulers
District 1
District 3

Visitors

Callie Martin
Craig Culmback
David Bader
Elena Pritchard
Matt Koegel
Rick Hlavka
Torrey Lautenbach

Representing

Skagit County Public Works/Solid Waste
Skagit Soils, Inc.
Lautenbach Industries
Skagit County Public Works/SW (recorder)
City of Anacortes
Green Solutions
Lautenbach Recycling

Call to Order

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. at the Continental Building Crane Room at 1800 Continental Place, Mount Vernon.

Introductions

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, requested introductions of all in attendance. Names and business title introductions were offered by each attendee prior to addressing agenda items. Diana Wadley, Department Of Ecology, attended the meeting by phone conference.

APPROVED

Public Comments

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, opened the floor to address any public comments. There were no public comments.

Review and Approve Minutes

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 11, 2015 meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Sutherland to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Doyle. The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

Agenda Items

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, moved forward to begin discussion of agenda item:

Review of CSWMP Briefing Document

Mr. Hlvaka introduced himself and passed out his review material entitled *Skagit County Solid Waste Management Plan Update*. The intention was to produce a document for this committee to review as well as for the benefit of the SWSGB as an introduction when it is presented to them at the scheduled governance board meeting next week. Key elements of the Plan were addressed in this update. The schedule and update cycle was reviewed at the February 11, 2015 meeting.

Vision Statement: Should one be established for the plan. Different ideas were discussed. A question was raised that if the plan is on a 5-year update cycle, could the plans intentions be stated in the Goals and Objectives rather than using a Vision Statement. It was suggested that the Plan could incorporate both; what we currently want the plan to look like, while keeping in line with the Plan in order to be able to address any future changes. A Vision Statement would be helpful in calibrating whether the Goals and Objectives are in sync with the Plans intentions and expectations to ensure that the Goals and Objectives within the document stay consistent with the Plan. A 20-year vision plan versus a 5-year may be more relevant with a long term value. Also, possibly the best allocation of resources would be to sequence focus in certain time frames of the Plan. A final determination can be made in one month at the next SWAC meeting once there has been time to consider the options and the additional input from the upcoming governance board meeting has been considered.

Waste Reduction: For this part of the Plan, Mr. Hlvaka requested a consensus on the intended level of effort expected. The following ideas were discussed:

It was suggested that we strive for a goal of 100% zero waste by 2020.

Also, to *move the community forward in recycling beyond the current efforts* already in place. Present accomplishments include long term agreements with Cities for operation of the Solid Waste System versus use of an incinerator. We now have a new facility; out for a period of 20 years that the community set for dealing with that ultimate disposal, the landfill portion of what our waste is. The focus on the goal of this Plan should be to make that landfill portion as small as possible to benefit the community as a whole. It is incumbent upon us developing the plan, to put forward something that is benefiting the community as a whole and try to minimize what is being landfilled. Being more

APPROVED

aggressive is a benefit to being less aggressive at this point since we are now past the period where there was confusion as to where we were going with Solid Waste. It was agreed that a more aggressive approach towards recycling would be appropriate in the Vision Statement.

Source separation is the key, with incentives, cost and convenience factors still requiring resolve. Education is another vital element that needs to be expanded on with School Districts.

Other avenues to explore would be *government promotion and education* of entities such as Craig's List to remove slightly used items from the tipping floor. The connecting of generators of particular types of waste to potential markets of other types of waste is another option. A presence in the new format of social media for waste reduction is another window of opportunity.

County government needs to be connected with other levels of government programs to better *identity the waste stream as a "resource stream"* in holding various levels accountable to make those resource items that enter the waste stream accessible. In relation to the Plan, what the governing bodies connect to that ensures that that is happening to the best ability through programmatic requirements both to manufacturers as well as consumers and users.

We as government should have a role in *supporting waste reduction at the point of generation* or from the home, removing items from the tipping floor is not economically viable. The Transfer Station does not have the resources to extract re-useables from the waste stream once it arrives on the tipping floor. Government support in education, source separation, and support for re-use stores is a more viable approach.

Raise tipping fees with the profits going towards education. There should be one source of information and education with a consistent message so that everyone is doing the same thing. If a zero-waste goal is to be met in the future, how the system will be funded needs to be addressed in the Plan for that kind of systemic change.

Recycling and Organics:

Recycling of food waste has become a problem, not from the food waste itself but from the contamination that comes with it. Compostable bags and utensils advertised as compostable are not composting sufficiently and contaminating the end product. Grocers and Restaurants need to better manage the education of their employees. Lower quality usages are not available any longer. The Department of Ecology just mandated in their composting and recycling regulations that only a certain amount of different contaminants are allowed in compost.

Bundling rates for garbage and recycling by encouraging more yard waste recycling in cities by possibly lowering rates or providing some incentives. Explore mandatory recycling or contract for that type of service in the unincorporated are in the Plan at a future date.

Department of Ecology could provide *a guidance document on mandated minimums* on de-construction and/or waste separation in the permitting process on recycling of the construction demolition materials based on the environmental impact. A State wide approach to increase recycling, especially of construction demolition, would be to have a waste management section in the SEPA checklist.

APPROVED

Solid Waste Collection:

The City of Anacortes is in the process of completing a new contract with Waste Management to handle their cities recycling and organics. Weekly mandatory recycling of yard waste will continue.

Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal:

The Counties long haul contact will expire in September of 2023 and should be addressed in this Plan revision.

Administration, Public Education and Regulation:

Better coordination of public education and where information can be obtained needs to be addressed.

Special Waste:

Other counties solid waste management plans, in particular Clark county, includes Waste to Well economic development; using waste prevention, re-use, recycling and composting as an encouragement to spur economic development. The best use of the Counties Transfer Station funds would be to put dollars towards education fostering the ability for an entity to remove re-useable items before they reach the station.

Announcements/New Business

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, opened the floor to address announcements or new business. There were no announcements or new business items to address.

Public Comments

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, opened the floor to address any public comments. Mr. Bader commented on the Construction and Demolition Wastes separation gives the impression that the author of the document felt that it would handle something different than solid waste. With the advent of a true flow control ordinance that makes it very clear, having the C & D separate will still lead to a confusion issue. There needs to be clarity that if it is handled separate from Solid Waste it should be made clear that it is part of Flow Control portion of the waste and needs to be managed in accordance with the flow control ordinance that was recently adopted.

Unfinished Business

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, opened the floor to address any unfinished business. There was no unfinished business to address.

Adjourn

Leo Jacobs, SWAC Chair, **made a MOTION to ADJOURN. The motion was seconded. By a vote of the membership, the MOTION passed unanimously.** Leo Jacobs thanked everyone for attending the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.