

**Notes from MRW Annual Report Discussion Breakout Group**  
**Statewide MRW Coordinators Meeting**  
**May 4, 2010**

- **It is confusing to have both participation and number of vehicles on the same collection event form.** Ecology is only looking for participation numbers here. The operator can choose to count people or vehicles, whatever is easiest for them to track. Ecology can modify the form to eliminate the confusion and go with just one of the two terms. The question is which one. Since we are looking for participation numbers I (AI) would recommend asking for participation.  
**Some vehicles bring in waste from their waste from multiple households.** Ecology recognizes this is hard to track and judge. The operator can use their best judgement in these cases. If the driver states what they are bringing in is from 6 different households, it makes sense to Ecology to count the participation for this one vehicle as 6.
- **It is difficult if not impossible to track participation numbers at unattended limited MRW facilities.** Ecology recognizes this difficulty and has no solution to the problem, but is open to any suggestions. Therefore, participation numbers are below what is actually occurring out there.
- **Some expressed a concern that there may be double (over) reporting occurring out there.** Ecology takes great measures and checks to ensure this does not occur or is greatly minimized. The checks and balances occur between the MRW reports and Recycling Survey and annual reports. There may be some overlap with CPG progress reporting.
- **Some expressed the desire to have a fillable PDF form (the current form-though fillable-can corrupt other areas of the form) that could be submitted electronically. It was also suggested that the form be formatted from portrait view to landscape view.** Ecology will look into this. We would have to see if there are form guidelines to follow that would allow or disallow a change like this. Currently, submitting the form electronically is an option and can be done.
- **Some expressed the desire for it to be easier to show multiple disposition methods for the same waste category on the form.** The difficulty here is that to, list all 8 disposition methods per waste category could make the form quite long. This could be accomplished on the current form (if anyone wants guidance on this, please contact AI Salvi). If Ecology is able to change the form to a more user friendly fillable PDF or other, this will be looked at.
- **It can be difficult to differentiate costs between CESQG and HHW operations because both services occur during normal business operations. Separating out staff and material costs are difficult as staff are serving both customers and wastes get combined. Can give CESQG contractor disposal costs because CESQG's need to pay for that service.** Ecology recognizes these difficulties and only asks you to do the best you can. Though it is still difficult (if not impossible to have an apples to apples comparison for facilities) Ecology found it encouraging that everyone at the breakout session felt they reported their true costs of operating their programs to the best of their abilities. Ecology could add another cost category for capital costs if jurisdictions felt they could do this. It seems most would have included capital costs in the other category. It seems like materials, publicity, and capital could all be their own cost categories. Ecology will explore if parsing each of these out is doable for facilities.
- **Difficulty in separating costs between facility and collection events.** Most jurisdictions that do collection events for outlying areas bring the wastes collected back to their facility for processing or consolidation with wastes collected at the facility. Therefore, some of the costs of the collection event get wrapped up into the facility costs.

- **Ecology inquired how much of Ecology’s report was used for other reporting purpose for the facility in their jurisdiction.** Some indicated very little was used in other reports they had to fill out concerning the facility and others said they did use the information gathered for the ecology report to show County Commissioners efficiencies of their facility compared to other facilities statewide and as a leveraging tool when negotiating vendor contracts.
- **Generally, people liked the idea of being able to list out the waste type that they have no other place on the form but to put in the other category – therefore make it easy on the form to list those waste types under the other category heading.** Ecology will work on making the form more user friendly to accommodate this. This would also help Ecology identify other possible waste types to be listed on the form.
- **Facilities expressed how a change in vendor could alter how they have to package up a certain waste type and thus change the category that waste type gets reported under on Ecology’s form from the previous year’s report.** Ecology could look into providing a place on the form to make mention if this occurs. This would also help Ecology be able to better identify trends in waste stream collections over the years – see next bullet.
- **Several people expressed the need for Ecology to analyze the data submitted to Ecology to identify more trends where one may exist.** Ecology stated that they try to do this at present. Used oil was cited as an area that was trending down and overall HHW collections leveling off. However, with better data such as identifying when a waste stream all of a sudden was reported under a different waste category (see previous bullet) this might be easier to do for some waste streams. The Solid Waste in WA Annual report (MRW Section) could be reformatted to highlight trends more effectively as well.
- **Discussion seemed to affirm the value in looking a cost per participant information as a measure of a facilities success.** It was mentioned, however, that some facilities are starting to see more customers come in with one item such as one CFL. Once facility mentioned that they track this as one participant and another mentioned that they wait to accumulate 10 CFLs to count as one participant.
- **Discussion seemed to affirm that the data Ecology gathers is helpful to local jurisdictions in comparing programs, though it is by no means perfect.**
- **The reports do not factor in any sort of educational component of a program.** It might be possible to split up the publicity cost into advertising and education costs if facilities felt they could do this.
- **The group expressed for Ecology to not make any changes to the form that are not already being tracked by facilities.** Before any changes are finalized to the form Ecology will meet with stakeholder to make sure they could track what was being asked for.
- **It was expressed that the recycle survey needed to incorporate more MRW categories because more diversion was occurring at MRW facilities than the recycle survey was picking up.** Ecology will explore this. It appears the categories currently on the recycle survey incorporate the biggest MRW waste streams being diverted. One question is would the inclusion of all MRW diverted make a dent in the percentage diverted from landfilling when the MRW waste stream is such a small percentage in the first place. Regardless, it would still represent a more true account of the diversion that local jurisdictions are achieving through their programs.