

**WASHINGTON STATE SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**\*\* MEETING SUMMARY \*\***

**March 16, 2010, 9:30 a.m.**

**Ecology Headquarters, Rooms 1S 16 & 17**

*Presentations and Handouts are Available at*

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/swac/sched.html>

---

Steve Wamback, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Introductions were made and Steve asked for a motion to approve the January 19 meeting notes. There was a motion to adopt them. The motion was seconded and the notes were approved.

***Ecology Legislative & Budget Update – Laurie Davies***

**Contact: 360-407-6103 or [Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov)**

Special session is underway to address budget issues. There are considerable differences among the Governor's, House and Senate budgets. The only budget that adds money back to the Waste 2 Resources (W2R) Program is the Senate budget which includes a \$17 million add for CPG out of LTCA.

A lot of legislation passed impacting the W2R Program, including ESSB 5543, the mercury light recycling bill. The bill is different than the E-Cycle Washington Program in that it requires a contract for the governing agency and a flat fee vs. market share for manufacturers. The bill is on its way to the Governor for signature.

Bills that also passed include:

- ESHB 2399 – Prohibiting and Prescribing Penalties for Engaging in or Advertising to Engage in Solid Waste Collection without a Solid Waste Collection Certificate
- SSB 6248 – Act Relating to the use of Bisphenol A
- SB 6557 – Limiting the use of Certain Substances in Brake Friction Material (copper brake pad bill)
- SHB 2745 – Compliance with EPA's Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule in the Lead-based Paint Program
- E2SHB 2539 – Optimizing the Collection of Source Separated Materials

Dean Large asked what the W2R Program's next targets are. Laurie said for PBTs (Persistent Bio-cumulative Toxins), the chemical action plan for PAHs is next. There is some desire to move away from a chemical by chemical approach. There is work underway on TSCA reform. We are looking at green chemistry. Implementation of the Children's Safe Products Act is ongoing.

***70.95 Update – Jay Shepard***

**Contact: 360-407-7040 or [Jay.Shepard@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Jay.Shepard@ecy.wa.gov)**

The W2R Program is pursuing updating the solid waste management laws, which were passed in 1969 and then amended 29 times.

Jay explained the process will begin by convening stakeholder workshops statewide to get input on what the issues are. He said we hope to proceed with agency request legislation in 2012. This effort could spread over several legislative sessions as this is a huge undertaking.

A website will be live by the end of this week with pages on issue areas, upcoming workshops, lists of laws, etc. The website will include an opportunity for online comments. SWAC will receive a link to the website.

Kevin Kiernan said we need to better define recycling and beneficial use.

Jody Snyder wanted to know how problem areas in the laws were determined. Jay said so far they have been identified in internal Ecology discussions. The statewide workshops will be opportunities for people to identify what they like and don't like about the existing law.

Dean Large asked about UTC's involvement. Jay said we will engage them.

Suellen Mele asked if the stakeholder workshops are intended to be scoping sessions. Jay said yes. The first series of workshops will not be for problem solving.

Bob Schille asked if soil issues would be included in this effort. Jay said soil could wind up on the table, but Ecology is addressing it in the update of WAC 173-350.

Brad Lovaas wanted to know how this effort aligns with the 350 and 351 rule updates. Laurie Davies said the 350 and 351 rules updates are needed sooner. We hope to have -351 language to EPA for review this summer. The -350 proposed rule language (CR102) will be issued in summer 2011, after spending next year working on updated and new sections with stakeholders.

Laurie Davies asked how SWAC would like to engage in the 70.95 effort. Would SWAC prefer to have separate meetings? It was decided that SWAC would have a 70.95 issue assessment work session in May. Jay said he would have comments back from the initial workshops to share with the group.

Steve Wamback said it looks like we are only looking at the problems with no focus on good things we have done, e.g. recycling programs. Jay agreed the approach should be shifted to "What's going right and how can we make it better?"

Suellen Mele said it is also a question of what is working and what tweaks we can make to make those things work even better. George Sidles agreed the focus should be working together as partners to make it better. We do not take enough time to celebrate accomplishments.

Suellen also pointed out that when looking at potential changes, changing one piece can affect many other areas. It would help to have very clear agreement in the law.

***Future of SWAC – Laurie Davies***

**Contact: 360-407-6103 or [Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov)**

The boards and commissions bill died in regular legislative session, but was resurrected last night. This agenda item is postponed until we know more.

***Beyond Waste Progress Report – Gretchen Newman & Chris Chapman***

**Contact: 360-407-6097 or [Gretchen.Newman@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Gretchen.Newman@ecy.wa.gov); 360-407-7160 or [Chris.Chapman@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Chris.Chapman@ecy.wa.gov)**

Now that the Beyond Waste Plan is updated and the Beyond Waste Progress Report ([http://www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste/09\\_bwprog\\_front.html](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste/09_bwprog_front.html)) has been issued three times, it is a good time to evaluate the indicators and information in the Progress Report. The 2009 plan update recommends an evaluation every five years. As part of this evaluation, this questionnaire is being shared with SWAC, W2R and HWTR teams, as well as a few outside folks for input.

The goal is to improve the existing report, not totally revamp it. Improving the report may include substituting a few indicators for better ones, eliminating a few indicators that are not useful, and/or improving effectiveness of others; for example, having more comparison data.

Due to resource constraints, we do not anticipate expansion of the number of existing indicators. Additionally, we want the indicators to continue to provide consistent, accurate trend lines. Ideally we do not want to change the existing inputs to the indicators themselves.

Please be aware any changes Ecology decides to make regarding the Progress Report will be reflected in the 2011 report, not the report issued in 2010.

Chris and Gretchen went over the questionnaire with SWAC. Following are the questions and SWAC's feedback.

*1. Have you reviewed the Progress Report online before today? Why or why not?*

- More than half reviewed the Progress Report online.
- Reasons why they didn't use it:
  - No excuse - People knew it was there, but didn't have time.
- Reasons why they did use it:
  - Local SWAC interested.

- Planning.
- Curiosity.
- Data mining.
- Use not directly tied to job, but used as resource.
- It's a published source – good for students and others with questions.
- Staff reviewed to make sure they are consistent with what's there.

2. *What do you like about it?*

- Easy to get a snapshot – Can skim through lots of information at once.
- Click-ability.
- Like ability to dig deep into data.
- Remarkable transformation in planning from oral tradition as a loose confederation of organizations to come together as a collective that is data driven – Outstanding.
- Collective management.
- Like information presented in different ways.
- Easy to assimilate as viewer.

3. *What do you not like about it?*

- Show normalization for more indicators (to per capita or to \$2000).
- Lag time between current year and what's printed (but understand issues and challenges around doing it sooner).
- Explain on printable version that the web version is clickable and that you can drill down for more information (did not realize how clickable it is).
- Timely data and the right data set are important. (Can we address this reporting lag in legislation?)
- There is never real-time data. The fact that we do not have the ability to point to the most current data possible is detrimental.
- Use economic data comparison with more indicators (correlation between some indicators and economic activity).

4. *Currently, we have 16 indicators and will probably not add additional indicators that increase the numbers beyond 16. Are there some indicators you would substitute for the ones we currently have? Are there some indicators that you would just eliminate? Why?*

- Eliminate paint recycling. It isn't useful (more locally based and we are moving away from taking latex paint).
- If major shifts occur, we would want to explain that (such as deciding if paint should go to the landfill).
- Per capita more visible on chart (gives more information than absolute data).
- Solid waste generation: Including more on how it relates per capita would be more useful than absolute numbers.
- Dramatic drops in biosolids and lawn/garden pesticides may need a different scale for interpretation in the future. These indicators are really important.

- Put graphs on a percentage change scale so we can compare how programs are effecting change. Could take out the bias in scale adjustment.
  - Could we overlay different categories on the graph to get a different picture, such as per capita or economy?
  - Not sure how “solid waste per \$” is useful. Overlay other categories to make it more meaningful such as unemployment, etc.
  - Is there a way to capture the national report card?
5. *One of our goals is to have indicators that reflect progress within each initiative area (Industries, Moderate risk waste, Green building and Organics). Do you feel the indicators effectively measure the goals and progress of the initiatives? If not, what do you feel is lacking? What suggestions, if any, do you have for improvements?*
- Use indicators that show the big picture. Given that we only have 16, show the big picture instead of delving too far into the initiatives.
  - Another way to present on the front page would be to choose those tied to the overall vision so we can get a snapshot more quickly, and next list more specific indicators. Color coding could also be used (red = bad; green = good).
  - Good mix as currently written.
  - Are we picking those we have control over? There is no right answer.
  - Hazardous waste indicators are not specific to industry or SQG. The initiatives have too much overlap. This is not a criticism of the indicators.
  - Link between indices and CPG funding to indicate success (this has not been done).
  - Hazardous waste indicators are not specific to IND and MRW. There is more of an issue with those initiatives. There is so much overlap it is hard to separate out which indicators are for Industry and which are for MRW. (MRW data is very hard to get.)
6. *Another goal is to compare Washington’s progress against the progress of other states or countries. Do you have any suggestions on what indicators would be good to compare with others?*
- Seattle Public Utilities does benchmarking with comparable cities, including internationally. This is hard to do with solid waste, but it can be done with water.
  - Everyone tracks differently, so don’t waste our time.
  - This is a great concept, but don’t put a lot of time into it.
  - Maybe solid waste generation, but not recycling.
  - Definitions vary so much.
  - How much of the universe do we have? Knowing the gaps is important. This can only be done if the majority of facilities report.
  - Compare with national data – five best and worst states.
7. *One objective of the Beyond Waste Progress Report is to set target goals where appropriate. For example, what percent of organics should we try to compost in 5, 10, or 25 years? Do you think numerical goals should be set? If so, how much energy and resources should Ecology put into this process? And what indicators should we set goals for?*

- Where practical.
- If we set goals and targets, it implies accountability when we have none in most cases. Be careful.
- Push for a softer target such as “continuous improvement.”
- There is room for both performance targets and aspirational goals. Make a distinction as to where we have control or not. In areas of control, set performance targets. Set up aspirational goals where we can work on indicators over time. (One foot in the BW Plan and one foot in the 70.95 project.)
- Leads into 70.95 discussion.
- Really important question - Look at both types of goals. (Watch out for capping at too low a level. This can actually cap the activity, which occurred in another state.)
- How would we finance the goals? We need to keep that in mind.
- Uncontrollable factors (organics compost vs. hog fuel – changes in markets).
- If a goal is set, how will it be financed? We don’t want it to become an unfunded mandate.
- Within the plan there are milestones – they are close to goals. How is this same or different than goals for indicators? Accountability in plan responsibility is more delineated.

8. *Three of the indicators (Lawn & Garden Pesticide Toxicity, Consumer Climate Change Index and Consumer Ecosystem Toxicity Index) use the Consumer Environmental Index (CEI) data model. Are these indicators understandable? Are these indicators useful? Why or why not? Should we continue to update and maintain these indicators in the future?*

- Have reservations about the Ecosystems Toxicity index. What does the graph really tell us? Should we be afraid or *really* afraid?
- Who is the audience? This is not for the average audience, but a more sophisticated one. Need to consider definitions for all terms.
- Could this scare people unjustly?
- Ecosystems toxicity is up 32 percent in 5 years. What is Ecology doing about this? Locals have no control over this. Leads to concerns that it could reduce money to locals.
- Opens up the issue of “What’s Ecology doing about this/what can we do?”
- CEI shows an important message that we are increasing toxics in products. Don’t forget this is good to get out to public. This indicator might be the best way to do it.
- It is important to try and depict these. We may need it to drive policy discussion, such as P2 and resources.
- This could drive more analysis. Want to know the key variables that lead to this increase.
- This is the oldest data in the progress report. It is so hard to keep current. The data is too old to be meaningful.
- Still have a question about what CEI means.

9. *Given the resource constraints government currently has, is it important for us to work toward one index or number (such an index would probably combine several indicators to a single number) to track Beyond Waste progress? Why or why not?*

- We feel pretty good about these indicators
- No need to find an overall index. This is a meaningless exercise. We don't have time. More work for government or someone else.
- Aggregate indices = a Pandora's Box of philosophical discussions.

10. *Do you have any other comments on the Progress Report? Please give us the names of anyone that might be willing to work with us on more specific information in the future.*

- Good work.
- We like it
- Like the printable document.
- Good session, good format.
- Results in something useful.
- Fabulous summary of a bazillion hours of work.

Other Comment: The Benefits of Recycling Focus Sheet is fabulous – Keep it up and continue to make it part of the climate change narrative.

***CPG Update – Laurie Davies***

***Contact: 360-407-6103 or [Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Laurie.Davies@ecy.wa.gov)***

Laurie said she believes all contracts are signed for Phase 1 of CPG. There was no additional funding cut. The language to amend the health contracts was agreed on. We should see the amendments in the next month or so. If Ecology receives the additional \$17 million in funding, we will look at contracting Phase 2.

***Agenda Items for Future Meetings***

- Update from EPA Region 10 on Solid Waste Issues on Tribal Lands – Kristen Hall/Kim Farnham, May 2010
- Footprint project briefing – Angie Fritz, Spring 2010
- 70.95 session – May 2010
- Future of SWAC

***Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.***

**Submitted by: Susanne McLemore**

***SWAC Members Present***

Laurie Davies  
Dennis Durbin  
Lorie Hewitt  
Peter Keller  
Kevin Kiernan  
Dean Large  
Brad Lovaas  
Jim Matsuyama  
Steve McGonigal  
Suellen Mele  
Wendy Mifflin  
Bob Schille  
George Sidles  
Jerry Smedes  
Art Starry  
Danny Joe Stensgar  
Steve Wamback  
Eddie Westmoreland

***Alternates Present***

David Baker  
Pat Campbell  
Penny Ingram  
John Sherman  
Jody Snyder

***Meeting Participants***

Chris Chapman  
Gretchen Newman  
Jay Shepard

***Interested Parties Present***

Kathy Davis  
Rick Itlavla