

**Benton County
Solid Waste Advisory Committee
(SWAC)**

SUMMARY

November 9th, 2022, 11:00 AM

In attendance:

<u>SWAC Members:</u>		<u>remote or in-person</u>
Benton County:	Will McKay	absent
City of Benton City:	Jessica Wadsworth	absent
City of Kennewick:	Chuck Torelli (Secretary)	remote
City of Kennewick	Jim Millbauer (alternate)	in-person
City of Prosser:	Don Aubrey	absent
City of Richland:	Theresa Richardson	in-person
City of West Richland:	Richard Bloom (Vice Chair)	in-person
Basin Disposal:	Darrick Dietrich	absent
Basin Disposal:	Rebecca Francik (Chair)	in-person
Waste Management:	Jeff Barcenas	in-person
Public Citizen:	Khris Olsen	absent

Additional Attendees:

Matt Mahoney, Benton County	in-person
Cristina Woods, Benton County	in-person
Jackie Mayfield, Benton County	in-person
Brian Malley, Benton County	remote
Martin Nelson, City of Kennewick	in-person
Mark Chidester, City of Richland	in-person
Michelle Mulrony, Dept of Ecology	remote
Tami Yager, Waste Management	in-person
Wendy Mifflin, HDR	remote
James Coleman, BF Health Department	in-person
Steven Gimpel, Depart of Ecology	remote
Roscoe Slade, City of West Richland	in-person

Meeting start time: 11:00 am

Discussion items

1-Introductions

Everyone attending virtually and in-person introduced themselves and stated what agency they were from.

2-HHW Event

Matt Mahoney stated he stopped by the event a few times and stated it was a successful event. This event was needed to be held due to the delay in opening the facility. Many citizens came early in the morning although the ideal time would be in the afternoon to avoid the long lines. The fairground location is a good location for the event due to the large area. Jim Millbauer stated he attended the event and thought it was efficient and appreciated us having the event.

Cristina showed a power point of photos and data relating to the event. She stated many people began arriving by 8 AM and the busiest time was from 12-12:30. The only item that they ran out of room for was water-based paint, which she stated was collected by the Paint Care Program. Kennewick and Richland had the largest number of residents come to the event, possibly due to the advertisements in their utility bills. Cristina explained the reason the lines get so backed up is because the collection and sorting of hazardous waste by the Clean Harbors team take time. There were three collection lanes and each lane had one collection team who searched for unauthorized items and removed items from vehicle to a sorting station. At the sorting station another team sorted the hazardous waste into different categories, and finally a chemist labels each hazardous waste and puts it in the appropriate containment for shipping. She explained the duties of the road crew employees who directed traffic and the other staff who took information from the citizens and lined up the rows of vehicles. Matt explained the event was scheduled on a Friday due to the location not being available any weekend prior to the estimated opening of the facility.

Matt explained the new completion goal of the facility is January 2. They would like the staff hired and have training for one month with Clean Harbors so it can be fully functional by February. Any future HHW events will most likely be held for the smaller communities, such as Benton City and Prosser for the convenience of the residence. Richard Bloom suggested a soft opening be done city by city to avoid over filling the facility when it first opens. Matt stated it has also been considered to have the facility open by appointment in the very beginning so they can work out the best workflow.

3-SWMLSWFA-2021-BECoSW-0092

Michelle Mulrony explained that every biennium they review each region and where they are at with their grant funding. Each region advises the Dept of Ecology if they are requesting any additional funding or if they will be returning any grant money. After all responses have been collected, they determine how much additional funding is available and how to disperse it. If an agency is selected to receive additional funding the Dept of Ecology will notify them. Cristina advised the entire amount of our grant money has been spent on the facility and the county has projected to need an additional \$708,000 for projects thru June. Cristina provided the group with the breakdown of amount already used by each agency. Rebecca asked Michelle if the tipping fees are anticipated to cover the expenses or if the state funding possibly would cover them. Michelle stated our grant money was fully expended on the facility, but funds may be available for the operations. She did also state that if the need is higher than the LSWFA grant the county will need to find alternate funding sources. Matt indicated the cost of the facility was around \$1.2 million. He believes future grant funds will be sufficient to cover the operating costs of the facility once it's up and running.

O & M expense for facility has been discussed prior and should be within the plan. Level of Service was intended to be set so that additional matching funds would not be required. Matt clarified that fees should be available, and individual agencies would not have any additional expenses. Original conversations were about Clean Harbors to operate the facility – but quotes for the facility to be open three days was nearly \$1million/year. County realized through outreach that with facility open more days, the expense became more reasonable, and that county staff will be least expensive option than through contracted providers. Michelle indicated if there are additional funds, they would be available around February. Martin requested the documentation the county had showing being open more days per week would be more cost effective. Chuck Torelli stated that the possibility of additional funds becoming available, from agencies that do not utilize their entire funds has previously been discussed. Richard Bloom indicated that this does happen, and that this group has obtained this sort of funding. Michelle added that some programs have stalled during recent years – she believes that additional money may be available. Enforcement funds are greater – but implementation funds may be possible, but they should not be counted upon.

Roscoe indicated that SWAC assumed funds would be available, and that local agencies were not anticipating providing additional funds.

4-5-Year Solid Waste Plan

Wendy – presented slides, and overview of Plan Chapter layout. Chapter 1 – Background, Chapter 2 – Waste Stream

Draft of the mission statement: “Benton County and the participating jurisdictions provide citizens with efficient, reliable, and affordable solid waste collection, handling, recycling and disposal services in order to improve the quality of life while protecting and preserving human health, environmental quality, and natural resources”.

Review in this manner, will allow progression through approval agencies. SWAC is anticipating reviewing two chapters with each meeting, to keep progress moving. SWAC is anticipated to approve, starting with DOE.

Draft goals of the plan:

Infrastructure and System - Flexible and adaptable, properly managed, cost effective and provide recycling opportunity.

Economic Sustainability – Waste is managed as a resource and the system has a sustainable funding mechanism.

Education – People and businesses make responsible choices about consumption, waste generation and disposal.

Outside Influences – Promote life cycle product stewardship and regulatory changes that increase recycling and diversion opportunities.

Chapter 1 – Background

Plan requires an agricultural member – Benton County needs to determine a representative. Richard Bloom indicated he has not received a response from WSU Extension. Rebecca questioned whether Lamb Weston might be willing to provide a representative.

- RCW 70A.205 requires local government to maintain current solid waste management plans.
- Plans must be reviewed and revised every five years.
- Status of previous Plan recommendations Appendix D.
- Regulatory overview.
- Changes in solid waste regulation and policy since 2013. Regulatory overview – completed since last plan was adopted. Ensures recommendations are being followed. This plan also is required to meet Oregon requirements – due to waste ultimately directed toward Oregon. Richard asked if regulatory overview is required, and Wendy said it makes adoption much easier. Rebecca asked if this plan meets Oregon requirements. Wendy stated she is unsure of Oregon regulations, changed in July, are incorporated. There have been changes to regulatory requirements since the plan from 2013. Tami stated the regulations changed in July. Rebecca also asked what happens if the revenues go negative, this question was not able to be answered.

Wendy inquired how red-line changes should be treated/collected. Matt suggested that comments be sent to county, who can forward input to Wendy. It's important that SWAC see the comments and any red-line input. Wendy indicated she has not seen any input, to date. Matt suggested that county receive – to Cristina/BC. Cristina clarified that emails distributed have been from the "SWAC" email.

Section 1.12.3 discusses food waste – question about what sort of safe environment are the mechanisms to make it safe to build (zoning, and other factors). Wendy explained that these are overarching mechanisms that must be considered – not necessarily adopted. Recommendations will be made – with implementation costs associated. Recommendations may then be made, after consideration of factors.

Rebecca asked if the group has adopted the plan in time according to the required timeline? Richard stated prior version was provided to DOE for review, but prior plan was never adopted. Matt indicated that a review was received (in 2022) indicating the prior plan would not be approved. This planning process is aimed at producing plan that will meet the requirements.

Michelle will follow up with SWAC, regarding "crop" and its' status. Unclear, if it has been approved.

Chapter 2 – Waste Stream

- Provides information on population and waste generation rates.
- Benton County current and future population estimates - Table 2.1.
- Current Waste generation rate (2018) - Table 2.2.
- Projected waste quantities – Table 2.3.
- Recycled and diverted materials - Table 2.4.
- Benton County waste stream - Table 2.5.

Looks at population and waste quantities. Using OFM figures from April 1, 2021, and forecasts for 2045, both in incorporated and unincorporated areas. In the future, updated waste generation rate may be available – at this time, 2018 figures are being used in plan. Thus, 2018 is being considered the “base year”.

2.4 Recycling and Diverted - Tonnages and recyclables were heavily affected by COVID period. Reluctant to use that period for data so they will be using the 2016/2017 data.

Table 2.5 Waste Stream – Richard stated he was aware of 2019-2020 study and had question. Might be appropriate to clarify why the 2016/17 data was utilized; there is not much of a difference in the data.

Wendy stated there have been questions with Waste Utilization study and is more comfortable with using 2016/17 information. Richard said “OK, as little difference – may be good idea to explain why.” Richard stated the only difference apparent between 2019 and 2015 was no newspapers.

5-Other

Next meeting will be December 14th, 2022, at 11:00 am. The plan was to review Chapters 6 and 8 but Wendy will not be able to attend so she asked if it was possible to change the meeting date. Consensus was to meet on Dec 14th, as scheduled, and the SWAC will review the chapters and will discuss them in the January meeting with Wendy. The January meeting may need to be scheduled to be a longer meeting. Wendy indicates she will work to provide a third chapter during December.

Matt stated the county would send out chapters 6 and 8 to all in the group and advised they would do the bulk of the red lining.

Meeting end time: 12:27 pm