

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

**Meeting Minutes
December 14th, 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)	absent
City of Kennewick	Jim Millbauer (alternate)	absent
City of Prosser:	Don Aubrey	absent
City of Richland:	Theresa Richardson	remote
City of West Richland:	Richard Bloom (Vice Chair)	remote
Basin Disposal:	Darrick Dietrich	absent
Basin Disposal:	Rebecca Francik (Chair)	in-person
Public Citizen:	Khristy Olsen	absent
Waste Management	Tami Yager (alternate)	remote

Additional Attendees:

Matt Mahoney, Benton County	remote
Cristina Woods, Benton County	in-person
Brian Malley, Benton County	remote
Shela Berry	in-person
Roscoe Slade, City of West Richland	in-person

Meeting start time: 11:04 am

Discussion items

1) Introductions

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

2) Approval of November 9, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Chuck motion to approve, second by Roscoe - MCU

3) Public Comment (none)

4) 5-Year Solid Waste Plan – Discuss DRAFT Chapter 6 and Chapter 8

- a. DRAFT Chapter 6 – Rebecca Francik encouraged input for Ch 6. Chuck indicated he's impressed with the level of detail. Tami mentioned she also was impressed with chapter, as presented. Roscoe did not have comment. Rebecca indicated she has many comments, but feels it is well written. She feels mentions should be less specific, with regard to aspects that facilities currently do not exist (carpet padding, pharmaceuticals, etc). Rebecca feels the document should be discussed as a guide, rather than emphasis upon legal requirements and background

Chuck mentioned that he appreciates the detail as to how we arrived at current status and feels historical aspects are valuable to the document. Perhaps links could be provided for the disposal options that exist for carpets, batteries, pharmaceuticals, etc. Roscoe indicated that each city likely has information as to direct disposal – that could be valuable additions for citizen use of the document. Rebecca mentioned that perhaps each chapter should identify the overall goal – that waste not reach water sources, etc. State the important information directly up front – with links, and then follow with remainder of chapter. This would require each section of the plan to have a goal stated. Tami mentioned she appreciates the background being provided, and a historical context. Hauler details and programs available could be incorporated into document. Richard Bloom mentioned that Ecology does not have a strict format for the Solid Waste Plan – but a checklist of required elements that it must contain. He feels the “prescriptive” requirements appear to be met with the DRAFT. Richard does not support putting links within a document – as they “break”. He feels the county should provide that level of information upon the county solid waste website. Rebecca inquired if Richard supports addition of goals being stated at the head of each chapter. Richard Bloom responded that his prior efforts included many goals – but is unsure if they were beneficial to the document. He added the action plan should contain that detail, but not his opinion they should be within the plan. Bloom indicated he does not expect people to reference the Solid Waste plan when determining how to dispose of waste, the plan is more of as a collective group how they plan to address waste disposal needs. Waste Management, Basin Disposal, City and County sites – important that there is consistency with all agencies with the information provided. Rebecca mentioned that if future requirements of Ecology are modified, there are no mechanisms to address suitable zoning, she suggested something broad enough to take to County Commissioners as an enforcement tool. Richard Bloom mentioned he does not believe the Solid Waste Plan is intended as an enforcement tool for changing Ecology requirements. Chuck speaks to what we should be doing, but future direction will come from regulating agencies at state level. The purpose of this plan is to establish a direction, but not as an enforcement tool. Rebecca believes our plan should indicate the intention to follow future directives from regulating agencies. She feels there is resistance to follow, in some regard – she hopes this plan provides consideration which might spur private development of facilities that may be required in the future. Tami added that language indicating that fiscally responsible investments need to fit the community. Richard stated that requirements must be considered – in that we might secure funding to evaluate the feasibility of future facilities, but that we should not be forced to invest without evaluation first. Matt Mahoney indicated he agrees that public sector plan updates are planning in nature, and that ordinances and policies are established in support. This is also a planning document – that would be basis for both public and private investments in solid waste

handling. Matt supports whichever direction this body desires but feels it important this be viewed as a planning tool rather than regulatory or as tool for enforcement. Rebecca requested “the county will work with entities to address regulatory requirements” – so that citing and zoning would be considered, rather than avoided “as not part of plan”. Richard indicated that cities and counties will be “signing onto the plan” and feels that putting “wills” into the plan may be an issue when approaching the assorted councils and boards of the participating agencies. He suggests “consider” language rather than “will”. He feels it is important that reference be made to potential source of revenue that might be pursued if opportunities arise. Tami feels it is important to address all waste streams, while considering alternative methods and approaches. Rebecca mentioned EPR (Extended Producer Responsibility) have caused a loss of local control. The most important aspect is that alternative disposal options must be referenced, if there is no market allowing for disposal in private sector. EPR is not well defined or actionable. Tami provided updates regarding EPRs, indicating that CDL (Construction, Demolition, Land clearing) waste is being handled at the WM Transfer Station on Ely. 6.15.2 mentions only Horn Rapids Landfill. Tami believes the section is lengthy and perhaps may have unintended consequences that should be considered. Rebecca mentioned we have good systems in place for EPRs like batteries and paint. Bloom believes recycling of carpet to be problematic. Styrofoam is also a challenge, with respect to cost efficiency (getting there).

Rebecca requested specific direction to consultant. She believes all reference to carpet be removed – as no facilities currently exist. Bloom mentioned mattresses. Richard agreed that reference to carpets should be suggested for removal from plan. Chuck agreed with removal. He questioned EPRs – what are the consequences if citizenry is not willing to absorb the expense? Tami indicated that EPRs charge “up front” for the disposal efforts. Aluminum, for example, subsidizes the other waste streams. Residents are then asked to absorb the expense when market conditions do not cover. Some higher value recyclables collected (like aluminum) help subsidize lower value materials like paper. The cost of curbside collection is not covered by the value of materials collected which is why customers have to pay for service. If EPR's are put in place for certain materials it could change the structure of the current curbside recycling programs and potentially take away local control. Rebecca – this does not mean we will not recycle, but that we will operate with the entities where we can gain the best price. Richard mentioned paint recycling – which he believes it an up-front expense added to price of paint....another EPR. Rebecca referenced perhaps mentioning EPRs, rather than mattresses, carpet, and specific types of waste. Rebecca mentioned she would not reference EPRs at all – until be determine direction from regulating agencies going forward. Richard mentioned that currently, citizens simply pull carpet themselves (landfill) to avoid the fees. Tami – mentioned that there is governmental pressure to handle these waste streams, but not necessarily a market. Roscoe confirmed that pharmaceutical drop-offs exist at all local PDs. Consensus that the document be a guiding plan, not an enforcement utility. Francik repeated that Language that city/counties will consider future directives should be within the plan – otherwise, new regulatory directives will be avoided. Tami believes this aspect belongs within another portion of the plan and suggests we discuss with consultant as to where most appropriate. Matt asked to confirm removal of EPRs is the intent – to include paint, carpet, mattresses. Consensus was the EPR references be removed, other than those known as hard to collect and with current disposal options in place at this time. Just mattresses and carpets, specifically.

- b. **DRAFT Chapter 8** – Richard mentioned specific reference to an energy center as WSU as being promoted, and that recommended action “County monitor progress of WSU as an Energy Center, in the event that current conditions change. Possibly adding another sentence – “proposed Energy Center at WSU/TC may represent opportunities that should be evaluated.” It’s possible a mini-digester could be possible, through new sources.
Chuck questioned whether reference to WSU is needed, but that it may be too specific. Richard mentioned timeliness. Chuck retorted this plan will go “to shelf’ as Richard said. Tami provided written updates to facilities. 8.5.1 mentioned as minimum rate up to 500 lbs, and then 6.40 per pound when above. Richland landfill projected to be suitable for 120 years, based on customer base and projected usage.
Chuck believes details are too specific – should only be included, if required.
Rebecca prompted other input – NONE.

- 5) **January meeting time and duration** – Rebecca mentioned duration, as group routinely goes long. Perhaps 1.5 hours is needed? Rebecca will advise if need for longer meeting, based on review of coming chapters. Cristina mentioned that any notes are appreciated – which will be provided to group. Rebecca mentioned she’d provide her notes this afternoon.

6) **Other**

Next meeting will be January 11, 2023 at 11:00 am.

Meeting end time: 12:08 pm