Form revised: December 6, 2011

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Seattle Public Utilities	Vicky Beaumont 233-7856	Karl Stickel 684-8085

Legislation Title: A RESOLUTION adopting Seattle's Solid Waste Plan 2011 Revision to the 1998 Plan "On the Path to Sustainability," as amended by the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Summary of the Legislation: The resolution would adopt the 2011 Revision to Seattle's 1998 Solid Waste Plan, as amended by the 2004 Solid Waste Plan Amendment. The Plan provides long-term vision and guides the City's solid waste management programs for the next five years. More specifically, the 2011 Revision confirms the goals, policies and program direction established in the 1998 Plan, as updated by the 2004 Plan Amendment. It describes progress towards established goals and objectives, and identifies strategies for continuing to move towards these goals over the next five years and through 2020. The adopted 2011 Revision will be submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology for approval.

Background:

State law requires local governments develop solid waste plans and that they be updated every five years. The Washington State Department of Ecology reviews and approves adopted plans. The 2011 Revision has a 20-year horizon, recommending solid waste programs for the next five years, and providing direction for the following 15 years. The City adopted the 1998 Plan "On the Road to Sustainability" in 1998. The 2004 Plan Amendment was adopted by Resolution 30750 in 2005. Funding for particular solid waste programs comes through the Seattle Public Utilities' (SPU's) annual budget process.

The Solid Waste Plan 2011 Revision does not establish new policy direction. The Revision confirms the vision, goals and program direction established in the 1998 Plan, as updated by the 2004 Plan Amendment, but also revises the timeline for achieving some of these goals. The 2011 Revision also summarizes progress since 2004 and describes how Seattle intends to proceed through the year 2020 towards achieving the established goals.

The Plan will continue to be implemented through the 2013-2014 Budget and Capital Improvement Projects (and subsequent years), as well as through other legislation e.g. ordinances adopting solid waste contract amendments. This resolution itself does not make appropriations or change spending, although it does establish programmatic expectations.

More specifically, the 2011 Revision:

- Lays out waste generation trends
- Discusses waste prevention and its transitioning role in managing discards
- Describes what SPU does with typical household and business waste that is produced in

Victoria Beaumont SPU Solid Waste Plan FISC September 14, 2012 Version #2

the city

- Discusses other wastes the SPU system needs to manage
- Spells out the Plan's future and financing
- Makes recommendations for the future affecting Seattle's solid waste system, and for increasing waste prevention and recycling.

Municipal Solid Waste system and facilities recommendations include:

- Staying the course regarding SPU's core system by continuing competitive contracting with private providers for collection, processing and disposal services
- Completing planned infrastructure improvements of rebuilding the two City-owned transfer stations
- Planning for contingencies such as disasters and the Alaskan Way Viaduct closure
- Continuing to monitor and maintain the City's closed landfills

Waste reduction and recycling recommendations include:

- Keeping on with Seattle's current slate of waste reduction and recycling programs
- Adjusting municipal solid waste recycling goal years to align with projected achievement of 60 percent by 2015 and 70 percent by 2022
- Creating for the first time a recycling goal for construction and demolition debris (C&D) of 70 percent by the year 2020
- Increasing education and enforcement targeted to the residential, self-haul, and commercial sectors
- Phasing in disposal bans on target materials such as compostable organic waste, clean wood, plastic film, asphalt roofing shingles, paving material (asphalt, brick, concrete), plastic bags
- Implementing programs for diverting or reducing carpet, junk mail, phone books, pet waste and diapers
- Continuing to build waste prevention activities such as those that foster product stewardship, reuse, sustainable building, on-site organics management, and City green purchasing.

The 2011 Revision discusses service level maintenance strategies for Clean City programs addressing graffiti, illegal dumping, and litter. Seattle is a partner agency in the Local Hazardous Waste Management Plan (LHWMP) for the local management of moderate risk waste (MRW), and contributes by running two MRW collection facilities and other activities under the aegis of LHWMP.

X	This legislation does not have any financial implications.
	This legislation has financial implications.

Other Implications:

Please check one of the following:

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications? Yes. The legislation has indirect and long-term financial implications. If all the solid

Yes. The legislation has indirect and long-term financial implications. If all the solid waste program recommendations in the Plan Revision were implemented, solid waste budget line items would shift over time. Also, the recommendations will slow the growth of the Solid Waste Fund revenue requirement, compared to staying with current programs. Decisions regarding specific program funding levels would occur via the budget process. Chapter 6, section 6.3 "Financing the Plan" contains a more complete discussion about financing Seattle's Solid Waste System.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

State law requires local governments develop solid waste plans and that they be updated every five years. Adoption of the solid waste plan occurs by legislative action by the Executive and City Council. The financial cost of not having a valid plan in place would be small, at least in the short term. The long term financial costs are unknown.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department? Yes. Implementation of the new goal for recycling of construction and demolition debris (C&D) will require coordination between SPU and the Department of Planning and Development, which regulates development and issues building permits.

d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?

It would be possible to develop a more aggressive program implementation timeline. That would require greater near-term implementation costs, but savings would also be realized sooner. The process of developing the Solid Waste Plan 2011 Revision included analyzing multiple possible program changes and timing. The final set of recommendations included in the Plan, and their implementation timeline, represent what SPU and stakeholders believe to be a good balance between aggressively pursuing zero waste goals and feasibility.

e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?

No. A public hearing on the resolution is not required by the State. State solid waste plan guidelines require public involvement for the development of the Preliminary Draft. SPU carried out the Plan's public involvement plan late summer to early fall 2011 and received feedback from hundreds of individuals, several groups, and the Seattle Solid Waste Advisory Committee as part of the process to develop the 2011 Plan Revision (as documented in Appendix C in the Plan).

f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?

No. However, on June 7, 2012 the SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for the Plan was published in the DJC, the Seattle Times, and DPD's Land Use Information Bulletin. The DNS was also entered in the Washington State Department of Ecology SEPA Public Information Center SEPA Register.

Victoria Beaumont SPU Solid Waste Plan FISC September 14, 2012 Version #2

g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?

No

h) Other Issues:

SPU, the Mayor and the Council took the Plan's recommendations and timeline into account in developing and approving Solid Waste Fund budgets for 2013-2014 and solid waste rates for 2013 through 2016, but also adopted some cuts to SPU's 2013-2014 budget. These budget cuts were intended to moderate the solid waste rate increases, but they mean that active monitoring and management will be required on SPU's part to achieve the near-term goal of recycling 60 percent municipal solid waste by 2015. SPU will plan to reallocate funding across its programs within the Solid Waste Fund in 2014-2015 to help achieve this goal and the other goals specified in the Plan.

List attachments to the fiscal note below:

None