

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Introduction

**Thank you for providing input on funding mechanisms and revenue sources for solid and household hazardous waste management in Washington State. We are seeking new and innovative funding mechanisms, sources, or rate structures that will:**

- **Remain sustainable as disposed garbage decreases; recycling and organics processing rates increase; total waste quantities decrease; and commodity values fluctuate.**
- **Meet community needs throughout the state, including in rural areas and in Eastern Washington.**
- **Incentivize waste reduction and recycling without encouraging illegal dumping or improper disposal.**
- **Support environmental sustainability and social justice.**

**After a few questions on demographics, this survey covers the following topics:**

- **Current and Future Funding Gaps**
- **New and Innovative Funding Mechanisms, organized into the following parts of the solid waste system:**
  - **Collection Rate Structures for Garbage, Recycling, or Composting**
  - **Education, Outreach, or Technical Assistance for Garbage, Recycling, or Composting**
  - **Waste Prevention and Source Reduction Activities**
  - **Household Hazardous Waste and Moderate Risk Waste**
  - **Clean-up and Prevention of Litter and Illegal Dumping**
  - **Permitting, Enforcement, and other Regulatory Activities**
  - **Administration and Planning**
  - **Monitoring, Maintenance, and Remediation of Closed Facilities**
  - **Other Mechanisms**
- **Other Research Leads and Comments**

**For more information, contact the project managers:**

- **Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia Consulting Group | [Jessica@cascadiaconsulting.com](mailto:Jessica@cascadiaconsulting.com) | 206.449.1126**
- **Janine Bogar, Waste 2 Resources Program | [Janine.bogar@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Janine.bogar@ecy.wa.gov) | 360.407.6654**

To request ADA accommodation, call Ecology at 360-407-6900, Relay Service 711, or TTY 877-833-6341.

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Demographics

#### Which of the following best describes you?

- ☐ I work at a **state agency** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I work at a **county public works department** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I work at a **county public health department** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I work at a **city** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I work in the **private sector** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I work for an **advocacy organization** in solid or household hazardous waste.
- ☐ I am a **member of the public** who does not work in solid waste.
- ☐ **Other** (please explain)

#### Which of the following best describes where you work--or live for members of the public? (Select all that apply.)

- ☐ Western Washington, urban or suburban area
- ☐ Western Washington, rural area
- ☐ Eastern Washington, urban or suburban area
- ☐ Eastern Washington, rural area
- ☐ Other or outside of Washington (please explain)

**Which type(s) of solid waste do you work with? (Select all that apply.)**

- ☐ Garbage
- ☐ Recycling
- ☐ Composting or organics processing
- ☐ Household hazardous or moderate risk waste
- ☐ Waste reduction or reuse
- ☐ Not applicable—I do not work in solid waste.
- ☐ Other (please explain)

**Which part(s) of the solid waste system do you work in? (Select all that apply.)**

- ☐ Collection, transfer, and transport
- ☐ Active disposal facilities (landfill or incinerator)
- ☐ Active processing facilities (recycling or organics)
- ☐ Inactive disposal facilities (landfill or incinerator)
- ☐ Permitting, enforcement, or other regulatory activities
- ☐ Education, outreach, or technical assistance programs
- ☐ Waste prevention or source reduction programs
- ☐ Clean-up and prevention of litter and illegal dumping
- ☐ Administration and planning
- ☐ Not applicable—I do not work in solid waste.
- ☐ Other (please explain)

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Current and Future Funding Gaps

**What parts of the solid waste system do you see as having major gaps in funding now or in the foreseeable future?**

- ☐ I see no major gaps.
- ☐ I don't know or am not sure.
- ☐ These parts have major gaps in the near term:

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### New and Innovative Funding Mechanisms

Cascadia is reviewing existing reports written or commissioned by the Department of Ecology:

- *Financing Solid Waste for the Future: Background Paper for Beyond Waste*(2004)
- *Solid Waste Management Cost Flows in Washington State*(2007)
- *Revenue Sources to Fund Recycling, Reuse, and Waste Reduction Programs*(2011)

This next section asks you for information on:

- New funding mechanisms your organization or jurisdiction has started using in the past 10-15 years.
- Innovative ideas for funding mechanisms and sources, even if they have not been used yet.

\* You will be able to provide input on funding mechanisms for all the parts of the solid waste system listed below. **Which part would you like to start with?**

- ☐ Collection rate structures for garbage, recycling, or composting
- ☐ Education, outreach, or technical assistance for garbage, recycling, or composting
- ☐ Waste prevention and source reduction activities
- ☐ Household hazardous waste and moderate risk waste
- ☐ Clean-up and prevention of litter and illegal dumping
- ☐ Permitting, enforcement, and other regulatory activities
- ☐ Administration and planning
- ☐ Monitoring, maintenance, and remediation of closed facilities
- ☐ Another type of funding mechanism
- ☐ I don't have any input to provide on funding mechanisms

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Collection Rate Structures for Garbage, Recycling, or Composting

**Please describe the collection rate structure and how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- How is the rate calculated?
- How is the rate presented to customers?
- Are there any innovative fees or surcharges?
- What part of the waste stream does it pay for (garbage, recycling, composting)?
- Does it pay for other parts of the waste system besides collection?
- Is it for residential customers, commercial customers, or both?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for funding collection?

**Is this rate structure currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using this rate structure)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this rate structure? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Education, Outreach, and Technical Assistance for Garbage, Recycling, and Composting

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What part of the waste stream does it pay for (garbage, recycling, composting)?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for funding these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the source or mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Waste Prevention and Source Reduction Activities

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for funding these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

☐

Not that I know of.

☐

Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**



## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Household Hazardous and Moderate Risk Waste

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for funding these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Clean-up and Prevention of Litter and Illegal Dumping

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Permitting, Enforcement, and Other Regulatory Activities

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What types of permitting, enforcement, or other regulatory activities does it pay for?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Administration and Planning

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What types of administration and planning activities does it pay for?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Monitoring, Maintenance, and Remediation of Closed Facilities

**Please name and describe the funding source or mechanism how it addresses the need for sustainable long-term funding. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, who collects, and how are the funds collected?
- What activities and facility types does it pay for?
- What makes it sustainable into the future for these activities?

**Is this source or mechanism currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Other Innovative Funding Mechanisms

**Please name and describe the funding source, mechanism, or rate structure. For example:**

- What is the funding base (e.g., recycling revenues, households, facility permit holders)?
- How is the funding amount calculated (e.g., percentage of revenues, monthly charge per household, annual fee based on size of facility)?
- Who pays, and how are the funds collected?
- What makes this funding source sustainable into the future?

**Which part(s) of the solid waste system does this funding source, mechanism, or rate structure pay for?**

**What type of organization would this mechanism be suitable for (e.g., city, county, state agency, waste collector/hauler, disposal/processing facility, regulator/enforcement, other)?**

**Is this source, mechanism, or rate structure currently in use?**

- ☐ Not that I know of.
- ☐ Yes (please identify which specific jurisdiction or organization is using the mechanism)

**Is there a website, report, or someone we can we contact for more information about this funding source or mechanism? Please provide any reference or contact information you have.**

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

### Other Research Leads and Comments

**We will also research mechanisms used to fund solid waste systems outside of Washington State and used to fund other types of utilities (such as water, energy, wastewater, and stormwater).**

**Do you have any suggestions for other people, organizations, reports, or particular funding mechanisms that we should include in this research?**

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes (please describe)

**Do you have any other comments, suggestions, or concerns regarding the development of sustainable funding mechanisms for solid waste management in Washington State?**

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes (please describe)

## Washington State Department of Ecology: Funding Mechanisms for Solid Waste

Thank you!

**Thank you for providing your input on this important research.**

**For more information, contact the project managers:**

- Jessica Branom-Zwick, Cascadia Consulting Group | [Jessica@cascadiaconsulting.com](mailto:Jessica@cascadiaconsulting.com) | 206.449.1126
- Janine Bogar, Waste 2 Resources Program | [Janine.bogar@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:Janine.bogar@ecy.wa.gov) | 360.407.6654



Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	There are major funding gaps for the collection, processing, recycling of 3 - 7 plastics, toxic and hard to handle recyclable materials (mattresses, paint, tires, HHW). Also, no funding or incentives for investments in local processing infrastructure.
Eastern WA	Rural	Solid Waste Handling Facilities & Recycling collection, sorting and transporting, and House hold hazardous waste collection and handling
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	very little funding of any kind for illegal dumping cleanup, response or prevention permitting and regulatory functions are under funded in most regions
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	I believe a website with education materials, drop off locations, purchase of recycled products, etc. would be helpful.
Other	Other	Washington delegates both permitting and enforcement to local JHDs, yet the level of State funding to them does not match up to the increasing burden on resources especially given the emphasis on end-disposal cash flow and declining disposal volume. Resources are further diluted at both the state and the JHD level by having to respond/support/execute initiatives coming from state planning that are broader than simply regulatory compliance and protection of the environment (e.g., producer responsibility, social justice initiatives). WA has built an excellent end of life and disposal system, then works excessively hard to divert disposables elsewhere to reduce LF volume while encumbering other activities whose regulatory rigor is less comprehensive.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Gaps in funding will be directly related to the future and continuing policies pursued by Dept of Ecology. Each must be reviewed on its own with consideration as to the policy is self funded or subsidized in one form or other. Without that form of a close analysis I could only guess.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Fats, oils & grease for commercial and residential programs.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Paying for recycling from the garbage tip fee. Our mission is to increase the former and decrease the latter. This is not sustainable.
Eastern WA	Rural	Recycle
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Solid Waste regulatory enforcement.
Eastern WA	Rural	CPG funding for enforcement & illegal dumping prevention needs to be increased dramatically
Western WA	Rural	Educational Programs for recycling and MRW/HHW collection prgrams
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Disposal costs increasing Markets for recycling inconsistent Low customer demand for sustainable products and packaging, reducing volumes (and hence \$) for recovery
Western WA	Rural	The consistent state/legislature authorized reallocation of MTCA funds to other account which do not support solid or hazardous wastes.
Eastern WA	Rural	The CPG grant that funds 75% of solid waste enforcement has been cut to less than half of former funding. The part of the CPG that funds planning and recycling activities has been cut in half as well. This funding is the only practical way local health jurisdictions can cover the cost of enforcement on illegal dumping. It can't be recovered from tipping fees or higher permit fees for the facilities. This funding needs to be restored to prior levels.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Funding wide-spread educational outreach in K-12, local colleges, environmentally-related NGOs, citizenry, and businesses in local communities and geographical regions.

Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	The activities funded by CPG (MTCA) and litter tax revenues have been reduced in the counties and cities over the last decade. This has resulted in some reductions in what we can do at the local level as well as at the statewide level.
Western WA	Rural	To expand or add any new commodities and or programs, we need infrastructure grants.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	All of our programs are primarily funded by fee-for-service model for garbage and construction debris. Disposal at state sanctioned regional facilities creates a franchised system of limited monopoly disposal that prevents counties from realizing savings from competition. Disposal costs per person are higher for small solid waste systems, counties with small populations, that are far away from state regional facilities. This report is an opportunity start discussion with the state towards a fair system that does not burden smaller, remote counties trying to provide safe and healthy solid waste disposal as expected by the state.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Education & Outreach for low income, renters, and other vulnerable populations.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Toxics reduction and hazardous waste management, waste prevention and recycling, solid waste transfer and disposal
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Enforcement programs are at risk due to budget cuts. Funding for reduction and management is lacking as well.
Western WA	Rural	Recycling education funding including funding for consistency in messaging. Major lack of impact upon manufacturers of packaging.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	No gaps in the near future - longer term we will face a challenge to find other funding than weight based rates.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Legacy site cleanup under MTCA. Waste reduction, especially smart packaging. Green waste and food waste processing (composting and anaerobic digestion).
Western WA	Rural	Need increase and sustainable funding
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Household hazardous waste. While garbage collection and recycling programs are often managed by the private sector, household hazardous waste facilities and events are typically managed and funded by local governmental agencies. When public funding is reduced, these services are often the casualties, which promotes illicit disposal of said waste.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	All diversion waste streams, including recycling, organics, household hazardous waste, and special waste streams such as tires
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Response to public complaints.
Western WA	Rural	Planning, enforcement and other regulatory work, education and technical assistance, administration of viable solid waste system, waste prevention
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	The regulatory scheme which creates "exempt facilities" and then passes on an expectation that local health is monitoring these facilities with no funding mechanism is flawed.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Public health related activities. Enforcement, Exempt facilities, Education
Western WA	Rural	Recycling - Reduced revenue for commodities and higher costs for collection and processing make recycling twice as expensive than landfill disposal. Organics management (composting) Education & Outreach Enforcement

Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Unable to maintain steady and reliable funding for education and outreach (e.g. CPG). The unsustainability of using SW tipping fees to subsidize recycling programs when the value of commodities are dropping and the cost of processing is rising.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	I believe the grants that are offered to our agency is not near enough to be able to serve our citizens the way we should be. I also believe the funding doesn't need to go through a middle entity like D.O.E. as we provide all the information and resources to run these programs. This is just a bottle neck that hurts everyone involved in these programs.
Western WA	Rural	Due to the 50% reduction in my waste reduction grant, I have no funds for materials to implement any outreach programs. The grant only covers some of my time, so I am doing outreach to schools and community groups with presentations, booths at community events, etc. I have no funds for flyers, advertising, signage, etc. We have changed some of the recyclables we can take in our multi-stream system, but I have no funds to provide that information to the community.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	From education, collection to the landfill all have major gaps.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Education and outreach
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Household Hazardous waste, recycling and garbage.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	There are major gaps in available funding for CPG recipients, mostly due to the reduction in W2R funding over the past few years. Smaller rural counties are unable to compete with the larger metropolitan cities and counties on the west side. Staffs are on the east side, and grant writing is a lower priority for some counties due to workloads.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Everything.
Eastern WA	Urban/Suburban	Management of wastes that are not regulated as hazardous or dangerous but have toxic components that can impact water quality. Recycling activities tend to be problematic in this respect. Specifically, I work on polychlorinated biphenyls, which waste regulations don't adequately address. Source control regulations (as in the allowable concentrations for use and disposal under EPA's Toxic Substances Control Act) also allow wastes to be managed as non-hazardous but they have the potential to impact surface water quality because the water quality standards are very stringent. There should be a greater effort to incorporate producer responsibility into the waste management scheme.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Household hazardous waste collection events at the city level. Research and implementation of effective multi-family recycling and composting programs. Development a passage of a Bottle Bill.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Exempt Facilities - There are some existing facilities that are currently known to local jurisdiction, however, due to funding inspections are not conducted periodically and new facilities are not cataloged.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Revenues are primarily disposal based. As recycling rates go up, revenues go down.
Eastern WA	Rural	- Litter cleanup and prevention - Household Hazardous Waste collection and disposal

Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Other	Other	Rural counties do not have adequate funding for hazardous waste management. I get many calls from residents seeking assistance with disposal where there is no program or infrequent programs - such as Chelan County, WA and others nationwide.
Western WA	Rural	Transferring the real cost of collection and disposal to customers with out incentivizing illegal dumping.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Abandoned landfill cleanup; closed landfill monitoring; open dump cleanup; recycling and reuse education (commercial); recycling and reuse education (multifamily); industrial materials reuse; recycling/reuse market development
Western WA	Rural	Continued enforcement and clean up efforts
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Funding for recycling and waste prevention staff. Currently, recycling coordinator position is paid for by grant funding from the Department of Ecology's Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG).
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Funding programs to manage legacy sites and reduce/recycle based on diminishing disposal fees
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Diversion of organic materials for food rescue or composting
Eastern WA	Rural	MRW funding in rural areas.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	There are major funding gaps for educational and technical assistance to reduce waste generation. WA Ecology Public Participation Grants (PPG) have been inconsistent at best. This is perfectly illustrated by the unfortunate process that occurred for the 2015-17 biennium where PPG funds awarded, then re-ranked and ultimately the funds were not awarded to the eventual awardees because they were raided in the budget process. As a result of the highly flawed PPG award process many non-profit and advocacy organizations incurred significant hardship and the high value projects in the queue did not get funding and were not completed. This is unfortunate for both the organizations but also to the state meeting waste reduction goals. This points to the fact that there needs to be a stable and secure funding mechanism to support ongoing education and technical assistance programs state wide. The current funding mechanisms do not adequately support the need and leads to inconsistent efforts varying by community. Education and technical assistance is consistently identified as one of the best ways to reduce waste and divert waste from landfill. It is time the state places the appropriate emphasis on funding these efforts. For the state to meet its goals it cannot continue to expect advocacy organizations to shoulder the major burden without providing some sort of stable funding and surety. Non-profit and advocacy organizations in general provide very good outcomes at less cost and they are key in waste reduction efforts. Maximum impact relies on some sense of consistency and stability so programs be implemented and sustained.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	every where!
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	CPG Funding
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Organics, multi-family recycling options
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Recycling diverts tonnage from solid waste, but does not generate revenues to operate agencies or support collection activities. Waste reduction does not generate revenues for solid waste and recycling operations.
Other	Other	Education outreach, code enforcement, organics pickup

Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Western WA	Rural	illegal dumping and solid waste accumulation abatement (private property dumping) education and outreach for recycling, waste reduction
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Recycling
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Closed Landfills
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Not sure if our City will receive Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG) in year 2017-2019 grant cycle. CPG funding is how our City pays for a recycling specialist.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Education and Outreach (Waste Reduction & Recycling, HHW, etc...) Solid Waste Enforcement - Illegal Dumping enforcement / complaint response as well as unpermitted or permit exempt solid waste handling facility reviews & enforcement Closed or Abandoned Landfills - Sites that are not in any sort of post-closure or custodial type care
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Sustainability as a whole Sustainable system-wide financing (the evolving ton, the WRR paradox - diversion reduces revenue) Education and Outreach Service innovation Alternatives to landfill and incineration (digestion, composting, mixed waste processing) Enforcement (illegal dumping, bans, etc.) Hazardous Waste management Support for product stewardship
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Permit issuance, regulation and enforcement. Proposed Ecology regulations are unsustainable.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	The Department of Ecology's Coordinated Prevention Grant does not appear to have a stable funding source.

Geography	Population Type	Identified Gaps (current and future)
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	There is a lack of stewardship systems and funding to fund collection and processing of packaging, hard to handle and toxic products and materials. There is inadequate funding for convenient collection/drop off and management of toxic products, sharps, electronics not covered by Ecycle WA, lighting not covered by Lightcycle WA, pharmaceuticals, carpet, mattresses, car seats, mixed plastic products, reusable building materials, etc. There is inadequate funding for universal and effective multi-family recycling and composting. There is inadequate funding to address urban litter, sharps clean up, dumping and litter related to homeless encampments and illegal dumping. There is not adequate funding for ensuring that MRFs have the technology and staffing necessary to effectively sort and market materials. MRFs lack the newest and best equipment for sorting mixed plastics and small plastics. The region needs a Plastic Recycling Facility so collected plastics can be sorted and used domestically and to ensure these plastics do not escape into the environment. The region needs a plastic film washing facility so the dirty plastic film from MRFs can be cleaned and processed in US and so these plastics do not escape into the environment. There is not adequate funding to finance high tech equipment for area compost facilities so that they can remove plastics and other contaminants from incoming feedstocks and processed organics. There is not adequate funding to establish small scale and large scale anaerobic digestors. There is not funding to incubate new approaches and businesses. There is not funding for community based programs such as tool libraries, repair cafes, etc. There is not adequate funding for food rescue programs and food banks such that they can effective utilize all the food that could be donated rather than wasted. They lack adequate equipment and staffing. There is not adequate funding for statewide or local campaigns to address food waste. Market development efforts are inadequate.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Waste Reduction/Recycling Programs Household Hazardous Waste Management Education/Outreach Programs Litter/Illegal Dumping Prevention and Response Closed Landfill Maintenance
Western WA	Rural	Solid Waste Enforcement staffing Litter Clean-Up
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	Adequate funding. Reduction in CPG and SHA funding. We need to figure out how to pay for and reward good behavior (recycling, reuse and waste reduction) in an equitable manner.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	CDL disposal bans in some urban areas with inadequate infrastructure to meet the volume of material generated and recycled.
Western WA	Rural	Incentives for community members to remove solid waste from their property.
Western WA	Urban/Suburban	All recycling efforts, waste reduction efforts, product stewardship efforts, recycled commodity market development

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Collection	A baseline utility support fee, tied to the basic operating costs for the system (independent of variable costs associated with tonnage throughput)	Not that I know of.		<a href="http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/Sustainable-Solid-Waste-Management-Study-Final-July-2014.pdf">http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/Sustainable-Solid-Waste-Management-Study-Final-July-2014.pdf</a> Sandra Matteson (King County SWD) - they are working on this topic with another consulting team.
Collection	Rates are charged to residential and commercial customers based on subscription volume. Organics service is subsidized and recycling service is free. A majority of revenue (~90%) comes from garbage service, with the remainder from organics subscriptions and miscellaneous recycling revenue. Increased recycling and organics puts pressure on garbage rates, but strong economic growth in the short-term has balanced out increased diversion. Long-term sustainability in rates depends on how much conversation/diversion potential has been achieved.	Yes	City of Seattle	Seattle residential rates: <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/util/MyServices/Rates/GarbageRates/index.htm">http://www.seattle.gov/util/MyServices/Rates/GarbageRates/index.htm</a> Seattle commercial rates: <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/util/ForBusinesses/SolidWaste/GarbageBusinesses/Commercial/CommercialGarbageRates/index.htm">http://www.seattle.gov/util/ForBusinesses/SolidWaste/GarbageBusinesses/Commercial/CommercialGarbageRates/index.htm</a> Solid waste rates contact: Vas Duggirala
Collection	The County has a tipping fee on the tonnage at each transfer station. The rate is based upon the CPI and adjusted each year - it's 85% of the CPI change from the previous year. There are three different fees - one for general solid waste use, one for MRW handling, and one for the post closure of a landfill. It would only be sustainable if we increased the fees. It was implemented as a supplement to grant funding.	Yes	Pacific County	Megan McNelly

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Collection	The collection of solid waste in Washington is regulated by the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC). The UTC sets rates for solid waste collection companies which are granted a franchise over a geographic area and a duty to serve the customers therein. Universal service is provided throughout the state, at the curb, in a system that works well for customers and the businesses that service them. The UTC system ensures that rates are just, fair, reasonable, and sufficient. The company gets a fair return on investment and customers are ensured quality service and reasonable prices. Under the UTC system the generators of waste pay for the cost of the service. This model makes sense and encourages waste reduction because those responsible for generating the waste pay for the costs associated with collection and disposal. Cities may opt out of the UTC system and contract out for collection services, though this system produces similar results as seen with the UTC.	Yes	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	
Collection	The ability to "opt out" of local solid waste collection may reduce the available funding potential. Consider using a solid waste district model, with county assessed rates independent of service delivered; essentially a service option fee for living in an area, regardless of whether you access the service directly or not.	Not that I know of.		
Collection	<p>Producer responsibility - Large producers that supply packaging and printed paper into the marketplace (ie Pepsi, Clorox, Nestle, Unilever) are charged a fee. Fees are based on a formula that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type of material the packaging is made of (alum, paper, plastic, etc)</li> <li>Cost to manage the packaging material (collect, sort, recycle etc)</li> <li>Amount of revenue generated by the recyclable material.</li> </ul> <p>Pay per kg/year – producers self-report the weight. Encourages the producers to minimize weight, use recyclable materials that can be recycled again. Funds the collection, transportation and recycling of the packaging and printed paper. Supports local infrastructure development to reduce transportation costs.</p>	Yes	British Columbia, Canada and many European Nations	Alan Langdon, Multi-material British Columbia (MMBC) <a href="http://www.multimaterialbc.ca/">http://www.multimaterialbc.ca/</a>



System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Collection	Cost of Service	Yes	State of Washington's Investor Owned Solid Waste Collection Companies	WUTC
Collection	Recycling credit for residential curbside customers not very effective.	Yes	Thruston, Kitsap and I believe others	
Collection	Enact a hazardous waste tax on all HHW products that have had a Chemical Hazardous Assessment performed. Tax amounts depend upon the degree of risk to human health and/or the environment. The revenues from such taxes would go to regulatory, educational and administrative costs to reduce HHW.	Not that I know of.		there's plenty of Chemical Hazardous Assessments (CHA) programs available, but I'm not familiar with relating the assessment scores to a tax.
Collection	Jefferson County's rate structure, fee-for-service, on MSW (residential, business waste and commercial construction and debris) delivered to the county transfer station funds: + Operation cost of disposal for recovered recyclables, residual waste, HHW, closed landfill maintenance costs; + Transportation of waste materials to processing and disposal locations; + Reserve funding for SW facilities capital projects.	Yes	Jefferson County and City of Port Townsend	Tom Boatman, Solid Waste Manager, Jefferson County 2016 Solid Waste Management Plan
Collection	Richland's municipally provided collection services are priced at cost recovery levels by service type (i.e. residential automated side-load vehicles, commercial front load vehicles, commercial roll-off vehicles). The rate includes waste disposal costs and common access recycling containers. Curbside recycling is priced at full cost recovery for collection and processing. Household hazardous waste services not covered by state grant funds are collected through collection rates.	Yes	City of Richland	Shari Richards
Collection	I would like the UTC to allow a higher fee for multiple cans of garbage disposed with the extra funds collected above the cost of the service to go back to the jurisdictions responsible for solid waste planning and solid waste enforcement/regulation. Issue would be ensuring excess gets back to correct entities and not just partially absorbed into the collection entity budgets.	Not that I know of.		

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Collection	Objective: Keep solid waste disposal fees down to prevent illegal dumping. Fully fund recycling, hazardous waste, and composting programs to encourage residents and businesses to fully participate. Reduce the cost of recycling and composting. Reduce the amount of hazardous waste entering the waste stream. Fund solid waste collection and disposal, enforcement, and outreach and education through tipping fees. Fund recycling, hazardous waste, and composting through a producer tax or sales tax (the more you consume the more you contribute). Enact producer responsibility legislation and product take-back programs that require manufactures, retail outlets, and the packaging industry to reduce waste and improve sustainability. Attract manufacturing and producers for recyclable commodities into the state/region so these commodities have local markets.	Not that I know of.		
Collection	Yard waste tipping fees are put into a fund that provides revenue for composting classes	Yes	The City of Port Townsend	<a href="https://jeffersoncountysolidwaste.com/11-alternatives-to-yard-debris-disposal/">https://jeffersoncountysolidwaste.com/11-alternatives-to-yard-debris-disposal/</a>
Collection	Do not know.			
Collection	Garbage collection and Recycling are interrelated, and both should have the ability to be funded with state public Works trust funds or Ecology funds. They are funded by user fees, and thus the run down ineffective facilities in Eastern Washington. We do not have the resources to sell recyclables due to cost of transportation to markets. markets are primarily on west coast. We are looking at setting up districts where residents pay an additional fee to haulers to aid the County with required programs. There are several unfunded mandates that we cannot conduct.	Yes	Lewis County, Skagit County, and Whatcom County have collection Districts.	Public Works Trust Fund Loans provide low interest loans for capital. Should not be loans or interest, but given to locals to build infrastructure. .
Collection	Pay as you throw, linear rates with embedded recycling and composting service. Residents do not get a "bulk discount" since the price per gallon is the same across all service levels. Customers are naturally encouraged to downsize and utilize recycling and composting services which are provided at no additional cost.	Yes	City of Kirkland	John MacGillivray

System				
Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Collection	The rate is based on garbage can size with incentivized pricing for smaller cans. The rate includes recycling and compostables for residential, and up to 200% of the garbage volume for commercial recycling. The rate is presented to customers on the bills and the haulers website. The rate includes disposal and transport.	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerallyn Roetemeyer
Education	Bellevue uses a combination of sources to fund solid waste education, outreach, and technical assistance programs, including the Department of Ecology's Coordinated Prevention Grant (CPG), the King County Waste Reduction and Recycling Grant, and the city's Solid Waste Fund.	Yes	City of Bellevue	Jennifer Goodhart, Conservation and Outreach Program Administrator
Education	Education is funded partially through collection fees and partially through the County and partner City managed State grant funds.	Yes	Collection fees are in use by Waste Management and the City of Kennewick, The grant is in uses by Benton County, the City of Kennewick, City of Richland, City of West Richland, City of Prosser, and Benton City	Grant DeJongh (Benton County)
Education	Department of Ecology gives out Coordinated Prevention Grants to local governments and non-profits. Grants are for 2 years. Everett's current CPG funds (2015-16) pay for a recycling coordinator who works on multifamily recycling, special event recycling and public place recycling.	Yes	City of Everett	Vicki Colgan, WA Dept. of Ecology

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Education	<p>HD partial responsibility for technical assistance and education functions. Current funding base is CPG &amp; tip fee surcharge on solid waste disposal at designated transfer station (\$/ton disposed billed on quarterly basis). Additional revenue collected for permit fees and fines, but those funds only small portion of funding mechanism. Potential funding fee could be a \$ amount per ton solid waste materials handled (not just disposed) at all processing and/or disposal sites. Then question is which facilities to collect fee and how much? How do you get amounts of materials handled? Neither funding mechanism deals with conflict on reducing the amount of materials that have to be processed and/or disposed and therefor reducing the funding source. Maybe better mechanism is tied to population but still need base amount to establish a program (like what CPG offers). Problem with collection at State level is funding source/amount of funds available are continually raided by the State legislature for competing priorities. Even if funding mechanism was set up at County level, not immune from county jurisdictions vying for funds to be used for other purposes. Current funding mechanisms not viable.</p>	Yes	Skagit County	
Education	<p>Outreach and education on waste disposal, recycling, hazardous waste, composting should be part of the primary education curriculum in school. Franchise waste haulers should be required to provide information on recycling, hazardous waste, and composting services and options available within their areas annually to their customers. Funding would be included in their rates. Technical assistance and enforcement would be provided by through the local health department and public works.</p>	Not that I know of.		
Education	<p>Funding base - CPG funding from ECY Amount calculated - based on allocations from the legislature Funds are allocated through grant applications These funds are not sustainable and are at the whim of the legislature</p>	Yes	Dept. of Ecology sends the grant funds directly to our Public Works Department, who sends them to us	<a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/grants/cpg.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/grants/cpg.html</a>
Education	<p>There is no funding for this. Ecology has a lot of staff called planners, educators, and technical assistance, but we never see the fruits of their labor.</p>	Yes	Yes, no local funding for education.	

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Education	Ecology staff regularly provide technical assistance to municipalities, health departments and private citizens in an effort to reduce illegal or unlawful disposal of solid waste. Ecology staff also provides technical assistance to consultants who may be working on particular projects in their region.	Yes	The Ecology budget pays for Ecology staff.	
Education	Producers of bottled drinks would pay fees calculated on a percentage of their yearly revenues, which would be used to incentivize the public to return/recycle their bottles to locations, such as grocery stores, for an agreed upon amount of money, possibly dependent on the size of the beverage container. This approach may be particularly effective in eastern Washington.	Yes	California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oregon, Vermont.	
Education	Tip fees subsidize our recycling because the cost of recycling is so substantial. HHW, outreach and some composting use the CPG grant	Not that I know of.		
Education	Administrative fees through Solid Waste Contract	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerallyn Roetemeyer, Jerome Jin
Waste Prevention	Households & curbside collectors. Percentage of revenue from District Citizens pay, County District collects and disperses funding via tipping fees	Yes	Lewis County via Lewis County Solid Waste Disposal District # 1	lewiscountywa.gov
Waste Prevention	Disposable products need to be more expensive (cost influencing/prohibitive) Incentives for alternatives to disposal need to be enforced at a higher level (manufacturers)- local rates insufficient and carry negative connotations, difficult to support politically, difficult to enforce. Advance Recycling Fees included in costs; system in place to do the work	Yes	e-cycle	WMMFA
Waste Prevention	Producer responsibility and product take-back legislation that funds end of life recycling or disposal for the product and any packaging that product comes in. If recycling generated revenues, there wouldn't be a need for this survey.	Not that I know of.		
Waste Prevention	Grant funding, administrative fee from solid waste contract, hauler responsibilities under contract. Administrative is percentage of haulers revenue, charge on quarterly bill to residential and commercial customers. Hauler bills customers, collects, and pays city	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerallyn Roetemeyer, Jerome Jin

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
HHW	Bellevue uses a combination of sources to fund household hazardous and moderate risk waste outreach, education, and technical assistance programs. Bellevue currently uses CPG funds to pay for a portion of its hazardous and moderate risk waste program targeting residential motor oil and oil filter recycling. Bellevue currently uses King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) Grant funds to pay for the other portion of its hazardous and moderate risk waste program targeting residential motor oil and oil filter recycling. It also uses LHWMP funds to support pollution prevention programs promoting residential natural yard care practices and household toxics use reduction. Visit <a href="http://www.hazwastehelp.org/AboutUs/fundingfees.aspx">http://www.hazwastehelp.org/AboutUs/fundingfees.aspx</a> to learn about how King County funds LHWMP.	Yes		<a href="http://www.hazwastehelp.org/default.aspx">http://www.hazwastehelp.org/default.aspx</a> , Jennifer Goodhart
HHW	Hazardous waste management activities in Seattle are funded by King County's Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP). LHWMP has a rate structure based on the size of a customer's subscription, but the City does not currently charge LHWMP fees to customers. The LHWMP fees are rolled in and reallocated within the City's rate structure.	Yes	King County LHWMP	For more information on the program and Seattle's involvement: Liz Kain Rates: Vas Duggirala Program website: <a href="http://www.hazwastehelp.org/">http://www.hazwastehelp.org/</a>
HHW	House Hold Hazardous Waste and Moderate Risk Waste is funded partially through collection fees and partially through the County and partner City managed State grant funds.	Yes	It is used to manage mobile collection events and will have to be adjusted to support a fixed facility.	Grant DeJongh (Benton County)
HHW	We use State and County grants to fund our collection sites.	Yes	We use State and County grants to fund our collection sites.	
HHW	Households and commercial collection. Citizens pay, county District collects and distributes funds when available	Yes	Lewis County, via Lewis County Solid Waste Disposal District # 1	<a href="http://lewiscountywa.gov/solidwaste">lewiscountywa.gov/solidwaste</a>

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
HHW	The primary waste category by volume we receive at HHW events is paint and paint-related materials (e.g., thinners, strippers). Regional or statewide collection of this material could be operated through funds collected by a per-unit basis for material sold in Washington State. A similar program is already in effect in Oregon through the Metro organization in Portland.	Yes	Metro, Portland, OR	
HHW	Benton County uses State CPG funds as the foundation for its Household Hazardous Waste program. An interlocal agreement among cities in the County funds the matching funds portion for the CPG funds to fill the funding for the program.	Yes	Benton County	Benton County Public Works staff may have more information. Benton County's SWAC has discussed establishing a County-wide collection service surcharge to fund the Household Hazardous Waste program independent of CPG funds, but this has yet to get any traction.
HHW	Technical assistance to facilities generating moderate risk waste is funded by Local Source Control Program funds. If that LSCP funding goes away, Skagit HD does not have any current funding capability to fund CESQG technical assistance. LSCP could go up or down just as CPG and SHA funding has fluctuated.	Yes		
HHW	RCW 82.21.030 LTCA consistent with MTCA RCW 70.105D passed by voter initiative in 1988 established a tax on first possession of hazardous substance in the state. These moneys should be directly distributed to County's to collect residential hazardous waste. CPG funds are utilized as primary source of funding to support projects beyond regular garbage collection. It is not enough with increasing regulations and increasing materials added to hazardous wastes for management. Should not be a grant process that takes a lot of time, direct allocation to the Counties to utilize. We comply with county and state auditors already, and Ilarc. Ecology spends a significant amount \$ on grant administration that could be better utilized by Counties for the people.	Yes	Ecology uses the money for clean up projects. They did not do it last year, and the Counties were still short on funds.	Laura Berg, Washington State Association of Counties or Wendy Mifflin who did manage Yakima County.

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
HHW	Some counties receive CPG funds to operate Moderate Risk Waste facilities across the state. Some smaller rural counties could benefit from a sliding scale which could reduce the 25% that they need to provide in order to receive CPG funding. A reduction could be offered using a per capita income coefficient for rural counties. Perhaps only 5% to 10% instead of the current 25%.	Yes	All CPG recipients are treated exactly the same, regardless of their financial resources. Unfortunately for the smaller poorer counties.	
HHW	County and state grants are source of revenue.	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerome Jin
Clean-up	The cleanup of illegal dumping, abandon vehicles, graffiti, needles, and homeless encampments is funded by a solid waste utility tax and a solid waste transfer tax. The solid waste utility tax is a stable long-term revenue source. The transfer tax is assessed on all garbage transferred within the City destined for landfills. This tax is not sustainable, but has been strong during the city's recent construction boom.	Yes	City of Seattle	
Clean-up	Use general fund taxes or solid waste fines to support a revolving fund to provide waste disposal credit 'chits' to poor people so they don't dump their garbage on the roadside.	Not that I know of.		
Clean-up	currently in my area litter prevention and illegal dumping is grudgingly and sparingly funded through local government general funds and marginally through tipping fees. In my own agency we request funding and then it gets funded if other items are not higher priority. Funding amount is not calculated in any per capita manner - just as a lump sum. not sustainable into the future because if finance get tight it is one of the items that gets cut back.	Yes	King County	
Clean-up	City of Redmond funds 0.5 FTE from solid waste fund for litter pickup. Revenue is from administrative fee under solid waste contract with hauler. Administrative fee is a percentage of hauler's revenue which hauler bills customer, collects and sends payment to city on monthly basis. King County has a program to help cities with illegal dumping, but Redmond has not taken advantage of that.	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerallyn Roetemeyer



System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Permitting	Facility permit holders They are charged a base permit fee that is based upon a number of hours of service multiplied by the agencies hourly service rate. Staff track time spent on each site via a daily time & activity accounting system. If additional hours of service are provided to the facility, the facility is invoiced on either a monthly or quarterly basis for those additional hours. Allows our agency to charge the facilities for the true cost of service. Facility pays. Health agency collects revenues both annually (annual permit fee (base fee) plus additional revenues of the site needed more attention that the base fee provided) and monthly (or quarterly). Solid Waste facility permits and enforcement activities (time spent enforcing) on said facility. It is a true cost of service model for the agency regulating these facilities.	Yes	Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department. Other jurisdictional health agencies have implemented permit fee's using this template as a model.	TPCHD's 2017 Fee Schedule. Contact Andy Comstock or Keith Johnston
Permitting	The main funding sources for investigating solid waste complaints, solid waste facility inspection, solid waste management plan reviews, technical assistance, or any regulatory activities at the local level are supported by grants (CPG &SHA), permit fees, and tipping fees. The fact that solid & hazardous waste will always be a constant factor in the environment, there will always be a demand for proper disposal methods and reduction of waste.	Yes	The local Health Department sets permit fees for solid waste facilities and maintains an enter county agreement with public works annually.	Andrea Krohn, Island County Public Health Solid & Hazardous Waste Coordinator

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Permitting	At the UTC, enforcement is funded through a percentage of regulatory fees. This funding is sustainable as it is built in to the regulated model, though in all reality it should likely be increased to provide for better enforcement. At DOE, enforcement programs such as the transporter law do not have a direct and dedicated funding mechanism. This is an issue that should be addressed. Developing dedicated funding for solid waste enforcement for the transportation of recyclable materials and at the facility level would dramatically reduce sham recycling, illegal dumping, prevent future clean-up sites, and ensure the integrity of Washington's solid waste system. At the local level, enforcement is funded through permitting fees and state grants. Grants providing for enforcement should have a dedicated source in the operating budget that will not be tied to accounts which see large changes over the years. The proliferation of permit exempt facilities under current DOE rules has deprived local governments of a great deal of funding for enforcement. Requiring some level of permitting for all facilities will provide for better enforcement across the system.	Yes		
Permitting	Permit fees and fee for service, specifically to cover permitting and facility inspection.	Yes	Spokane Regional Health District	NA
Permitting	Permitting for facilities inadequate to provide ongoing activities for commercial violations inadequate recognition, perception of value to the community	Penalties Inadequate Incentives inadequate - limited	Not that I know of.	
Permitting	The Snohomish Health District has spent the last year plus on an extensive in-county campaign to teach various city councils about the extent of work District employees perform for their citizenry. Attending council meetings, presentations in Olympia, networking with other public health organizations to ask for additional dollars per citizen from each incorporated city. Snohomish was relatively successful. Bottom line: Snohomish had to demonstrate how its work helped their citizens.	Yes	Snohomish Health District - \$2/citizen in incorporated cities w/in Snohomish County	Heather Thomas, Snohomish Health District's Government & Public Affairs Manager.

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Permitting	Solid waste enforcement programs at many LHJ's are dependent on the receipt of grant funds through the coordinated prevention grant program. Funding in this arena generally has come through the MTCA funds and were cut approximately 50% in the last budget cycle. Public health has endured many of these types of cuts over the last decade leaving many smaller departments unable to adequately respond to mandates including solid waste. The need is find a method based on a per capita assessment then distribution based on number of facilities, plus population.	Not that I know of.		Not that I know of
Permitting	Current funding base is CPG & tip fee surcharge on solid waste disposal at designated transfer station (\$/ton disposed billed on quarterly basis). Additional revenue collected for permit fees and fines, but those funds only small portion of funding mechanism. Potential funding fee could be a \$ amount per ton solid waste materials handled (not just disposed) at all processing and/or disposal sites. Then question is which facilities to collect fee and how much? How do you get amounts of materials handled? Neither funding mechanism deals with conflict on reducing the amount of materials that have to be processed and/or disposed and therefor reducing the funding source. Maybe better mechanism is tied to population but still need base amount to establish a program (like what CPG offers). Problem with collection at State level is funding source/amount of funds available are continually raided by the State legislature for competing priorities. Even if funding mechanism was set up at County level, not immune from county jurisdictions vying for funds to be used for other purposes. Current funding mechanisms not viable.	Yes	Skagit County uses \$1/ton waste disposed as Health Department solid waste activities surcharge. Skagit County HD uses CPG grant funding	
Permitting	Funding is available for administration of grants, with recipients receiving funds to develop and maintain solid waste and hazardous waste plans for the duration of the grant period.	Yes	All grant recipients may receive funding for this purpose.	

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Permitting	Funding are mainly from facility permit holders. It is currently calculated based on annual fee accessed from the size of facility and the type of permit - piles, solid waste and etc. The facility pays for the permits which covers the amount of time spent on inspection, permit reviews and other administrative work of the local public health officials related to the facility. This funding is self sustaining , however it can be improved with the addition of fee based structure based on risk. Facility posing high risk to the environment and or public will be closely monitored through increased inspections and developing relationships with the operators to ensure all possible mitigating measures are in place to avert any possible accidents. This takes time and should be accounted for with the fee paid rather than have a flat rate fee structure, which makes its unfair to facilities that do not require close monitoring like their high risk counterpart.	Not that I know of.		
Permitting	CPG grant funding with a locally supplied match. The grant funding continues to decrease (oil) as the need increases for enforcement at the local level. The funding is calculated at the state level and is passed on to local. This funding (plus local match) is our county solid waste enforcement program. Without it we will not have a program. I don't know if it is sustainable; can be swept by the legislature at any time.	Yes	Most county governments, some cities or public works departments	Washington State Department of Ecology
Admin	Bellevue mostly uses Solid Waste Fund monies to fund solid waste administration and planning. Bellevue's collection rate structure includes an annual administrative fee that the hauler pays in monthly increments to Bellevue. Bellevue uses the administrative fee to pay for solid waste expenses, including the salaries of one full-time solid waste staff member, portions of salaries for 7 other staff members, supplies, equipment, professional consultants, and overhead.	Yes		Stephanie Schwenger, Solid Waste Program Administrator
Admin	Local Fees collected by municipalities on collections rates - both for supporting solid waste programs and also as utility tax to support general government and/or public safety programs	Yes	City of Vancouver	Rich McConaghy or Tanya Gray

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Admin	While less of a funding source suggestion, creating unity between counties could result in cost savings. Currently, household hazardous waste must be managed in the county in which it is generated. This prevents counties with shared metropolitan areas from utilizing the same disposal resources (e.g., a landfill that has a household hazardous waste transfer station in County A cannot receive HHW from a city in County B, even if said city is on the border of Counties A and B). It also prevents the establishment of statewide distribution and disposal chains. By permitting this activity, counties can manifest savings that are currently prohibited, allowing for cost savings to be realized without requiring additional funding.	Yes	State of Oregon	
Admin	HD fulfills partial role in planning for the viable solid waste system, with Skagit Co Public Works as primary. Current funding base is CPG & tip fee surcharge on solid waste disposal at designated transfer station (\$/ton disposed billed on quarterly basis). Additional revenue collected for permit fees and fines, but those funds only small portion of funding mechanism. Potential funding fee could be a \$ amount per ton solid waste materials handled (not just disposed) at all processing and/or disposal sites. Then question is which facilities to collect fee and how much? How do you get amounts of materials handled? Neither funding mechanism deals with conflict on reducing the amount of materials that have to be processed and/or disposed and therefor reducing the funding source. Maybe better mechanism is tied to population but still need base amount to establish a program (like what CPG offers). Problem with collection at State level is funding source/amount of funds available are continually raided by the State legislature for competing priorities. Even if funding mechanism was set up at County level, not immune from county jurisdictions vying for funds to be used for other purposes. Current funding mechanisms not viable.	Yes	Skagit	
Admin	Adminstration and Funding is paid from revenue generated from administrative fee that hauler bills and collects from customers.	Yes	City of Redmond	Jerallyn Roetemeyer

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Monitoring	Funding base is via a tipping fee by residents in Pierce County throwing away solid waste destined for disposal at the LRI Landfill. Pierce County administrative charge (percentage) on each ton of waste entering the LRI Landfill from the Pierce County solid waste system (distinct from the JBLM or City of Tacoma systems that also use the facility) Residents (as customers) ultimately pay the fee. LRI (facility owner & operator) collected the fee's. Covers elements of Pierce County Sustainable Resources and Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department solid waste program activities. Sustainable in that society continues to throw away significant quantities of solid waste. Non-sustainable if recycling / waste reduction efforts are highly successful.	Yes	Pierce County's solid waste system	Suggest contacting Pierce County Sustainable Resources (Steve Wambach) for additional details.
Monitoring	Historic funding has been closed landfill maintenance funds that have been exhausted. Proposed funding is by rate surcharge.	Yes	Multiple county and city agencies.	Anne Holmes, KC SWD
Monitoring	There isn't any funding other than the County trying to collect an amount on garbage fees. But that is not enough to close "closed" landfills. Especially when additional regulations are passed down, after it has been closed for 20 years. We must continue to take expensive water samples forever, and conduct an additional study to request post closure. Which has not been granted to any central Washington landfill.	Yes	Doesn't work because there isn't enough money to pay for solid waste infrastructure and close landfills without any hope of a real closure.	Klickitat County is trying to close Horsethief landfill. They have had to hire a consultant for the past two years without a "closure". Fortunately for Klickitat they have a funding source that most of us do not, Republic landfill supports other solid waste infrastructure in the County freeing up the County's funds for the services, regardless if it will ever be closed.
Monitoring	Funding for maintenance and monitoring of closed facilities is made available through CPG. Usually, recipients have not remembered to include the cost of repairing their sampling equipment and wells.	Yes	All organizations are eligible for funding if they submit a grant application.	

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Other	Bellevue's solid waste collection contract includes a number of provisions involving performance fees, bonuses, and incentives that the city can (and does) issue for violations of the contract. In the first contract year, Bellevue issued approximately \$26,000 in fees and bonuses. In the second (and most recent) contract year, Bellevue issued \$326,000 in fees, incentives, and bonuses. The city does not rely on revenues from fees, bonuses, and incentives for any of its programming. However, it can use unanticipated funds from fees, bonuses, and incentives, when available, to support solid waste-related programs.	Yes	City of Bellevue	Stephanie Schwenger, Solid Waste Program Administrator
Other	Please note that stewardship systems provide funding and services that cover all nearly all areas being addressed by this survey, and as such, should be included in each section. For instance, MMBC and similar programs for packaging provide funding for collection, processing, administration, market development, research, retooling facilities, etc. Locally, the stewardship programs include Ecycle WA, Lightcycle WA, Call2Recycle, and the new King County Secure Medicine Return Program. These are all manufacturer financed programs and the State already has the details on them. For Ecycle WA, Call3Recycle and the Medicine Return program manufacturers internalize the costs of the programs and finance the system. In Lightcycle, an eco fee is passed through the chain of commerce and the consumer pays a defined fee to finance the system.	Yes	Two programs are legislated and statewide. The pharmaceutical program is throughout King County. Call2Recycle is a national voluntary program with services for select batteries throughout the state.	<a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/eproductrecycle/">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/eproductrecycle/</a> <a href="https://kingcountysecuremedicinereturn.org/">https://kingcountysecuremedicinereturn.org/</a> <a href="http://www.call2recycle.org/">http://www.call2recycle.org/</a> <a href="http://www.lightrecycle.org/">http://www.lightrecycle.org/</a> There are of course many more across the US, Canada, Europe, Asia and South America. More info is available from the Product Stewardship Institute and similar sources.
Other	Some programs alluded to earlier require heavy system subsidy with inconsistent system return. An example is food waste composting - to the degree politically feasible, subsidies should be reduced (thereby redirecting resources to fill the funding gaps) and market economics should play a more central role in affecting waste flows to alternatives. To the extent the end-value of the "product" produced from solid waste is less than the cost of producing it, that product/process should decline in favor of those options whose value proposition aligns with market forces.			

System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Other	<p>Funding base: Users of the fee-for-service enterprise disposal service.</p> <p>Funding Calculation: Rate per ton received, SW costs (operation) + SW reserve contribution = Revenue Who Pays: No exceptions, all rates same, residuals and C&amp;D by the ton, at the transfer station scales Sustainability: + State increase strength of laws that prevent the legislative seizure of Capital and Equipment reserve funds; ++ or, provide 1% capital facility bond rate for approved capital work plan items. + State provide some general funding of disposal transportation costs to state sanctioned disposal facilities using a formula based on: 1. per county population (or annual tonnage transported), 2. distance from sanctioned disposal facilities, 3. Factor in county recycling and diversion rates for total waste streams; ++ or, encourage local, or regional local central disposal centers for each county (local lined landfills and local tax free processing centers).</p>		Simplify State rules	Steve Wamback, Solid Waste Manager, Pierce County
Other	<p>Producer responsibility for toxic materials in consumer products. Producers would contribute to a fund that addresses disposal costs. This is similar to how electronics wastes, oil, batteries, and some other recycling programs work. The link between solid waste and wastewater is that the solid waste regulations are not as strict as the water quality regulations so materials are purchased, used, and disposed of with toxics concentrations that are billions of times greater than the water quality regulatory limits. The only way to address this completely is to address source control measures, which ultimately benefit the solid waste system as well.</p>			<p>Adriane Borgias, WQ Ecology Eastern Region Office.</p> <p>The Spokane Regional Toxics Task Force (SRRTTF) just completed a Comprehensive plan that outlines the challenges they face:  <a href="http://srrttf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/SRRTTF-Comp-Plan-Cover-Letter-on-letterhead_updated-11.29.16.docx">http://srrttf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/SRRTTF-Comp-Plan-Cover-Letter-on-letterhead_updated-11.29.16.docx</a></p>



System Component	Funding Mechanism	In Use?	Used by Whom?	Contact
Other	I have heard of some concept from some other foreign places called something like extended producer responsibility, whereby the makers and sellers of things are also responsible for those things recycling and disposal. Sounds crazy, I know - but maybe we should look into it? Since our way of life is entirely based on buying and consuming, maybe the costs of consumption should be internalized instead of externalized as they currently are? That way we wouldn't have to pull money from somewhere else to pay for self-funded services. Change laws so that products can only be leased, not owned, so that once they've outlived their use, they are returned to their maker for their next disposition (remanufacturing, deconstruction and recycling, or decomposition).	Yes	Europe, Canada and elsewhere outside U.S.	German greendot, EXPRA, use Google?

### Other People, Organizations, Reports, or Funding Mechanisms to Research

The Recycling Partnership offers recycling grants, as does the Closed Loop Fund. The EPA has offered grants in the past. However, with extremely limited staffing, Bellevue does not have capacity to apply for and administer competitive grants.

Stewardship programs and especially's BC's programs and especially MMBC's program for printed paper and packaging.

Seattle Public Utilities handles water, wastewater, and stormwater in addition to solid waste.

Bottle bill funding

SWANA

Oregon state - both solid and hazardous waste systems: Don Haagensen, attorney (retired), Cable Huston Benedict and Haagensen, Portland, OR

Tipping floor fees

My electricity (PSE) offers me the option of paying extra for green power. Why not the other way around?

Vermont, Wisconsin, Maine, California are states that seem to be ahead of Washington in promoting Product Stewardship programs, which is just one mechanism for funding problem waste.

WASC Solid Waste Managers Caucus

Looking at each individual county, health department and cities with solid waste programs including code enforcement through out the state.

EPA and Keep American Beautiful have recycling and composting funds available

Jeff Brown, Epicenter Services; Jeff Morris, Sound Resource Management

### Other Comments, Suggestions, and Concerns

Linking funding to the actual products that are purchased and then "disposed" in the State is the most effective means for providing sustained funding. Having the funds held in trust and administered by private non profit stewardship organizations is the only way to ensure these funds are not diverted for other government needs as we see happen with litter tax funds, tire fees, etc.

#### Moderate Risk Waste Operational Funding

Washington State is known nationally for having one of the premier solid waste handling systems in the country. It is a successful public private partnership. Washington's recycling rate is among the best in the nation. Clearly, the current system works very well, and is not broken. Consumers are happy and do not complain about their bills. Regulated companies are successful and provide excellent universal service. The system works well in practice and adequate funding mechanisms are largely in place. Real threats to the integrity of this system, such as a lack of enforcement and the proliferation of sham recyclers are where real

Closed landfill regulatory administration should be consistent with administration of similar risk level facilities under MTCA. There are existing incongruent policies and regulations.

I work in a City that does not have a waste hauling contract in place nor does it collect any garbage fees. The sole source for recycling coordinator is grant funded and there are other small municipalities that rely on CPG funds exclusively. If the CPG funding goes away recycling programs and staff go away.

Consider assessing a waste generation fee on large volume retail waste material generators, such as Costco or other stores that use a lot of packaging materials that are not very recyclable.

We need to move beyond traditional rate structures where the recycling systems are funded by volumes of garbage that is disposed. There needs to be a mechanism whereby the producers of packaging and products are incentivized to make their products more durable, more recyclable and less toxic.

Keep the funding where it belongs and do let it get moved to some politicians pet programs

Solid waste enforcement (littering , illegal dumping, property violations) is very expensive and in essence untenable as the code is written.

WA DOE should push the legislature for the necessary funding to sustain the LHJ CPG funding at a much higher rate. In turn WA DOE should perform audits of the LHJ's to ensure proper spending of those funds.

Coordination with neighboring states/country to avoid import/export loopholes for our policies regarding specific strategies.

Taxes for litter control/roadside clean up are currently collected from fast food generators, etc., but funding is consistently cut or eliminated because it is reallocated. This needs to stop, and the funds need to be available

Similar to I-405 and having a user tax for those people using the commuter lane, add a user tax to products that create problem wastes. Those monies can go to regulatory and educational programs, especially focusing on reducing hazardous waste - Green chemistry.

Fiscally conservative communities in eastern Washington find it difficult to adopt aggressive waste diversion programs because of adverse economics. Adoption of these programs will likely continue to be slow unless there are incentives made available to support these goals or increased regulatory pressure.

Save money by eliminating the Coordinanted Prevention Grant funds as "grants", they are allocations to the County. it is a waste of money for Ecology staff and time for County's to go through a grant process when they could be responsibly directly allocated.

See previous comments about how to link solid waste management funding/benefits to other media (such as water). Even though the standards are not the same, ultimately materials we use have a pathway to water. So when considering solid waste management, look also at source control, not just disposal and cross media impacts: how improved management of the solid waste system helps cities, counties, and others in reducing costs. Adriane Borgias, WQ Ecology Eastern Region Office, would be happy to explore creative opportunities

### Other Comments, Suggestions, and Concerns

Exempt facilities should be converted into a funding stream through close monitoring of these facilities

Product stewardship has strong potential for generating hazardous waste funding. Long term I would want to see disposal fees as part of purchase of hazardous material, much like Paint Care in Oregon. Should apply to all materials which, as waste, would be state or federally regulated. And, in general have a waste tax for virtually all goods - based on weight - this would drive many innovations such as packaging reduction. At same time - work towards statewide implementation and eliminate local waste fees which are very difficult for corporations to manage - especially when a company such as mine will have hundreds of local agency taxes to attempt to account for, many many layers - Huuge problem, we can make America Great Again! :)

Stop with the voluntary, goal oriented approach. Mandatory is required (pun intended) to make lasting change.