

Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group (ITSG)

Approved March 26, 2008

King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Kathleen Edman – City of Auburn

Tom Spille – City of Bellevue

Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way

John MacGillivray – City of Kirkland

Peter Landry – City of Normandy Park

Stacey Breskin-Auer – City of Redmond

Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline

County Staff:

Jennifer Broadus, SWD

Jeff Gaisford, SWD

Josh Marx, SWD

Bill Reed, SWD

Thea Severn, SWD

Diane Yates, SWD

I. Review Agenda and Minutes

Everyone present introduced themselves. New ITSG member Peter Landry from the City of Normandy Park was introduced.

The draft February meeting notes were approved as submitted.

II. SWD Updates

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates reported that the Governance Report is on the Regional Policy Committee's (RPC) agenda this afternoon.

It has been suggested the Solid Waste Advisory (SWAC) and Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) meet jointly in April for the Waste Prevention and Reduction (WPR) presentation. SWAC has agreed, providing the meeting is an open public meeting.

MSWMAC distributed a letter to cities soliciting participation on ITSG and MSWMAC. New members from the cities of Woodinville and Normandy Park have been appointed.

III. ITSG Meeting Schedule

In light of the ITSG Guiding Principles and Meeting Protocols that were adopted by MSWMAC at its last meeting, ITSG discussed the need for more time to respond to MSWMAC's direction. ITSG decided to move the regularly scheduled meeting to the week following MSWMAC.

The following new dates have been scheduled:

- April 16, 2008
- May 14, 2008
- June 18, 2008
- July 16, 2008
- August 13, 2008
- September 17, 2008
- October 15, 2008
- November 19, 2008

- December 17, 2008

IV. Follow up to March MSWMAC Meeting

In March, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented “WPR: Recommendations Part 1” to MSWMAC. This can be found at:

<http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Reccomend1MSWMAC03142008.ppt>

ITSG discussed the eight items that MSWMAC had provided them.

1. ITSG’s opinion on the need for recycling events given the additional outlet for materials.

ITSG discussed the following concerns:

- Difficulty in finding locations for events
- Popularity of events, and the need to transition through education
- Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) materials that are collected at events
- Collection events can be used as a recycling education tool.

ITSG members agreed that recycling events are not the most cost effective or efficient way to provide recycling services. However, until viable options are in place (i.e. a new or renovated transfer station accepts the variety of materials collected at a recycling event) these events should continue to be provided. As options become available in a given area, events in that area should be discontinued.

2. Background information on who is currently providing organics collection services; information on full spectrum of services and the current health codes and infrastructure – Develop an “Organics Fact Sheet”.

ITSG discussed the following:

- Food scraps that are disposed via methods other than landfilling or composting, such as in garbage disposals
- How collection of food scraps for customers who do not subscribe to yard waste service would be handled, such as multi family or commercial customers and how they would need containers for food scrap service.
- The need to standardize health department regulations so they are consistent
- The difficulty in measuring food scrap programs, with inaccuracies in the haulers data, breakdowns by cities as opposed to a regional trend, and also a lack of a current diversion rate to provide a baseline comparison
- A per capita approach might be helpful to MSWMAC
- Pilot programs for multi family complexes that have expressed interest in recycling food scraps verses selling the program wholesale
- There was discussion about the inconsistency of what’s accepted in food scrap recycling programs (e.g., shredded paper; what is considered compostable paper; meat and dairy vs. all vegetative programs)
- For commercial food scrap programs there was discussion on the impact of calculating the rate based on weight vs. volume

ITSG determined that a 40 percent single family organics recycling goal is overly ambitious and the division does not have enough information to support it.

ITSG determined that a 20 percent organics recycling goal for multi family is too high and could only be accomplished through the allocation of significant resources both in funding and staff time. A 10 percent goal may be more realistic.

3. Are the goals and dates in the presentation appropriate for each category?

ITSG will continue discussion of this item at its April meeting and report back to MSWMAC at its May 14th meeting.

4. Add waste prevention goals for each category and how that would be measured.

ITSG will continue discussion of this item at its April meeting and report back to MSWMAC at its May 14th meeting.

5. Review and comment on single family curbside collection standards.

There was consensus from ITSG that there should be a collection standard.

ITSG discussed:

- Concerns about shredded paper with curbside recycling
- Issues in dealing with plastic bags

6. Review and comment on how best to incorporate bulky waste collection.

Topics raised by ITSG:

- Current hauler costs are high, but with economies of scale would be more affordable
- Education on bulky waste collection for cities' councils and the public is needed
- Contracts with haulers should require the collection is not to be subcontracted
- The division should look to other parts of the United States that have bulky collection to use as a model
- Adding bulky service to unincorporated areas and cities governed by WUTC franchises is problematic due to their rate setting rules

ITSG concluded that bulky item collection should be added to cities' collection contracts and the WUTC rate setting rules should be changed to allow the cost of bulky item collection to be included in curbside collection rates.

7. *How do cities currently require space for multifamily recycling? Are there model codes, or other code options?*

Guidelines have been developed with input from cities but each city independently decides if it will adopt space requirements or enforce them. The guidelines that were developed by Cynthia Moffitt were circulated.

8. *Review and comment on options for plastic bags.*

ITSG reached consensus that:

- Goals should be attainable
- Not accepting plastic bags should be added to the curbside standard

ITSG is interested in a product stewardship, or a tax/fee approach to handling plastic bags and other disposables, such as paper cups. Collection of plastic bags through curbside service is not the best approach.

Next Steps:

ITSG member Tom Spille volunteered to give the ITSG update at the April MSWMAC meeting.