

Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
May 23, 2007
King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Debbie Anspaugh – City of Bothell
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way
John MacGillivray – City of Kirkland
Kristn McArthur – City of Redmond
Stacey Breskin-Aver – City of Redmond
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline

County Staff:

Gemma Alexander – SWD
Jennifer Broadus - SWD
Jeff Gaisford – SWD
Shirley Jurgensen
Kevin Kiernan – SWD
Bill Reed – SWD
Bob Tocarciuc - SWD
Diane Yates – SWD

I. Review Agenda and Minutes

Everyone present introduced themselves. New ITSG member John MacGillivray from the City of Kirkland introduced himself.

The April 25 minutes were approved as submitted.

II. ITSG Schedule: Discussion

ITSG discussed its schedule for the remainder of the year, and agreed to meet on the following dates:

- June 20, 2007 ITSG meeting to discuss the draft Waste to Energy (WTE) report.
- June 28, 2007 ITSG meeting to discuss Rural Level of Service.
- July 25, 2007 tentative ITSG meeting. This meeting may be a final opportunity to discuss WTE, and the third party review report may be available by this date.
- The August ITSG meeting was moved to September 5, 2007 due to construction that will take place from August 10 to August 29.
- The November meeting was moved to November 28, 2007.
- The December meeting was moved from December 26 to January 3, 2008 in order to meet before MSWMAC, which is scheduled for January 11th.

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates will email other ITSG members to see if these dates work for them.

III. SWD Updates

Yates reported that the rate proposal is scheduled for the June 13th agenda of the Operating Budget Committee.

The ITSG legislation has been postponed by the Regional Policy Committee (RPC), pending discussion of a workplan, which may involve interim reports.

RPC asked for more detail on the governance report. There will be a council staff report at the June RPC meeting with specific questions asking RPC for policy direction.

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported that the Bow Lake Facilities Master Plan has been approved by the Growth Management and Natural Resources

Committee (GMNR) and was forwarded to the Council for action. The Plan can not be implemented until the rate proposal has been approved.

The landfill gas to energy legislation is in the process of being transmitted to council.

Kiernan related historical background on the U.S. Supreme Court's April 30th decision regarding flow control. The decision upholds the authority of local government to exercise flow control by placing solid waste under local jurisdictions' policing powers.

The third party review is now being conducted by Gershman, Brickner, & Bratton (GBB). GBB has given the division a list of 47 questions, ranging from operational questions to technical clarifications. Some of the questions relate to intermodal capacity. The division is compiling answers to these questions.

A letter was sent to R.W. Beck by King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert regarding Beck's presentation on the WTE technology study findings. The division understands that the letter was emailed to MSWMAC members. The letter was not sent to the division. Kiernan responded to ITSG members' questions about the issues raised in the letter:

1. Cost comparisons - The study will not consider the cost of building a new publicly owned and operated landfill. There is sufficient landfill capacity in the northwest. Costs of the conversion facility were based on the best available information. It did not distinguish between public or private financing and/or operation.
2. Waste estimate - The study estimates waste to be managed through the disposal system using the current recycling rate and increasing that rate by the historic growth in recycling. It is unclear how "comparing how much is recycled" is relevant to this study.
3. Ash disposal - Any alternative other than disposal of ash in landfills is not currently permitted in this state. One of the study parameters is that ash management must be consistent with applicable regulations. The division will not consider alternatives not currently allowed under state law.
4. Steam sales - In order to sell steam to Seattle Steam, the facility would need to be located within Seattle city limits. Sites outside the city would be too far from their system to be economical. Seattle is not part of our planning area, and the likelihood of acquiring and permitting at least 50 acres of industrially zoned land within Seattle is very low.
5. Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) - The data presented represent the best available information. The study recognizes other studies have found different results and clearly explains the reasons for the difference GHG offsets from energy generation were considered. This region does not use coal for electrical energy production. Other regions where this is the case have considerably different energy issues.
6. The division will not consider other jurisdictions' wastes without their specific requests and their participation, including assistance with funding of the study. The jurisdictions mentioned have contractual agreements for the management of

their wastes, and the division would not presume to study the outcome of breaking their contracts.

ITSG members noted that King County had purchased 20 acres of land at Fisher Flour Mill on Harbor Island. Kiernan replied that it would be challenging to acquire the amount of land required for waste to energy in that location for the purpose of steam sales. It was also noted that in the past there was talk about potentially including other jurisdictions' waste in county plans. Kiernan replied that those conversations included the jurisdictions concerned, as any future consideration of partnering with other jurisdictions would have to do. ITSG agreed that Councilmember Lambert's letter should be on MSWMAC's agenda.

IV. Waste Prevention & Recycling: Single Family & Multi-Family Diversion Options Part II

Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford gave a presentation on single family and multi-family curbside recycling options for the Comp Plan. It is available at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SFMFOptions.ppt>

ITSG discussed the differences between single family and multifamily waste. ITSG members expressed surprise that the data for the food and plastic bag waste was so high. Gaisford confirmed that these numbers were accurate, and that this is an area that needs to be targeted.

In response to a question, Gaisford noted that motor oil isn't showing up in the waste stream in significant amounts. ITSG discussed the confusion surrounding the numbers 1-7 for classifying plastics, and agreed that clarification through communication and education is necessary.

ITSG members commented that infrastructure must be in place before mandates are considered. Gaisford responded that although infrastructure is a prerequisite for mandates, infrastructure by itself does not have as much impact on mandates. An example of this is found in Seattle's experience with their ban. They have seen a rate increase of 15% in Multi-Family diversion.

ITSG noted that a financial incentive was not included in the Multi-Family Curbside mix toolbox, or a breakdown of the "other materials" for Multi-Family curbside mix. Gaisford stated that this information would be added to the presentation.

Gaisford noted that there is a pilot program in place in Redmond for Multi-Family Organic disposal through collecting yard and food waste. Kristn McArthur from the City of Redmond stated that it there was a significant amount of work and education involved, resulting in a diversion increase of 2-3%. John MacGillivray of the City of Kirkland noted that Waste Management, Inc. is picking up residential food waste in Kirkland and that the infrastructure for commercial food waste is still not finalized. There are some concerns about how much longer it will take for Waste Management to do their commercial routes.

ITSG asked for clarification on the less than 1% figure for electronics. SWD staff Bill Reed stated that as a result of the electronics disposal ban, few electronics are arriving at the transfer stations. Gaisford added that the new e-waste product stewardship law does not allow charging the consumer for disposal. McArthur noted that at a recent Redmond recycling event there was a significant amount of electronics for recycling.

There was discussion of the problems associated with glass at the materials recovery facilities (MRF), including equipment maintenance and worker safety. ITSG noted that there are different styles of container bills that can be used to remove glass from the curbside mix. It was also noted that with modified single stream collection like that used in Tacoma, MRFs receive less than 1% glass. ITSG agreed that dual stream collection of glass and a glass disposal ban should be included as options in the presentation.

Gasiford stated that estimates of MRF capacity have changed since the MRF study was conducted, and that planning for additional recycling should take this into consideration.

Stacy Breskin-Aver of Redmond stated that she believes prohibiting disposal of primary recyclables from multi-family is premature, and that more work needs to be done on education and infrastructure first.

ITSG discussed a number of other materials. Members noted that plastic bags and film disposal tonnage is high considering the low weight of the material. There was interest in the data that Seattle is collecting on plastic bags. ITSG noted that in addition to glass, scrap metal can create problems at MRFs. ITSG also discussed the possibility of moving toward product stewardship of latex paint. ITSG discussed food waste in some detail. Gaisford suggested that commercial and Multi-Family food waste may best be dealt with together, since the infrastructure will need to be very similar. ITSG also noted that food waste programs would have to take into account potential other issues, such as vermin. Gaisford stated that the Health Department is interested and involved in that issue.

ITSG agreed that the final slides offering suggestions on where to focus future analysis should be included when the presentation is given to MSMWAC. Gaisford asked ITSG members to provide additional comments on the presentation until Wednesday, June 6.

Next Steps

The next ITSG meeting is scheduled for June 20th.