

Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
Meeting and Governance Discussion Summary
September 20, 2006
King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue
Tom Spille – City of Bellevue
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Kristn McArthur – City of Redmond
Stacey Breskin-Aver – City of Redmond
Linda Knight – City of Renton
Amy Ensminger – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff
Mark Buscher - SWD
Diane Yates – SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD
Bill Reed – SWD
Jane Gateley – SWD
Josh Marx - SWD

Marc Daudon – Cascadia Consulting

I. Review Agenda and Finalize Notes

ITSG unanimously approved the draft July 27 and August 18 minutes.
Everyone present introduced themselves.
ITSG reviewed the agenda and confirmed that the October 3 meeting will focus on development of the Comp Plan schedule.

II. Updates

SWAC approved the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan conditionally, pending the results of the third party review. There was one dissenting vote, due to a concern that closure of Renton Transfer Station would reduce rural levels of service. The issue of rural levels of transfer service will be addressed in the Comp Plan.

The division gave a briefing to RPC that included the recommendations of the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan and background on the recycling goals.

There was a public meeting in Tukwila last week as part of the SEPA process for the Bow Lake Transfer Station Facilities Master Plan. Very few people attended.

Linda Knight of Renton will give the ITSG update to MSWMAC in October. Elaine Borjeson will give the update in November.

III. Recycling Studies

SWD staff Josh Marx said that Cascadia Consulting performed three studies for the division, two of which will be presented today. The first is a broad study of the markets for recycled materials that is not specific to King County's system. The intent of the study is to provide background knowledge to help inform policy decisions about recycling programs. Marc Daudon of Cascadia gave a powerpoint presentation available at: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/KCM_Markets_Presentation.ppt

ITSG discussed the technical barriers to bottle to bottle glass recycling. Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way commented that the impact of single stream vs. source separated glass

collection on the marketability of the recycling glass illustrates the significance of cities' collection contracts.

Discussion of the issues surrounding organics recycling clarified that the market for compost is strong, and additional marketing is not required. However, the demand for the highest quality compost is not currently being met.

ITSG members generally agreed that the data was presented at the right level of detail for MSWMAC's October meeting, but that it should be presented with more context. Council staff Mike Huddleston suggested the presentation should be tied back into the transfer system and asked how following the consultants' recommendations would affect the cost of transfer system upgrades and the life of Cedar Hills.

Nina Rivkin of Redmond suggested that less technical detail should be presented in favor of policy implications.

Elaine Borjeson of Kirkland suggested that the division be prepared to answer questions about metals and plastics.

SWD staff Bill Reed described the second study, which looked at customer use of the free recycling areas at the transfer stations. Customers do not pass through the scalehouse to drop off free recycling, so this survey provides the first data the division has collected on how this service is used. The survey provided a snapshot of use patterns that will be used to guide future research.

Surprisingly, approximately 90% of customers who use free recycling service at the transfer stations are single family residents. Only 12% of recycling customers bring garbage and recycling to the stations during the same trip. More predictably, rural customers and customers who do not subscribe to curbside service bring recyclables to the transfer station more often than urban curbside subscribers. Urban customers are more likely than rural customers to find other ways to recycle if transfer stations stopped offering free recycling service. Many customers who recycle at the transfer stations do not know that recycling service is included in the cost of their garbage collection subscription. This is something the division wants to look at more closely.

ITSG members agreed that this presentation will require more explanation of the context and implications to the system. Everyone agreed that MSWMAC will expand the discussion to include the issue of self haul garbage service at the transfer stations, as well as the impacts of self-haul garbage and recycling services on the costs of transfer station development. After discussion, ITSG agreed that this study should be presented to MSWMAC during the self-haul issues discussions for the Comp Plan.

Several members commented that replacing primary recycling at the stations with recycling services for more strategic, or niche, materials, might be a good idea. The division confirmed that what materials to recycle at stations, and which ones to charge for, are key policy questions for the recycling chapter of the Comp Plan.

IV. Status Report on Governance Discussions

Huddleston presented a draft letter from ITSG to the King County council communicating that the Governance Report will not be completed before September 28, and suggesting a new deadline.

After discussion, ITSG decided to ask Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings to sign the letter and send it to the council on behalf of ITSG. ITSG decided to suggest a new deadline of December 15. Some members were concerned that December was too ambitious given the holiday season, so ITSG decided to meet three times in October.

Rivkin commented that the report does not have to provide recommendations for each issue, but only needs to present options or, in some cases a placeholder, to determine when the issue will be addressed as part of the broader planning process.

Huddleston offered to help draft the report.

ITSG discussed the report that Ordinance 14971 required from SWIF, and agreed that the intent of the ordinance was for the SWIF to see ITSG's report before making its own recommendation, despite the fact that only one deadline was identified for both products.

Rivkin noted that Ordinance 14971 called for a list of Comp Plan amendments necessary to implement the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan. Huddleston said that list could be provided in the legislation adopting the plan.

VII. Next Steps

Intergovernmental Staff Liaison Diane Yates will ask Theresa Jennings if she is comfortable signing the letter to council on behalf of ITSG. ITSG members will email their comment on the letter to Yates by Friday, September 22nd.

Yates will email ITSG to schedule the three meetings in October.

Huddleston asked ITSG members to send in their comments on the third party review RFP as soon as possible.

The next meeting is September 27 from 10-12, and will continue the cities' caucus on ILA issues. Huddleston is invited to attend.