

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

December 14, 2007

11:45 – 2:00 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Meeting Minutes

Dual SWAC/MSWMAC Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>SWAC Position</u>	<u>MSWMAC Position</u>
Carolyn Armanini	Chair, Interested Citizen	City of Lake Forest Park Representative
David Baker	Local Elected Official	Deputy Mayor, City of Kenmore
Joan McGilton	Local Elected Official	Mayor, City of Burien

SWAC Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
Bill Beck	Interested Citizen
Joe Casalini	Waste Management Industry
Jerry Hardebeck	Vice Chair, Waste Management Industry
Suellen Mele	Public Interest Group
Max Pope	Interested Citizen
Carolyn Prentice	Interested Citizen
Ray Schlien	Interested Citizen
Relaena Sindelar	Marketing Professional
Judy Stenberg	Interested Citizen
Dave Whitley	Recycling Industry

MSWMAC Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Susan Fife-Ferris	City of Bellevue	Conservation & Outreach Program Manager
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jim Lauinger	City of Kirkland	Mayor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Kevin Kiernan, SWD Director
 Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Mgr
 Pam Badger, Special Waste Supervisor
 Thea Severn, Interim Lead Planner
 Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison
 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff
 Kinley Deller, SWD Staff
 Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Guests

Mike Reed, King County Council Staff
 Kirsten Weinmeister, City of Snoqualmie
 Jeanette Brizendine, City of Federal Way
 Jerome Jin, City of Redmond
 Bob Dixon, Interested Citizen
 Todd Smith, ReNu
 Denise Chanez, Teamsters Local 117
 Bill Ziegler, Teamsters Local 174

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. Everyone
3 present introduced themselves.

4
5 **SWD Updates:**

6 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that he is now the permanent
7 Director, and Terri Hansen is the new Assistant Director.

8
9 Kiernan said the Transfer and Waste Management Plan was approved by Council, which,
10 together with the approval of the new rate, will allow the division to move forward with
11 planned transfer station improvements.

12
13 Members of SWAC and MSWMAC will soon be receiving invitations to the opening of
14 the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station.

15
16 An agreement has been reached on additional property near the Factoria Transfer Station.
17 Meetings with the City of Bellevue regarding the new Factoria Transfer Station are
18 ongoing. Construction of the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station is not planned
19 to begin until completion of the new Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station.

20
21 In response to flooding from the storm two weeks ago, the division is waiving fees for
22 flood damaged materials during the period of December 13-16. The impact on the
23 system has been minimal so far. Kiernan said that there are implementation issues
24 regarding fee waivers, and the division has met with Snohomish County to learn more
25 about their voucher system. Snohomish County issues five-yard fee waiver vouchers to
26 storm victims, which allows residents to bring in their storm debris on their own time.
27 The division will discuss storm response with the committees further in the future.

28
29 **Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Disposal and Recycling**

30 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford's presentation is available
31 at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/C&DJointDec14.ppt>

33 SWAC member Suellen Mele asked if Gaisford included beneficial use in his definition
34 of recycling. He responded that for the purpose of this presentation the term “recycling”
35 refers to all forms of diversion, including beneficial use.

36

37 MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris asked whether the differential between the funds
38 available for C&D recycling incentives and the amount paid out is a result of low
39 recycling rates.

40

41 Gaisford said that the average recycling rate for all of the private C&D transfer stations is
42 seven percent. The goal is for the entire incentive fund to be paid out, so the question is
43 one of how much facility recycling rates can be improved.

44

45 SWAC Chair and MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini asked if the unused \$800,000
46 in the incentive fund is earmarked for use, such as recycling education programs.

47

48 Gaisford replied that it is not being used. Kiernan added that the money is not included
49 in the division’s financial plan, because the intent is to pay it all out in incentives.

50

51 Fife-Ferris asked if there was any way to use the interest that is accumulating on the
52 unused incentive money. Kiernan said the division should look into that, but added that
53 the division is reluctant to use anything from that fund because the full amount should be
54 available in case the haulers earn the full incentive. He said that because the contract is
55 only three years old there has not been a lot of reporting yet, so it is hard to evaluate how
56 the program is working so far.

57

58 SWAC Vice Chair Jerry Hardebeck said that this is the first time this kind of contract has
59 been used to manage C&D. He pointed out that some facilities are achieving recycling
60 rates much higher than seven percent. The low average is partly a result of some
61 facilities accepting loads that contain no recyclable material, and partly a result of the
62 level of dedication to removing recyclables that make it to the end of the belt.

63

64 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked if the incentive needed to be increased. Kiernan
65 said that might be the case, and that it could be done through contract amendments.

66

67 Jerome Jin of Redmond asked if the recycling incentives in the C&D contracts are
68 allocated by volume or diversion rate.

69

70 Gaisford replied that there is a fairly complicated formula that includes an overall rate
71 threshold, and gives more credit for higher value recycling such as wood to wood than for
72 beneficial use.

73

74 Garber said that several homes in Newcastle were recently demolished to make way for
75 the Coal Creek Parkway, and that the demolition debris was processed for recycling using
76 a field processing unit. This machine allowed the demolition debris from four or five
77 houses to be processed in one week with a ninety-five percent recycling rate. She offered
78 to provide more information on that project, and suggested that this sort of process could
79 play a role in the future.

80

81 Gaisford agreed, saying that on-site recycling deserves further consideration.

82

83 Hardebeck commented that, similar to curbside recycling, C&D recycling is developing
84 independently in each city. He suggested that instead of waiting for infrastructure to
85 develop haphazardly, the county should develop standards for C&D processing contracts
86 now, when cities are just beginning to contract for C&D recycling.

87

88 SWAC and MSWMAC member Joan McGilton commented that renovation is
89 environmentally preferable to new construction, even using Leadership in Energy and
90 Environmental Design (LEED) standards.

91

92 Gaisford said that, analogous to prioritizing waste prevention over curbside recycling,
93 reconstruction makes good environmental sense, and should be encouraged. Kinley
94 Deller, SWD staff added that the LEED “Core and Shell” program provides
95 environmental standards for remodeling.

96

97 Mele asked what percentage of C&D material is generated by the various sectors, and if
98 any specific materials make sense for targeting.

99

100 Gaisford replied that 150,000 tons of C&D are disposed as garbage at the transfer stations
101 by self-haulers and contractors on small jobs. But he said that the data provided by
102 Department of Ecology does not break down the category of C&D to the level of detail
103 required to answer Mele's question. He agreed that would be useful information, and
104 said that the answer may vary locally, as some cities are already built out, while others
105 are developing rapidly.

106

107 Hardebeck commented that the largest component by weight of C&D waste is asphalt
108 roofing shingles.

109

110 Armanini asked if it would be possible to add C&D recycling areas to the transfer
111 stations as they are remodeled.

112

113 Gaisford replied that recycling should be set up in a way that incentivizes separation
114 rather than commingling of C&D materials. He added the division wants to find ways to
115 accept some recycling at the existing stations rather than just wait for new construction.

116

117 Commenting on a photo of a self-hauler attempting to back up a trailer in order to dispose
118 of C&D at a transfer station, SWAC member Bill Beck said that the transfer stations are
119 designed in a fashion that is unfriendly to self-haulers trying to back-in with trailers.

120

121 Kiernan replied that the interior columns make backing in more difficult. The division is
122 moving away from designs that include interior columns.

123

124 Greenwood asked if cities with mandatory C&D recycling rates have been successful.

125

126 Gaisford said there have been mixed results. Tracking of the results has not been
127 consistent, and different cities have set different thresholds, but mandatory recycling rates
128 can be an effective tool when applied correctly. Garber added that Seattle is considering
129 this approach.

130

131 SWAC member Dave Whitley commented that caution is needed when considering any
132 kind of mandate, because the infrastructure must be in place first.

133

134 Armanini asked Whitley to describe his expertise in recycling issues for the benefit of
135 MSWMAC members who are unfamiliar with Nuprecon and ReNu.

136

137 Whitley said he works for Nuprecon, a commercial and industrial demolition company
138 which is the largest generator of C&D waste in the region. Their ReNu division is
139 responsible for collection, hauling and diversion of commingled and source-separated
140 materials to between ten and fifteen different recycling processors. His company handles
141 a large portion of the C&D waste stream and has a strong interest in diversion. They also
142 do salvage and recovery. Through the National Demolition Association they are engaged
143 with EPA and other agencies to develop end uses for recycled C&D materials. He added
144 that this is an industry that is truly in its infancy and requires creativity in finding new
145 recycling opportunities, courage in investing and resourcefulness in developing new end
146 uses for materials. He complimented Gaisford and the division for doing a very good job
147 in public education and in presenting this information to the committees.

148

149 Mele asked Whitley if there was any opportunity for the county to help with market
150 development and moving materials from beneficial use to recycling.

151

152 Whitley replied that industry looks to the public sector to be a customer. For example,
153 crushed aggregate does not always have a ready market. If WSDOT committed through
154 its procurement process to use a certain percentage of crushed aggregate as road base, it
155 would be very helpful. Gypsum also needs a consistent end use market.

156

157 SWAC member Joe Casalini introduced himself by saying that he has been with
158 Rabanco/Allied for twenty-five years. Per King County Ethics rules, he disclosed his
159 company's contract with the Solid Waste Division for C&D. He worked on developing
160 the original curbside recycling programs and the 3rd & Lander MRF, which was the sixth
161 such facility built in the United States. His company has been a leader in environmental
162 programs and currently holds a Construction, Demolition, and Landclearing (CDL)
163 contract with King County.

164

165 Casalini said that construction and demolition waste is traditionally considered a single
166 waste stream when in fact there are critical differences between their generation
167 processes and the materials they generate. Construction is fairly efficient and lends itself
168 to source separation relatively easily. Demolition often begins by pulling out specific
169 valuable materials, such as doors and fixtures, but the actual demolition results in a
170 commingled waste stream that requires time and money for recovery. This distinction
171 between construction and demolition wastes is important and is analogous to the
172 difference between high grade paper and mixed grade paper. Casalini added that the
173 analogy to paper holds with C&D markets as well. He said it is important to avoid the
174 demand-to-oversupply cycle that plagued paper in the 1980's.

175

176 **Commercial Sector Diversion Tools and Options**

177 Gaisford's presentation on this topic is available at:

178 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnnp/swd/CommercialJointDec14.ppt>

179

180 MSWMAC member Erin Leonhart commented that Health Department concerns are also
181 a barrier to food scraps recycling.

182

183 Fife-Ferris said that half of Bellevue's population is in multifamily housing, which is
184 included in their commercial recycling contract. Bellevue is struggling with how to
185 address the new mixed use buildings, which often have an issue with providing enough
186 space for traditional recycling, let alone food waste containers. Developers do not want
187 to give up valuable space for waste. Although Bellevue has space requirements in its
188 codes, many project plans are being changed after plan review, and there is no further
189 review before the project is built. In addition to the review issue, there is changing
190 technology. Bellevue's codes were written when garbage trucks were smaller, so even
191 buildings that meet code do not have sufficient space for the new recycling trucks. This
192 is probably a region wide problem, as most cities have codes that were developed around
193 the same time. The codes need to be updated to be consistent with current technology.

194

195 SWAC and MSWMAC member David Baker asked if the handouts included data for
196 multifamily residential buildings, and Gaisford confirmed that they do not. The handouts
197 relate only to commercial buildings.

198

199 Hardebeck suggested a two tiered rate would be useful for food scraps. This would give
200 businesses with food handling permits the ability to pull organics out of their garbage,
201 without requiring other businesses to subsidize their disposal of heavy food waste.

202

203 Casalini said that commercial recycling will require spending a lot of time with building
204 managers, who have to deal with the space issues that developers leave them. He agreed
205 with Fife-Ferris that source separation requires more space than is often available, and
206 suggested that a new collection system may be required. He added that in general,
207 industry purchases carefully to minimize waste. Industries that produce specific products
208 tend to try to recycle their process wastes to save money. The problem is with mixed use
209 buildings and large buildings that have multiple tenants managed by a single building
210 manager. Recycling is much more complicated in these situations.

211

212 **Adjourn**

213 Garber said that Pelosa has proposed a biannual joint MSWMAC/SWAC meeting.

214

215 MSWMAC Vice Chair Jessica Greenway asked if the division will email a 2008 meeting
216 schedule to MSWMAC. Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates confirmed
217 that she would send members a 2008 schedule, as well as forward Garber's materials
218 relating to onsite demolition recycling.

219

220 Hardebeck thanked everyone for an educational and fun meeting.

221

222 The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

223

224 Submitted by:

225 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff