

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE (MSWMAC)**

April 11, 2008

11:45 – 2:30 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

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

SWAC Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
Bill Beck	Interested Citizen
Joe Casalini	Waste Management Industry
Bob Dixon	Interested Citizen
Richard Gelowicz	Recycling Industry
Jerry Hardebeck	Vice-Chair, Waste Management Industry
Suellen Mele	Public Interest Group
Mike Pearia	Waste Management Industry
Max Pope	Interested Citizen
Carolyn Prentice	Interested Citizen
Ray Schlien	Interested Citizen
Judy Stenberg	Interested Citizen
Joe Tessier	Labor –Teamster Local 117
Dave Whitley	Recycling Industry

MSWMAC Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Pelozo	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Tom Spille	City of Bellevue	Solid Waste Program Administrator
Sabrina Coombs	City of Bothell	Special Projects Administrator
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Gina Hungerford	City of Kent	Conservation Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Vice-Chair, Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jim Lauinger	City of Kirkland	Mayor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Chair, Mayor
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Chris Eggen	City of Shoreline	Councilmember
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Kirsten Weinmeister	City of Snoqualmie	Recycling Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Justina Tate	City of Woodinville	Asst. to the City Manager

Staff in Attendance

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff
Pam Badger, Special Waste Supervisor
Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff
Jeff Gaisford, Recycling & Environ Services Mgr
Jane Gateley, SWD Staff
Shirley Jurgensen, Interim Engineer Mgr
Tom Karston, SWD Staff

Kevin Kiernan, Division Director
Josh Marx, SWD Staff
Jim Neely, SWD Staff
Bill Reed, SWD Staff
Alexander Rist, SWD Staff
Thea Severn, Interim Lead Planner
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Guests

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association
Tim Henry, City of Auburn
Sharon Hlavka, Green Solutions

Preston Horne-Brine, Flexcon, Inc.
Todd Smith, ReNu, Inc.

1 **Call to Order**

2 The meeting was called to order at 11:55 a.m. Everyone in attendance introduced
3 themselves.

4
5 In accordance with King County’s ethics rules, SWAC members Joe Casalini and Mike
6 Pearia disclosed that they represent companies that have construction and demolition
7 waste contracts with King County.

8
9 **“This is Solid Waste” Video Presentation**

10 Division Director Kevin Kiernan introduced the video, “This Is Solid Waste,” which was
11 prepared for the division in the late 1960s. Copies of the video are available to interested
12 members.

13
14 **SWD Updates / SWAC/ Master Schedule / ITSG Report**

15 SWD Updates

16 Kiernan reported legislation is pending before the King County Council that would
17 restrict King County agencies from using single-serving bottled water.

18
19 The Shoreline Transfer and Recycling Station has been in operation for two months. The
20 station will add new fee recycling materials by June 1st. The new materials are
21 fluorescent lights, both compact bulbs and tubes; and electronics, including DVD players
22 and televisions, but excluding computers.

23

24 Topics on the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) April 9th agenda included three solid
25 waste related items: briefings on the Governance Report and the Conversion
26 Technologies Report, and an update on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management
27 Plan (Comp Plan). No formal vote was taken on these items.

28

29 The March 30th Seattle Times reported a decline in tonnage countywide. For the first
30 quarter, tonnage is down 6.6 percent from the forecast. The decrease in tonnage is a
31 reflection of regional economic conditions. The division will continue to monitor this
32 situation closely and will report to the committees if the situation continues.

33

34 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates reported SWAC/MSWMAC member
35 Joan McGilton gave an update to the Public Involvement Committee of the Suburban
36 Cities Association (SCA) on recycling. There was one question about the relationship
37 between recycling and conversion technologies.

38

39 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked about King County's budget shortfall. Kiernan
40 stated that the division is an enterprise fund dependent on rate revenues, and is not
41 directly impacted by the current expense fund.

42

43 SWAC Update

44 Armanini said that SWAC's March meeting included discussion of the Department of
45 Ecology (Ecology) grants for biofuels research. SWAC member Richard Gelowicz said
46 that in Canada there is a pilot to convert plastics into fuel. SWAC discussed legislation,
47 including pharmaceutical and fluorescent bulb take-back efforts. The committee
48 discussed recycling events from a residential perspective and considered whether funding
49 for these events should be the responsibility of manufacturers. SWAC is in consensus
50 that proposed goals place too heavy an emphasis on recycling, rather than waste
51 prevention and reduction. The SWAC minutes are available online on the division's
52 website.

53

54 Master Schedule

55 Interim Lead Planner Thea Severn reported that the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff
56 Group (ITSG) meeting dates have changed to the Wednesday following MSWMAC's

57 monthly meeting. Both Chairs have asked for a motion on the Waste Prevention &
58 Recycling (WPR) recommendations on their May agendas, which is reflected on the
59 schedule, as well as a motion in December for final review of the draft plan.

60

61 Garber suggested that the ITSG report be moved to immediately precede the WPR
62 Recommendations presentation. She said she would keep a running list of directions to
63 ITSG. Garber asked MSWMAC members to please email any additional direction for
64 ITSG to Yates by April 15th.

65

66 **Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris: Preliminary Recommendations**

67 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford's presentation is available
68 at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/JointC&DApril11.ppt>

69

70 In response to a question, Gaisford said that the recommendations apply to both
71 commercial and residential C&D.

72

73 Armanini cited the limited success of current C&D recycling incentives, and questioned
74 the division's recommendation to extend that program. Kiernan said that some of the
75 incentive funds are being redeemed. Gaisford added that the recommendation is to make
76 incentives available to a wider range of C&D processors than just those under King
77 County contract. Casalini said that Allied has made a capital investment to enable them
78 to take further advantage of existing incentives.

79

80 Armanini asked about the quality of the C&D recycling data. Gaisford said that C&D
81 recycling figures from Ecology changed from one year to another so significantly that
82 those figures need to be further analyzed. Kiernan said that the data received directly
83 from the contracted haulers, however, is fairly consistent.

84

85 In response to a question, Kiernan said the recommendation to dump and pick mixed
86 loads can be effective, but requires both customer education and active participation by
87 employees. It is already in practice at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer station,
88 where the process is evolving.

89

90 Casalini said that there is an important difference between clean wood and dirty wood.
91 Any wood that has been treated, painted, or has nails in it is considered dirty wood. If the
92 clean and dirty woods are combined, the wood recycling market is jeopardized. Pearia
93 said the wood market was negatively impacted when the Boise Cascade plant failed.
94 Mele said that wood in C&D generally is used for beneficial use instead of recycling.
95 She would like the County to take a role in shifting it towards recycling. Gaisford said
96 one area that the County and cities could help would be in their purchasing practices and
97 policies.

98

99 In response to a question, Gaisford answered that the LinkUp program encourages
100 recycling markets. For example, LinkUp is working with the Department of
101 Transportation (DOT) to pilot the use of asphalt shingles in paving.

102

103 SWAC Vice-Chair Jerry Hardebeck said he would like C&D recycling to receive the
104 same treatment as commodities received in the early days of recycling. This has not
105 happened before because C&D is disposed outside of the Cedar Hills Landfill. Curbside
106 recycling programs began with the cities and the haulers sharing the risk of the
107 commodities market. Hardebeck added that if C&D processing cost \$50-70 a ton like
108 commodities, the market would be stronger.

109

110 Gelowicz said that recycling markets change frequently and there must be a plan for
111 responding to market variability. Casalini said some markets are still young and need
112 time to develop. It takes time to get infrastructure in place for these markets. There has
113 been a lot of change in materials and technology in the construction industry in the last
114 five years. The current markets don't address new materials.

115

116 Armanini asked about glass recycling. Gelowicz said that currently glass recycling costs
117 money. The Seattle area is lacking glass processors, but there are investors considering
118 this market.

119

120 Casalini said it is important to recognize that CDL includes three different waste streams
121 requiring processing. The definitions for these materials need to be reconsidered.

122 Materials from construction sites are usually source separated, while demolition cannot
123 be separated easily. Landclearing debris is completely different.

124

125 Hardebeck said that he used to think 50 percent diversion by C&D processors was
126 impossible; however a sister company to CleanScapes, Inc. is achieving that rate because
127 they have a strong incentive. They do not own their own landfill and must pay a very
128 high tip fee. The current standards are too low, and the bar needs to be raised for
129 processors.

130

131 Casalini said the current system does not account for the increase in deconstruction
132 salvage that precedes demolition. Kiernan said facilities that have a high construction
133 recycling rate generally only accept certain materials. Allied and Waste Management's
134 contracts require that they accept all materials, which affects their percentages.

135

136 Armanini said there needs to be a focus on waste prevention. Recycling definitions are
137 complicated and fluid, but priority should be kept on reduction.

138

139 ITSG Report

140 MSWMAC and ITSG member Tom Spille reported on ITSG's response to MSWMAC's
141 direction from the March meeting. ITSG was unable to answer all of MSWMAC's
142 questions and will continue at their April meeting.

143

144 ITSG agreed that recycling events are not the most efficient way to collect recyclables.
145 However, they should continue until other viable options are available.

146

147 The organics recycling goals of 40 percent for single family and 20 percent for
148 multifamily seem too high to ITSG, but there wasn't enough information to make a
149 decision. A major concern for ITSG members is the difficulty involved in measuring
150 these materials. MSWMAC member Linda Knight asked whether organics is meant to
151 include both food and yard waste. Spille replied that the ITSG discussion centered on
152 food waste. Gaisford said that the diversion goal from the landfill is for food scraps and
153 compostable paper, not yard waste.

154

155 ITSG agreed there should be a curbside collection standard.

156

157 Regularly scheduled bulky waste collection should be added to cities' contracts. The
158 current on-call system of collection results in a prohibitive fee.

159

160 Last spring, ITSG discussed the question of space for recycling in multifamily buildings,
161 and sample guidelines were circulated. The cities do not have a standard approach.

162

163 ITSG would be interested in seeing a product stewardship or a tax/fee approach for
164 plastic bags, since cloth bags are the preferred alternative.

165

166 Greenway said that she thinks it's realistic to have an ambitious single family food waste
167 goal. It's not hard to move to 100 percent food waste recycling in a short time, because it
168 isn't inconvenient for single family residents. Education is needed for the single family
169 sector. Multi family food waste recycling will be much more challenging.

170

171 Spille asked for further clarification of MSWMAC's direction regarding an organics fact
172 sheet. Garber said that MSWMAC wanted to know what options are available for that
173 service, what a realistic standard would be, and what health codes would affect those
174 service options. Spille said that ITSG will research that further. Garber said ITSG's
175 direction will be emailed to them by April 15th.

176

177 Committee members discussed issues related to plastics recycling. Garber noted that the
178 challenge lies in keeping public education consistent with current acceptance policies in
179 mobile markets.

180

181 **Overall WPR Recommendations and Evaluation Criteria: Discussion**

182 Severn's presentation on this topic is available at:

183 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/JointWPREvaluation&Rec.ppt>

184

185 The division's recommendation is for a ban on multi family curbside recyclable
186 materials. The division is not recommending a single family recyclables ban because
187 many cities are close to achieving a 45 percent recycling rate without a ban.

188 Gaisford said that the chart presenting the application of evaluation criteria is not a
189 comprehensive summary and does not provide a final cost. It is a decision making tool
190 that shows different impacts. There is no single criterion that can be used to make the
191 final decision.

192

193 Gaisford said that some of the proposed programs can be implemented sooner than
194 originally proposed. The year 2016 was used in anticipation of the closure of Cedar Hills
195 Landfill.

196

197 Armanini noted that cities with higher recycling rates may also have higher generation
198 rates. She said that waste generation is a more important number than percentage
199 recycled.

200

201 Spangler said that since recycling percentages can be skewed, the goals should be
202 directed toward tonnage and not percentages. Severn remarked that since it is
203 problematic to measure what is not generated, there isn't good data on waste prevention.
204 She said that there is more focus on recycling because it is measurable, but ideally
205 tonnage would decrease while recycling rates increased.

206

207 Pelozza suggested presenting numbers as both percentages and tons.

208

209 Hardebeck suggested mandatory collection service to make curbside collection more
210 convenient. Gaisford stated that could be added to the collection standards.

211

212 Pelozza asked if one more year of capacity at Cedar Hills Landfill is the equivalent to 28
213 million dollars. Interim Engineering Manager Shirley Jurgensen said that it is 28 million
214 dollars in present value.

215

216 **Adjourn**

217

218 The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

219

220 Submitted by:

