

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 12, 2008

11:15 – 1:50 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Joan Clark	City of Auburn	Recycling Coordinator
Rich Wagner	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Susan Fife-Ferris	City of Bellevue	Conservation & Outreach Program Manager
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Sabrina Combs	City of Bothell	Special Projects Administrator
Barre Seibert	City Of Clyde Hill	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Gina Hungerford	City of Kent	Conservation Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
John MacGillivray	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Tom Gut	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
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

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

Ann Berrysmith, Finance and Administration Manager

Kevin Kiernan, Division Director

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Cities

Scott MacColl, City of Shoreline

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

Guests

Sharon Hlavka, Green Solutions

1 **Call to Order**

2 After hearing the Governance Committee Report in caucus, and breaking for lunch,
3 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber of Newcastle called the meeting to order at 12:10 a.m.
4 Everyone present introduced themselves.

5
6 **Approval of May Meeting Minutes**

7 **MSWMAC Vice Chair Jessica Greenway of Kirkland moved to approve the June**
8 **minutes.**

9
10 Greenway suggested adding the word “lunch” before garbage in line 28.

11
12 Chris Eggen of Shoreline asked that line 92 be changed to read, “asked whether.”

13
14 *The June minutes were approved as amended by consensus.*

15 .
16 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/Other/Master Schedule**

17 **SWD:**

18 Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that the division received five proposals in
19 response to the Factoria Transfer Station RFP.

20
21 The Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station has been awarded a LEED Platinum rating
22 by the US Green Building Council. It is the first transfer station to achieve the highest
23 LEED rating, and one of only a handful of buildings in the world to do so.

24
25 The division has received three awards from the Solid Waste Association of North
26 America (SWANA): a Silver Excellence Award in Public Education for the *Recycle*
27 *More, It's Easy to Do* campaign, a Silver Excellence Award in Integrated Solid Waste
28 Management for its collaborative approach to planning and integration of environmental
29 features at the new Shoreline Station, and an Innovation Award for its integrated solid
30 waste management plan. From all nominations received by SWANA in all categories,
31 only one Innovation Award winner is selected each year. The application for the award is
32 available at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/mswmac.asp>

33

34 Several MSWMAC members toured Cedar Hills this summer. One of the questions
35 raised during the tour regarded the Landfill Gas to Energy Project. That project is
36 underway. Testing is expected to begin in November, with full operations beginning next
37 year. The contract guarantees a minimum payment to the division that will increase with
38 natural gas prices. Another question raised at the tour related to the final height of the
39 landfill. The footprint of the landfill is limited, and laws dictate the slope of filled areas.
40 Thus geometry dictates the final height of the landfill.

41

42 Members who attended the tour complimented their tour guide, Interim Operations
43 Manager Dean Voelker. Barrie Seibert of Clyde Hill said he was very impressed with the
44 professionalism, environmental protection measures and sensitivity to neighbors
45 exhibited at the landfill. Kiernan and MSWMAC members who attended the tour
46 encouraged everyone to tour the landfill.

47

48 The Bow Lake Transfer Station has received the necessary permits to proceed with work.
49 Initial work on drainage will begin within the month.

50

51 On July 12 and 13, there was a reusable building materials collection event at Shoreline
52 Recycling and Transfer Station. The event was held under a zero dollar contract with the
53 ReStore, obtained through a procurement process. ReStore staff collected reusable
54 materials from interested customers outside the transfer station gate. Although the pilot
55 event was not publicized, 640 pounds of reusable materials were collected on Saturday,
56 and 2360 pounds were collected on Sunday. Some of the materials collected included
57 lumber, light fixtures, pavers, doors and windows.

58

59 The division is currently the subject of two different audits. The first is a county-wide
60 Construction Management audit. It is a very complicated audit that involves many
61 agencies with different construction management processes and is not moving rapidly.
62 The second is a Utilities Audit that looks only at solid waste and wastewater. This audit
63 is in the initial scoping phase. The auditors are interviewing staff, and have an interest in
64 overhead. The results of the audit will be made public, and the division will keep

65 MSWMAC informed as the audits progress. Planning and Communications Manager
66 Thea Severn added that the State Department of Health has produced a presentation for
67 other government agencies undergoing audits, and estimates that agencies should be
68 prepared to dedicate one full time staff person for four to six months to support the audit.
69 Because Severn is the division's point of contact for the Utility audit, the Comp Plan
70 schedule could be impacted.

71

72 The Beyond Waste workgroup of the state's Climate Action Team has produced its initial
73 work, with the goal of producing recommendations for the next legislative session. The
74 focus of the recommendations is reduction of greenhouse gases, and the division is
75 already working on many of them. Recommendations include optimizing collection,
76 product stewardship and managing organics through energy recovery techniques such as
77 fermentation. MSWMAC members may be particularly interested in the
78 recommendation to optimize collection by requiring residential customers to use curbside
79 collection of garbage and recyclables. The Beyond Waste Report is available at:

80 [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Climate%20Action%20Team-
81 %20Final%20Report%20IWG%20V3%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Climate%20Action%20Team-
81 %20Final%20Report%20IWG%20V3%20FINAL.pdf)

82

83 All of the cities are invited to the Greening in Place daylong meeting on green building
84 and green design. The meeting is on Tuesday, September 16, 2008 at Seattle University.

85

86 SWAC:

87 Yates reported that SWAC last met in June. They had a substantive discussion of the
88 proposed financial policies. There was considerable interest in the use of debt funding,
89 fee structure options, and the definition and enforcement of policies relating to the
90 division as an enterprise fund. SWAC suggested a few language changes.

91

92 Master Schedule:

93 Severn reported that the Conversion Technologies report has been at Council for a long
94 time without any action being taken. Since there is no requirement for action, she plans
95 to remove the Conversion Technologies report from the schedule. If she receives any
96 indication that Council intends to act on the report, she will add it back onto the schedule.

97

98 The division expects to have a complete draft Comp Plan in January, which will then be
99 subject to a 120 day review period. Revisions will take place next summer, with a final
100 draft to be released next fall. The Cedar Hills Site Development Plan should be
101 completed in time to inform the final draft of the Comp Plan.

102

103 Offsite prep work will begin on Bow Lake this month. Next year, the division will begin
104 the siting process for the new Northeast Lake Washington and South County Transfer
105 Stations. There will be a single Request for Proposals for both siting processes.

106

107 The back of the master schedule contains meeting schedules for the committees.

108

109 In response to a question, Severn said that improvements at Houghton are awaiting action
110 from the Houghton Community Council.

111

112 **Regional Emergency Planning**

113 SWD staff Gemma Alexander reported that the division is participating in a region wide
114 disaster debris planning process as part of the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI).

115 UASI produced a regional disaster debris plan for Snohomish, King and Pierce Counties
116 this spring. Individual jurisdictions, including the division, are now beginning work on
117 Operational Debris Management plans. Many cities have chosen to wait and use the
118 division's plan as a template for their own plans.

119

120 The draft Transfer Chapter for the Comp Plan ends with a description of Temporary
121 Disaster Debris Storage and Reduction Sites (TDSRs) and their siting criteria. The
122 Debris Plan will include a list of potential TDSR sites. Although most identified TDSRs
123 will never be used, even in the event of an emergency, it is important to identify as many
124 potential sites as possible in order to be prepared if such sites are ever needed. The
125 division would like input from the cities on where TDSRs might be sited. The cities are
126 much more familiar with the properties that may be available, and more importantly,
127 feasible as TDSR sites within their own boundaries.

128

129 Kiernan said it is important to find out about potential conflicts. At first, county-owned
130 parks were considered for TDSRs, but the division discovered that those sites were
131 already designated for mass shelter, which takes a higher priority.

132

133 Garber noted that the available sites are constantly changing. A site that was used for
134 storm debris in Newcastle last December has since been scheduled for development.

135

136 Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue suggested that the division make a formal request of the
137 cities to help identify sites, and said that the request should include a deadline for input.

138 Mark Relph of Shoreline added that the request should be addressed to city managers.

139

140 **Draft Comp Plan Chapters: Review and Discussion**

141 Severn said comments on the draft Transfer and Planning Chapters are due at the end of
142 September.

143

144 Planning Chapter:

145 Greenway said both chapters are well written and easy to read. She suggested some of
146 the information should be in the Introduction Chapter. Severn replied there may be a lot
147 of repetition in the various chapters of the Comp Plan, which will need to be addressed
148 when the plan is complete. Some information may be moved to the Introduction Chapter.

149

150 Eggen commented that the Planning Policies do not address reuse and recycling. Garber
151 replied that PL-3 addresses prevention. Severn added that the Comp Plan will contain an
152 entire chapter on reuse and recycling. Kiernan said the goal in this section is to provide
153 the tools for monitoring the programs which will be described in other chapters.

154

155 Jon Spangler of Redmond commented that the phrase, "as needed" is not necessary in
156 policy statements.

157

158 Fife-Ferris asked how often the 320lb assumption is updated. Kiernan replied that it is
159 not often. Severn added that all passenger licensed vehicles used to be included, but with
160 the proliferation of minivans and SUVs, this was changed to include sedans only.

161

162 Spangler asked how materials recovery facility (MRF) contamination levels were handled
163 in the data. Severn said the contamination numbers are backed out of recycling data.

164

165 Spangler asked about the curbside organics collection pilot program. Linda Knight of Renton
166 said that the pilot has been completed and the technical report is now available
167 (http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/garbage-recycling/documents/Renton_Residential_Pilot_Report.pdf).

168 Mayor Law has continued the service in the pilot areas, and a new contract with Waste
169 Management extending the service citywide is awaiting council action. The pilot program
170 offered garbage, recycling and organics collection to the North area every week. South area
171 residents were offered garbage and recycling collection on alternate weeks with weekly
172 organics collection. A customer survey yielded a strong response, with similar high ratings for
173 customer satisfaction in both pilot areas. Residents who were vocal opponents of the program
174 in the beginning have stated that they love the program now. There was no rate increase
175 involved in the pilot program, and the new contract does include a rate increase, so the city
176 expects some backlash from that. However, residents have asked for the service. There was a
177 reduction in total waste generation during the pilot project as well. This result was unexpected,
178 but may be the result of the intensive education efforts directed at pilot program participants.

179

180 Siebert asked what the motive was for the project. Knight replied that sustainability and cost
181 savings resulting from reduced collection frequency are the two primary motives.

182

183 Kiernan noted that the Health Department was very involved in the project.

184

185 Fife-Ferris commented that the population data on page 9 should include dates.

186

187 Spangler asked if the division has considered including home size as a forecasting factor.
188 Severn replied that she would ask the division's economist.

189

190 Fife-Ferris noted that on page 10 there was no discussion of the impact of tonnage
191 decreases on the system. She said impact on revenues and life of the landfill should be
192 included, or at least a reference to the place where that information is included.

193

194 Kiernan replied that there will be a chapter on financing. He added in response to a
195 question that division funds are part of the investment pool, and have taken losses in the
196 range of \$40,000 to \$60,000. This is a small percentage of the reserve.

197

198 Spangler said Figure P-1 should include previous years to show how the trend leads to
199 current figures as well as projected figures.

200

201 Transfer Chapter:

202 Fife-Ferris said it is not clear what is a policy and what is an action. She would like to
203 see the actions pulled out from the policies. She said she will send the division a written
204 list of specific comments on the policies.

205

206 In response to a question, Kiernan said the plan will include a list of acronyms.

207

208 Spangler asked if the division would call out the significant changes from the past Comp
209 Plan. Severn said that will be done where there is significant difference from the
210 previous plan. Garber added that the introduction could address some of those changes.

211

212 Eggen noted that the text on page 12 drifts from the heading, and should be changed to
213 more directly address the topic. Severn said it would be inappropriate to make changes to
214 that language because it is a report on past action that has been taken directly from earlier
215 approved reports. Kiernan added the actions described are analogous to Roads Standards.

216

217 Fife-Ferris said there is no discussion of the impact on Factoria by Houghton's closure.
218 Severn replied that the specific impacts cannot be calculated until the new Northeast
219 Lake Washington transfer station has been sited, but she agreed that the existence of
220 impacts could be acknowledged.

221

222 Seibert said Clyde Hill is concerned about Factoria closing for two years. Kiernan said
223 the division will look at ways to mitigate the impacts of the closure.

224

225 Robert Van Orsow of Federal Way said that on page 5 the Cascade Recycling Facility is
226 incorrectly listed as an Allied Waste facility in the table. It is a Waste Management
227 Facility. He asked that on page 19 the text include language that space has been reserved
228 at the new Bow Lake Transfer Station for a fixed HHW facility. Kiernan said that space
229 has been reserved, but that the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program has not
230 determined that another fixed facility is needed.

231

232 Referring to policy TS-9, Fife-Ferris asked if a cost benefit analysis is done before
233 deciding that the division will try to attain a Platinum rating on a capital project. Kiernan
234 responded that the division does look at costs and doesn't promise a LEED Platinum
235 rating with every project. Garber added that SEPA routinely uses the term "feasible" to
236 mean "practical" with consideration for cost.

237

238 Severn said the consultant responsible for the environmental impact statement (EIS) has
239 received the draft transfer chapter. She added that the plans for the urban transfer system
240 have already been subjected to environmental review under the EIS for the Transfer and
241 Waste Management Plan. That EIS will be an addendum to the Comp Plan and its EIS.

242

243 Yates asked members to send any further comments on the chapters to her by email.

244

245 **Direction to ITSG**

246 MSWMAC did not have any direction for ITSG.

247

248 **Public Comment**

249 There was no public comment.

250

251 **Adjourn**

252 The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

253

254 Submitted by:

255 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff