

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
December 12, 2008
12:45 a.m. – 2:15 p.m.
King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center
Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
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
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
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
Don Fiene	City of Lake Forest Park	Councilmember
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
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

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff
 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
 Kevin Kiernan, Division Director
 Victor Okereke, Interim Engineering Manager
 Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager
 Diane Yates, SWD Staff

Cities

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association
 Scott MacColl, City of Shoreline

Consultants

Ryan Asman, HDR Engineering
 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 12:45 p.m.
4 Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

5
6 Garber stated that the January 9, 2009 MSWMAC meeting agenda will include the
7 election of chair and vice chair in addition to discussions of the dispute resolution
8 process, host city mitigation, and MSWMAC replacing the Regional Policy Committee
9 as the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum. The agenda will not include the discussion of a
10 Comp Plan chapter.

11
12 **Approval of October Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

13 **Chris Eggen of Shoreline moved to approve the November minutes.**

14
15 *The November minutes were approved by consensus.*

16
17 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/Other/Master Schedule**

18 **SWD:**

19 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan noted that the Houghton and Factoria
20 transfer stations will close for safety reasons when 4 ½" of snow accumulates on the roof.

21
22 The Solid Waste Division received the annual Environmental Award, Government
23 Category from Waste News Magazine. Also, the division's Green Tools program is a
24 semi-finalist for a \$100,000 grant for Innovations in American Government from the
25 Harvard/Kennedy School's Ash Institute for Democratic Governance.

26
27 The 2009 budget has been adopted by the King County Council with two provisos that
28 affect the division. The first instructs the division to review policy options related to the
29 maintenance and monitoring of closed landfills that are funded in the post closure landfill
30 account. The second requires that two progress reports be transmitted on the status of
31 negotiations with the cities to extend the interlocal agreements.

33 The King County Council is scheduled to take action to finalize furloughs on Monday,
34 December 15.

35

36 The Council passed ordinance 16320 authorizing the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff
37 Group (ITSG) as a standing committee to assist MSWMAC in its work on December 8th.

38

39 The division's legislative transmittal schedule for 2009 is now available.

40

41 SWD has begun implementing the use of tippers at Cedar Hills. These machines tip
42 trailers into the air allowing gravity to empty them. Tippers empty the trailers more
43 quickly and use fewer moving parts than the walking floors previously in use. In response
44 to a question, Kiernan said that the division would not replace the walking floor function
45 of trailers over time.

46

47 Solid Waste Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn, noted that the division
48 received comments on the WPR chapter from Bellevue staff as well as from the cities of
49 Redmond, Bothell, Kirkland, and Auburn. Comments were wide ranging, addressing
50 content as well as formatting and length. The division will meet with cities to clarify their
51 comments. All input will be considered and the revised chapter will be available during
52 the public review process. Comments received will be sent to MSWMAC members upon
53 request.

54

55 SWAC:

56 SWAC is working on membership issues. The committee has elected a new vice chair
57 subsequent to the previous Vice Chair's retirement from the waste management industry,
58 which he had represented on the committee..

59

60 SWAC provided comments on the WPR chapter. Additional SWAC discussion focused
61 on beneficial use definitions and C&D recycling.

62

63 Master Schedule:

64 Severn reported that the division intends to procure consultants in the first quarter of
65 2009 to begin design work for Factoria transfer station reconstruction and the siting for
66 new stations in the South County and NE Lake Washington service areas.

67

68 The Cedar Hills Site Development Plan work is proceeding. The results of that work are
69 anticipated to be received in time for inclusion in the Comp Plan.

70

71 **Comp Plan Working Draft Disposal Chapter: Discussion**

72 Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates asked that all comments on the draft disposal
73 chapter be submitted by close of business on January 5th.

74

75 Kiernan noted that the chapter includes discussion regarding extending the life of the
76 landfill. Though alternatives regarding extending the life of the landfill are included in
77 the chapter for reference, evaluating the specifics of those alternatives is part of the Site
78 Development Plan process. The final draft of the disposal chapter is expected to include
79 details from that Site Development Plan process that are not yet available.

80

81 The public review period of the Site Development Plan will overlap to some degree with
82 the review period for the Comp Plan.

83

84 Kiernan suggested that MSWMAC look closely at the proposed policies.

85

86 Garber suggested that the recommendations and policies be stated together at the
87 beginning of the chapter. Severn said that the division continues to evaluate options for
88 making recommendations and policies more easily accessible. One option is to box the
89 recommendations as was done in this draft chapter.

90

91 In response to comments, Severn noted that the division is carefully separating policy
92 statements from actions.

93

94 Jon Spangler of Redmond noted that the disposal chapter in the previous Comp Plan had
95 ten policies while this chapter has three. Severn responded that the content of chapters is

96 different between the plans. For example, the previous disposal chapter included a
97 discussion of closed landfills, which has been moved to the environmental stewardship
98 chapter of this plan.

99

100 Spangler noted that the word diversion meant something different when it was used in the
101 WPR chapter. Kiernan said that diversion in the WPR chapter meant that materials were
102 diverted from the waste stream. Diversion in the disposal chapter means that the waste is
103 diverted from the Cedar Hills landfill. It may be valuable to define the term when it is
104 first used in the chapter.

105

106 Spangler asked if the term extending landfill capacity was accurate and suggested it be
107 replaced by maximizing capacity as opposed to lifespan. Kiernan responded that it is
108 possible to increase the lifespan of the landfill without increasing its volume by changing
109 operational procedures such increasing recycling of rock and cover used.

110

111 Spangler suggested that policy DS-2 be altered to ensure that the standards for protection
112 of public health and the environment apply to other disposal or diversion methods
113 considered by the county. Garber agreed and suggested that the policy be revised to
114 address that concern. Severn responded that policy DS-2 applies only to the operation and
115 maintenance of Cedar Hills. However, the screening and evaluation criteria for disposal
116 options listed on page 14 addresses standards of that type for future diversion, disposal or
117 conversion technology options.

118

119 Spangler said the language in policy DS-3 is confusing. John MacGillivray of Kirkland
120 agreed and suggested breaking it into two sentences to increase clarity.

121

122 Discussing policy DS-3, Spangler asked why the division would consider partial early
123 waste diversion when the least expensive option is disposal at Cedar Hills. Kiernan
124 responded that partial early waste diversion would most likely increase costs slightly in
125 the short run. However, it may allow the division to delay the higher costs of disposal
126 which will occur after closure of Cedar Hills. Partial early waste diversion may also

127 provide leverage for negotiating disposal contracts by maintaining the ability to walk
128 away from negotiations.

129

130 Kiernan noted that policy DS-3 says that the option of partial early waste diversion will
131 be examined. It would only be implemented if it made sense economically. In response
132 to a question Kiernan said that the reasons for considering partial early waste diversion is
133 discussed in the second paragraph on page two and again on page ten where the division
134 will consider adding more detail.

135

136 Don Fiene of Lake Forest Park suggested that changing the words “which could” in the
137 first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page ten to “to” may add clarity. Garber said that
138 change implies that the division will make a decision between only those alternatives
139 instead of any alternative that meets the screening and evaluation criteria listed on page
140 fourteen.

141

142 Spangler suggested that a policy which minimizes disposal by increases in waste
143 reduction and recycling be added to the disposal chapter.

144

145 MacGillivray suggested that the list in the second paragraph on page three be presented in
146 a bulleted form.

147

148 Spangler suggested that the closure date listed in the second paragraph on page two
149 should reflect previous MSWMAC conversations. Severn responded that the date reflects
150 the current plan which has not been officially changed. Though the Transfer System and
151 Waste Management plan suggested extending the life of Cedar Hills, the Site
152 Development Plan work that would evaluate alternatives and recommend a closure date
153 has not been completed and approved by the council.

154

155 Spangler suggested that a title be added to the introduction and that the title on page three
156 be changed to be more specific. Garber suggested that the title be changed to “Landfill
157 Background” or “Cedar Hills Background.”

158

159 In response to a comment Severn noted that the word “waste” will be removed from the
160 first line of the third paragraph on page six.

161

162 Spangler suggested that packing waste to a greater density does not create airspace as is
163 implied in the fifth paragraph on page six. Instead, it allows more waste to be placed in
164 existing airspace. Spangler recommended that the language in that paragraph and in the
165 last line on the final paragraph of page six be changed to “maximize the use of airspace.”
166 Garber suggested that “preserve airspace” be removed from that line.

167

168 In response to comments about including alternatives for extending the life of Cedar Hills
169 in the Comp Plan, Kiernan noted that it is difficult to strike a balance between including
170 sufficient information to provide context while not usurping the Site Development Plan
171 process.

172

173 Spangler suggested adding the Pros and Cons of each alternative to the chapter.

174 Kiernan said that the Site Development Plan will go through a separate environmental
175 review. The outcome of that review will be included in the final Comp Plan in some
176 detail.

177

178 Garber recommended removing the alternatives from the Comp Plan. This would limit
179 the possibility that comments to the Site Development Plan would be received during the
180 public comment period of Comp Plan.

181

182 Chris Eggen of Shoreline disagreed and said that he supports including the alternatives.
183 He suggested that the division consider adding language earlier in the chapter to explain
184 the connection between the Comp Plan and Site Development Plan. Severn responded
185 that information about the Site Development Plan is initially presented on pages two and
186 three. Garber suggested that the language be changed to clarify that the processes are
187 separate and that the Site Development Plan information will be folded into the Comp
188 Plan.

189

190 Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way asked how the timelines for review of the Comp Plan
191 and the Site Development Plan coincide. Kiernan said it is a challenge. Severn said that
192 is why this detail is being included in the Comp Plan.

193

194 In response to a question from Joyce Nichols of Bellevue, Kiernan noted that the Site
195 Development Plan process will assess the costs of alternatives and the resulting
196 information will be included in the Comp Plan.

197

198 Interim Engineering Services Manager Victor Okereke noted that all interested parties
199 will be invited to participate in the review process of the Site Development Plan.

200

201 MacGillivray suggested that the chapter include a table showing the similarities and
202 differences between the alternatives in addition to the narrative. He also suggested that
203 the section needs a wrap-up, particularly because it does not include a recommendation.

204

205 In response to comments regarding the recommendation on page ten that King County
206 not site a replacement landfill either in King County or in another county, Severn noted
207 that the recommendation came directly from the current Comp Plan and is intended to
208 mean that King County will not site, own or operate a replacement landfill at any location
209 after Cedar Hills closes.

210

211 Discussing future waste diversion on page ten, Kiernan noted that the division will solicit
212 proposals from multiple vendors and those that meet the criteria listed on page fourteen
213 will be considered. Barre Seibert of Clyde Hill asked if the language makes it clear that
214 the division is only interested in proven technologies. Kiernan responded that the
215 requirement for proven performance is included in the operating history portion of the
216 criteria. Garber noted that potential early diversion options could include waste export,
217 waste-to-energy, and other technologies that meet the screening and evaluation criteria
218 for disposal options.

219

220 In response to comments from Spangler and Garber, Severn said that the terms “mass
221 burn waste-to-energy,” “refuse derived fuel,” and “advanced thermal recycling” will be
222 removed from the second paragraph of page eleven.

223

224 Seibert noted that the language in the third paragraph on page eleven implies that no
225 decision will be made about disposal alternatives during the planning period. If the
226 planning period for the Comp Plan is twenty years, that statement appears to be
227 inaccurate. Kiernan responded that though the planning period for the Comp Plan is
228 twenty years, it is revised every six years and that is the intent of the sentence. That
229 sentence is accurate assuming that the Site Development Plan results in alternatives that
230 extend the life of Cedar Hills. If that is not the outcome, this Comp Plan may need to
231 include a recommendation about disposal alternatives.

232

233 Kiernan asked that committee members pay particular attention to the screening and
234 evaluation criteria for disposal options on page fourteen. Seibert noted that the third
235 bullet under social should begin with the word effect, not affect.

236

237 Rich Wagner of Auburn suggested that the Operating History section be moved to the top
238 of the list emphasizing that the division is not interested in unproven technologies.

239 Seibert and Garber suggested that the division consider adding a recommendation that
240 only proven technologies be considered.

241

242 Severn said that each of the criteria is exclusionary to some degree. The environmental,
243 social and economic sections were listed first because they represent the triple bottom
244 line.

245

246 In response to a question, Severn noted that C&D disposal is an important part of the
247 county’s solid waste system. C&D has been integrated throughout the Comp Plan as
248 opposed to being segregated into a separate chapter as was done previously.

249

250 Nichols asked if there is an update on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe issue for Harbor
251 Island. Kiernan responded that the division owns the Harbor Island property. It is not

252 connected to the BNSF trail issue. The division currently leases properties on it, which
253 generate revenue. There are no plans to sell or trade the property.

254

255 **Direction to ITSG**

256 MSWMAC did not have any direction for ITSG.

257

258 **Public Comment**

259 Fiene noted that he is a self hauler and uses the new Shoreline Recycling and Transfer
260 Station. He thanked the division for its prompt response to his recent call concerning the
261 free recycling area. He said the area is much improved.

262

263 **Adjourn**

264 The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

265

266 Submitted by:

267 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff