

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

**October 13, 2006**

**11:45 – 2:00 p.m.**

**King Street Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Center**

**Approved Minutes**

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Jack Dovey	City of Federal Way	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste and Recycling Coordinator
David Baker	City of Kenmore	Deputy Mayor
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

**Theresa Jennings, Solid Waste Division Director**

**Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager**

**Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager**

**Brad Bell, Landfill/Shop Operations Manager**

**Thea Severn, Transfer/Transport Manager**

**Mark Buscher, Lead Planner**

**Tom Karston, Finance and Rates Analyst**

**Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison**

**Gemma Alexander, Staff**

**Kathy Hashagen, Staff**

**Sandra Matteson, Staff**

**Bill Reed, Staff**

**Josh Marx, Staff**

King County Council Staff

**Mike Reed**

**Mike Huddleston**

Guests

**Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities**

**George Sidles, Seattle Public Utilities**

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:10. Everyone present  
3 introduced themselves.

4  
5 **Approve September Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

6 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin suggested language clarifying statements made in Lines  
7 29-31, Line 78 and Lines 216-218.

8  
9 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza disagreed with Spiegelman's statement on Line 275 that  
10 the biggest barrier to product stewardship is in the mental view of citizens and elected  
11 officials.

12  
13 Garber responded that Spiegelman was referring to the need for a paradigm change from  
14 the current view that government is responsible for waste to a view that industry is  
15 responsible.

16  
17 MSWMAC member Linda Knight suggested that the minutes be changed to read, "She  
18 said in Canada the biggest barrier has been the mental view of citizens and elected  
19 officials."

20  
21 *The September minutes were approved as amended by consensus.*

22  
23 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway said the September 8<sup>th</sup> presentation at MSWMAC  
24 by Helen Spiegelman of the Product Policy Institute about Vancouver's waste reduction  
25 programs showed concrete roles each of us can play. She suggested that the presentation  
26 would be valuable to the Regional Policy Committee and the County Council.

27 Spiegelman's presentation is available at:

28 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SPIEGELMAN.ppt>

29  
30 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager, Jeff Gaisford informed the group that  
31 the information has been shared with SWAC and audiences internal to the Solid Waste

32 Division. Perhaps as time goes by it will be appropriate to provide the presentation for  
33 other audiences.

34

35 **ITSG Update**

36 ITSG and MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka reported that ITSG met four times in the  
37 past month. Two of the meetings included Solid Waste Division staff. During those  
38 meetings ITSG discussed recycling studies including market assessments and transfer  
39 station recycling, provided feedback on the draft Comprehensive Solid Waste  
40 Management Plan Development Schedule, and discussed host city mitigation with Solid  
41 Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings.

42

43 Solid Waste Division employees did not attend the other two ITSG meetings which were  
44 focused on governance issues. County Council staff and ITSG members discussed host  
45 city mitigation, dispute resolution and the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum. ITSG members  
46 expect the report on governance to be completed and sent to Council not later than  
47 December 31, 2006.

48

49 Rivkin added that ITSG intends to bring a list of its recommendations and issues to  
50 MSWMAC for their input before writing the report on governance to be sent to Council.  
51 She requested that a minimum of forty-five minutes be set aside in the November and  
52 December MSWMAC meetings to discuss governance issues in caucus. Garber  
53 suggested that MSWMAC members may want to have extended meetings in November  
54 and December to accomplish that task while still addressing the Comprehensive Solid  
55 Waste Management Plan issues identified on the draft schedule.

56

57 *MSWMAC approved the suggestion by consensus.*

58

59 **SWAC Update**

60 SWAC member and MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton reported that Steve Goldstein  
61 resigned his position on SWAC. He has chosen to become more active in local  
62 government and is specifically interested in the planning commission. Nominations for  
63 SWAC officers are completed. Current members appear to support the idea of retaining

64 existing leadership for another term. Only one SWAC member did not vote to  
65 conditionally approve the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, citing concerns about  
66 service levels for self-haulers in rural areas if the Renton Transfer Station is closed.

67

68 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings added that the division has let SWAC  
69 know the issue of service levels to rural customers will be addressed in the Comp Plan.

70

71 **SWD Update**

72 Jennings thanked Garber, Greenway and Pelosa for providing feedback to the Regional  
73 Policy Committee regarding the collaborative process. Construction on the First NE  
74 transfer station remains on time, on schedule and on budget. Currently construction is  
75 focusing on installing the utilities and pouring the foundation.

76

77 Rivkin asked for information about the Bow Lake Facility Master Plan open house.  
78 Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported that one attendee, a neighboring  
79 property owner, chose to appeal the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance  
80 (MDNS) as part of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process. The Solid Waste  
81 Division is responding to the appeal.

82

83 Rivkin asked if there was information the division could share with MSWMAC  
84 concerning the 2007 budget requested. Jennings responded that because the budget has  
85 not yet been transmitted to the Executive she couldn't comment at this time.

86

87 Council Staff Mike Reed said the Request for Proposal (RFP) to find a facilitator for the  
88 third party review process has been vetted by the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO)  
89 and has moved to county procurement. He is optimistic that the procurement process will  
90 be completed within thirty days. The \$50,000 contract will hire a vendor to facilitate the  
91 process of third party review. They will gather information, select members of a panel of  
92 experts, coordinate the process and write the final report.

93

94 Rivkin asked how the vendor will select panel members. Reed responded by saying the  
95 RFP leaves that up to the vendor. Garber asked if firms that have worked for the Solid

96 Waste Division in the past or expect to work for them in the future will be excluded from  
97 consideration. She expressed concern that there are a limited number of qualified local  
98 firms and they may not wish to respond if as a result they are precluded from future work.  
99 Reed responded that the intent of the RFP is to ensure the results of the third party review  
100 can be seen as having distance and objectivity.

101

102 Peloza expressed concern that the scope of work does not address that issue. Reed  
103 responded that #5 in the most current version of the scope of work does address the issue.  
104 Reed will send a copy of the most current version to Intergovernmental Relations Liaison  
105 Diane Yates, who will distribute it to MSWMAC.

106

107 Noting that the rate proposal will be introduced Monday, October 16, Rivkin asked if it  
108 could reasonably be adopted before the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan.

109 Huddleston responded saying that this rate proposal funds projects covered by the current  
110 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. Therefore it is not necessary that the  
111 Transfer and Waste Export System Plan be passed before the rate proposal. He added  
112 that unless this group considers extending the terms of the Interlocal Agreements (ILAs),  
113 if the plan is passed, the county would have to issue 20 year bonds by 2008 in order to  
114 pay for capital projects before the expiration of the ILAs in 2028.

115

116 Peloza identified an error on page 7 of the Scope of Work. Language should be changed  
117 to show the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan will be completed by 2006, not  
118 2007.

119

### 120 **Seattle's Recycling Plan/Programs Presentation**

121 Tim Croll of Seattle Public Utilities referred to the handout, "Director's Briefing:  
122 Preliminary Update to 60% Projections" distributed at the meeting. The first page of the  
123 document reflects a set of programs proposed by Mayor Nickels.

124

125 In response to a question about the city's ban of recyclables from the garbage, Croll said  
126 that a significant effort was made to inform the public in advance. Enforcement of the  
127 ban was phased in gradually and is primarily focused on education. At the curbside,

128 residential garbage collectors look at each can. If it appears to contain more than 10% of  
129 recyclable materials the can is tagged and left at the curb. More than 3.9 million cans  
130 were collected in the past year. Only 892 showed evident recyclables.

131

132 Commercial enforcement is done by random inspection of dumpsters. If more than 10%  
133 of recyclable materials are evident, the dumpster will receive a notice. A fine of \$50 is  
134 assessed only after the third infraction. Last year 898 businesses were inspected and only  
135 19 received a notice. No fines were assessed. Representatives of the Chamber of  
136 Commerce became ambassadors for the program within the commercial sector.

137

138 Smaller businesses that do not sell their recyclables are able to put out two 90 gallon  
139 toters of paper and other recyclables to be picked up curbside at no charge. Surveys have  
140 shown that 60% of citizens feel positively about the ban.

141

142 Croll said the City of Seattle Public Utilities is following the suburban cities in working  
143 to recycle pre and post consumer food waste. They have implemented a plan that allows  
144 vegetative food waste to be collected along with yard waste every other week. When the  
145 new contract comes up, they will consider changing collection schedule to every week for  
146 yard waste and every other week for garbage. The more frequent pick up may address  
147 Health Department concerns about what food waste can be recycled.

148

149 The City of Seattle is planning to renovate the north and south transfer stations for self  
150 haul only. The renovated stations would have an enhanced ability to support recycling.  
151 A study considering the advisability of a third station will be completed in spring of  
152 2007. If built, the third station would accept waste from commercial hauling trucks, as  
153 well as construction and demolition materials for recycling.

154

155 Croll said it is difficult to quantify waste reduction goals. He described the city's reuse  
156 pilot program with the Salvation Army that allows self-haulers to remove some salable  
157 items from the waste stream. They are considering expanding the program to include  
158 items that others could take home and put to use for free.

159

160 McGilton expressed concern about the liability of allowing citizens to remove items from  
161 the waste stream. Croll responded that the liability can be controlled by taking steps to  
162 make the system safer. Also, by removing materials from the waste stream before  
163 customers pass the transfer station scale, recovery is a pre-waste activity in regulatory  
164 terms.

165

166 Huddleston asked how the City of Seattle measures sustainability. Croll replied that in  
167 addition to strict financial measures such as avoided landfill costs, the city considers  
168 other impacts like greenhouse gas emissions.

169

170 Huddleston asked if the City of Seattle has studied the sustainability of conversion  
171 technologies. Croll said that while recycling is environmentally beneficial because it  
172 eliminates the transportation impacts involved in using virgin materials, the  
173 environmental benefit or cost of conversion technologies relative to landfilling seems to  
174 depend on the recovery rate of methane at the landfill.

175

#### 176 **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan Update**

177 Buscher reviewed the draft schedule for updating the Comprehensive Solid Waste  
178 Management Plan. The schedule shows how the planning moves through the advisory  
179 committees. Buscher said he expects the schedule to change in response to level of  
180 interest and discussion as the groups move through the issues. The current draft schedule  
181 mirrors the method used previously on the Waste Export and Transfer System Plan. It  
182 also follows the process required by law and the Interlocal Agreements.

183

184 The schedule shows development of milestone reports on four complex issues. These  
185 milestone reports will follow the same approval process as used for the previous  
186 milestone reports. Just as those reports informed the final Transfer and Waste Export  
187 System Plan, Buscher said these milestone reports will inform the development of the  
188 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. Buscher said he anticipates that the  
189 schedule for the milestone reports will be called out in ordinance. He expects that  
190 milestone reports about Waste Reduction and Recycling goals and programs and Cedar  
191 Hills Landfill Capacity will outline alternatives and include directional recommendations.

192 Milestone reports about Conversion Technologies, and Intermodal and Long Haul will be  
193 mostly informational and will outline a process and timeline for final decisions on these  
194 issues.

195

196 Rivkin commented that she liked the proposal for concrete reports and the sequencing  
197 shown in the schedule. She requested that an additional table be constructed showing the  
198 schedule by topic to add clarity. Noting that the MSWMAC column of the schedule  
199 identifies the final opportunity for discussion of each topic, she requested the same  
200 treatment of each topic in the ITSG column.

201

202 Rivkin asked for clarification of the difference between the recycling milestone report  
203 and the recycling chapter. Buscher responded that milestone reports, especially for  
204 recycling, where so much of the work is done by the cities, identify the fundamental  
205 goals, how they will be measured and defined, and what materials will be targeted. The  
206 chapters of the plan will be based on the conclusions of the milestone report and will  
207 discuss more specific and detailed issues, such as types of programs, funding, roles and  
208 tasks for the County and the Cities. He added that issues not discussed in the milestone  
209 reports will still work through the committees before inclusion in the Comp Plan.

210 Buscher said this planning process is similar to the previous one, where milestone reports  
211 built agreement on fundamental issues before details were developed for the final plan.

212

213 Hlavka asked if it would be possible for recycling coordinators to come to ITSG meetings  
214 to provide their expertise when the WRR topics are discussed. Diane said recycling  
215 coordinators have been invited to participate in ITSG meetings. She added that the  
216 division hopes each city will coordinate internally so that the division receives a  
217 consistent message from each city.

218

219 Pelosa requested a schedule from now until 2016 including milestones. Buscher will  
220 work with Kiernan to create that type of spreadsheet.

221

222 Huddleston said the council chair would like to see a document that details the planning  
223 process. Garber suggested that the schedule could be appended to legislation approving

224 the Transport and Waste Export System Plan. She asked if the process provided in the  
225 draft schedule would meet the needs of the group.

226

227 *The draft schedule was approved by consensus.*

228

229 **Recycling Studies Presentation & Discussion**

230 Recycling and Environmental Service Manager Jeff Gaisford said the purpose of the  
231 presentation is to provide an overview of the studies and other sources that inform the  
232 division's recycling programs. The presentation is available at  
233 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/studyoverview.ppt>

234

235 Pelosa asked if loads are secured when customers come to transfer stations.

236 Transfer/Transport Manager Thea Severn responded that the Solid Waste Division has  
237 the ability to assess a fine for unsecured loads and has stepped up enforcement.

238

239 Gaisford offered to return to MSWMAC to provide more detailed information if  
240 necessary.

241

242 **Adjourn**

243 Garber said that the meetings for November and December will begin with a governance  
244 discussion at 11:00.

245

246 The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

247

248 Submitted by:

249 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff