

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

**March 9, 2007**

**11:45 – 2:30 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
Susan Fife-Ferris	City of Bellevue	Conservation and Outreach Program Mgr.
Debbie Anspaugh	City of Bothell	Administrative Coordinator
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste and Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	City Representative
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	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**

**Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager**

**Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager**

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

**Pam Badger, Special Waste Supervisor**

**Bob Tocarciuc, Planning Supervisor**

**Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison**

**Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff**

**Tom Karston, SWD Staff**

**Josh Marx, SWD Staff**

**Bill Reed, SWD Staff**

**Dinah Day, SWD Staff**

**Sandra Matteson, SWD Staff**

King County Council Staff

**Mike Reed**

Guests

**Charles Scott, Cascadia Consulting**

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:10. Everyone present  
3 introduced themselves. Division Director Theresa Jennings introduced Bob Tocarciuc,  
4 the division's new Planning Supervisor.

5  
6 **Approve December Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

7 *MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini moved approval of the February minutes.*

8  
9 *MSMWAC member Jessica Greenway moved to amend the minutes at line 103 with the*  
10 *addition of the sentence, "Kirkland City Council discussed the governance report with*  
11 *the understanding that the City of Kirkland may be asked to sign a longer term*  
12 *interlocal agreement."*

13  
14 *The February minutes were approved by consensus.*

15  
16 **SWD Update**

17 Jennings said the division is advertising for a new Assistant Director. The position will  
18 be open until March 21.

19  
20 Jennings reported that the consultants who are working on the waste to energy (WTE)  
21 study for the budget proviso will brief MSWMAC in April on WTE technologies. The  
22 consultants will return in May to report on the findings of their study.

23  
24 The rate study has been reintroduced to council and referred to the Operating Budget  
25 Committee. The Bow Lake Facility Master Plan is expected to be transmitted to Council  
26 this quarter.

27  
28 Jennings encouraged MSWMAC members to attend the green building summit at Gould  
29 Hall on March 21 from 8-4. The keynote speaker will be the CEO of Cascadia and there  
30 will be information on LEED certification and sustainability. The registration fee is \$45.

31

32 Intergovernmental Staff Liaison Diane Yates said the Washington State Department of  
33 Transportation will be doing extensive work on northbound lanes of I-5 in August, and  
34 ITSG members have pointed out that south end cities may have difficulty getting  
35 downtown for meetings. She asked if MSWMAC wanted to cancel their August meeting.

36

37 *MSWMAC cancelled its August meeting by consensus.*

38

### 39 **SWAC Update**

40 Armanini reported that at its last meeting SWAC heard and discussed the same  
41 presentations that MSWMAC will hear today. She said SWAC's minutes are available  
42 online if anyone is interested in that discussion.

43 [http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/public\\_documents.asp](http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/public_documents.asp)

44

### 45 **ITSG Update**

46 MSWMAC and ITSG member Rob Van Orsow reported that ITSG also heard the same  
47 presentations that are on MSWMAC's agenda today and gave input.

48

### 49 **Third Party Review Update**

50 Council Staff Mike Reed said that negotiations with the consultant GBB are nearly  
51 complete. There were three main issues:

- 52 1. The \$129,500 budget can not be exceeded.
- 53 2. The county had concerns about some of the consultants on the team who have  
54 done ongoing or recent work on contract with the county. The consultant will  
55 remove two of their team from this work.
- 56 3. The county has asked for the addition of members on the team with West Coast  
57 solid waste experience. The consultant is looking for appropriate candidates.

58

59 Council staff hope to finalize the contract next week. The next step will be for the  
60 Growth Management and Natural Resources committee to approve the contract as part of  
61 their March 27 agenda.

62

63 Armanini asked about the schedule for completing the review.

64

65 Reed said they are trying to get authorization to proceed with work by the end of the  
66 month, in which case work would begin in April and be completed in July.

67

68 Armanini asked if there were any lessons learned through this process so far.

69

70 Reed responded by noting that the Executive branch is more extensively involved  
71 with the procedural requirements associated with the contracting process.

72

73 Armanini commented that although the review is for the benefit of the council,  
74 MSWMAC may have comments on the result. She suggested if the results become  
75 available in August when MSWMAC will not be meeting, that comments should be  
76 submitted by email so MSWMAC will not delay the process any further.

77

78 Reed added that some MSWMAC members may be involved in the third party review.

79

80 Garber said she is concerned about the process after the review is completed. In her  
81 experience, usually not all parties are satisfied with the results of third party review and it  
82 can take time to achieve consensus that the results are valid.

83

#### 84 **Quorum Requirements**

85 Garber said some cities have assigned representatives to MSWMAC, but do not attend  
86 meetings with any regularity. This has affected the quorum requirement. Garber would  
87 like to confer with those cities before taking action, but has not been able to contact them  
88 yet. She asked to defer this discussion until she has heard from them.

89

#### 90 **ITSG Governance Report**

91 Garber called members' attention to the draft proposed motion regarding the continuing  
92 role of ITSG. She suggested that a sentence be added to address the concern that the  
93 motion should be clear MSWMAC is asking the county to legislate ITSG's permanence.

94

95 Reed said that Huddleston has started to draft legislation to that effect, and has suggested  
96 identification of some work products to include in the legislation.

97

98 Garber said the key issue today is the motion at hand. She asked about the process for  
99 development of the legislation and whether MSWMAC would be able to review it.

100

101 Jennings said that the ordinance could be drafted by council staff or by the division. She  
102 said there are two issues involved. The first is the continuation of ITSG, and the second  
103 is ITSG's work program.

104

105 Garber said MSWMAC will wait to draft a work plan for ITSG.

106

107 Armanini said that there may have been some confusion after last month's meeting. She  
108 said she wanted to clarify that she asked for a conversation about the role of ITSG, and  
109 never meant to question ITSG's existence. She knew that the ordinance called for ITSG  
110 to sunset and wanted to ensure that action was taken before that happened.

111

112 *Armanini moved to establish the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) as*  
113 *a standing staff work group consisting of cities' staff, King County Council staff and*  
114 *Solid Waste Division staff. The role of ITSG shall be to support the work of and report*  
115 *directly to MSWMAC. ITSG's duties shall include reviewing draft work products and*  
116 *making recommendations to MSWMAC, as well as other duties that may be requested*  
117 *by MSWMAC from time to time. MSWMAC asks that the county draft legislation re-*  
118 *authorizing ITSG as a permanent standing committee to assist MSWMAC in its*  
119 *ongoing work.*

120

121 *The motion passed unanimously.*

122

123 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked if MSWMAC is also a permanent committee.

124

125 Kiernan replied that Ordinance 14971 established both MSWMAC and ITSG. ITSG was  
126 established with a sunset date, but MSWMAC was not.

127

128 Garber commented that she agrees with everything that has been said about the benefit of  
129 ITSG, which has been enormous.

130

131 **Waste Prevention and Recycling**

132 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented the proposed  
133 timeline for bringing waste prevention and recycling topics to the committee. Referring  
134 to the handout, he said tasks are on the left, including strategies, evaluation criteria, goals  
135 setting and recommendations. On the right side months are assigned to each task. He  
136 said the division proposes to organize the discussions by generator; single family,  
137 multifamily, commercial, construction and demolition, as well as special topics like  
138 transfer stations and product stewardship. Gaisford said product stewardship overlays all  
139 of the generators, but merits a concentrated discussion. He said that MSWMAC will set  
140 the pace. Some topics may be passed through quickly, while others may require more  
141 detailed discussion, taking longer.

142

143 Armanini asked if there has been any discussion of measuring volume diverted, rather  
144 than tons.

145

146 Gaisford replied that could be considered, but all of the existing data is measured in tons.  
147 He suggested that volume could at least be considered as a part of the plastics discussion.

148

149 Gaisford proposed to begin the discussion of definitions in April. For example, what is  
150 meant by “environmental benefits?” Should environmental benefits be measured  
151 quantitatively or qualitatively? He said this conversation may be modeled after the  
152 development of the transfer station evaluation criteria that were used in the waste export  
153 planning process.

154

155 Gaisford said the discussion of goals is last because we have varied knowledge of what is  
156 possible and may get more achievable goals once everyone has a full understanding of  
157 the options.

158

159 Gaisford said that as we go through the presentations on possible programs, we will also  
160 want to understand our achievements so far and what's being done in other jurisdictions.

161

162 **Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Study**

163 Gaisford introduced Charlie Scott from Cascadia Consulting. Scott presented the results  
164 of the MRF study. His presentation is available at:

165 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/MRFStudy.ppt>

166

167 The full report is available at:

168 [http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/documents/MRF\\_assessment.pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/documents/MRF_assessment.pdf)

169

170 MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris asked how many bales were checked at each  
171 MRF.

172

173 Scott said they were at each facility for two or three days and checked three or four bales  
174 each day. He said the study provides a snapshot because there was not enough money to  
175 evaluate more.

176

177 Jennings said the division performs regular waste composition studies, where data is  
178 collected on wet and dry days during different seasons and days of the week. These  
179 studies find that there is very little variation in the waste stream.

180

181 Scott agreed, saying that waste quantities increase at the holidays, and may contain more  
182 paper, green waste is seasonal, as is construction and demolition waste, but generally, the  
183 proportion of recycling to waste does not change much over the course of the year.

184

185 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked if the color of glass made any difference to  
186 recyclability. Scott replied that it does not.

187

188 Armanini asked if the glass problem is aggravated by single receptacle collection and  
189 broken glass. Scott said that glass is a problem for those and many other reasons.

190 Broken glass damages machines, screens and conveyor belts and also gets into workers'

191 hands and lungs. Small pieces of glass contaminate other materials, especially paper.  
192 Processing and markets are also part of the problem.

193

194 Pelosa asked what the contamination threshold is for reusing glass. Scott said it is a  
195 question of technology, and which market you are looking at. Contamination is not a  
196 problem for glass reused in the construction industry for roadbeds, but the bottle industry  
197 requires larger pieces of cleaner glass.

198

199 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow asked if the study accounted for shrinkage resulting  
200 from moisture loss during processing. Scott said that the study was not that precise.

201

202 In response to a question, Scott said markets can absorb all of the material coming out of  
203 MRFs in our region through 2010. Seattle is currently in the bid process for management  
204 of its recyclables, and this may drive the addition of new capacity.

205

206 In response to questions from MSWMAC member Don Henning, Scott said that there is a  
207 law of diminishing returns, but sometimes there is enough material to merit reprocessing  
208 residuals to remove recyclables. He added that MRFs are continuously making changes  
209 to their processes and equipment to improve the products and respond to market changes.

210

211 In response to a question, Scott said that China dominates the international market, and  
212 will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

213

214 Armanini asked if the plastic bands left by bottle caps act as a contaminant. Fife-Ferris  
215 replied that they are small enough to have no impact.

216

217 Garber asked about a permitting standard for residuals that defines a facility as a MRF.  
218 Kiernan said the King County Health Department has set a limit of 11% for licensing as a  
219 MRF. Scott added that two of the MRFs studied are licensed as transfer facilities.

220

221 Scott said that MRFs in the region are working well, and commingled recyclables  
222 collection works, but there is an undeniable issue with glass. He said different strategies

223 may be used to deal with the problem, ranging from eliminating glass recycling through  
224 separating glass at the curb to instituting a different process for glass recycling.

225

226 Gaisford said the division is meeting with the MRFs to discuss strategies for dealing with  
227 glass, and will report to MSWMAC on the results.

228

229 Scott commented that all of our recyclables are going to the same few places, so it makes  
230 sense to deal with recycling regionally.

231

232 In response to a question, Jennings clarified that the MRFs are privately owned.

233

### 234 **Illegal Dumping**

235 SWD staff Dinah Day gave a presentation on King County's programs dealing with  
236 illegal dumping. Her presentation is available at:

237 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/IllegalDumping.ppt>

238

239 In response to a question, Day said outreach programs have mostly reached elementary  
240 schools, although some middle and high schools have participated as well.

241

242 Special Waste Supervisor Pam Badger commented that "No Dumping" signs have  
243 historically acted as an invitation to dump rather than a deterrent.

244

245 MSWMAC member Linda Knight commented that children are not the only litterers.

246 She said Metro passengers routinely litter at bus stops.

247

248 Fife-Ferris commented that litter attracts litter, so sites must be cleaned up quickly.

249

250 Day said that programs used to be designed under the assumption that education was all  
251 that was necessary to change behavior. However, the Department of Ecology was able to  
252 form a focus group of people who dump and litter. The focus group was very clear that  
253 they would not change their behavior unless they were faced with consequences.

254

255 In response to a question, Day said there are no local studies available on illegal  
256 dumping, so we can only look at other jurisdictions' successes and failures for guidance.  
257 In Arizona, mandatory garbage collection is paid for by property taxes. Nevertheless,  
258 there is still an illegal dumping problem there.

259

260 Kiernan commented that many illegal dump sites are also the site of other illegal  
261 activities, so investigator safety is very important. Field investigators need training and  
262 sometimes backup from the sheriff's office.

263

264 In response to a question, Kiernan said the real challenge to enforcement is the lack of  
265 resources to prosecute. Law enforcement and the prosecuting attorney have to prioritize  
266 their activities, and illegal dumping rarely rates as a high priority.

267

268 Badger added that enforcement depends on the codes, which are all property based. It is  
269 difficult to prosecute for dumping on someone else's property.

270

271 Day said there has been talk of defining waste as property. This has been done with  
272 hazardous waste and allows the county to hold the original owner ultimately responsible  
273 for how the waste is handled, even if they designate that responsibility to someone else.

274

275 Fife-Ferris commented that there is legal precedent for that.

276

277 **Adjourn**

278 The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

279

280 Submitted by:

281 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff