

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 09, 2007

11:45 – 2:00 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Susan Fife-Ferris	City of Bellevue	Conservation & Outreach Program Manager
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Ann Berrysmith, Finance and Administration Manager

Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Interim Lead Planner

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

1 **Call to Order**

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

4
5 **Approve September Meeting Minutes**

6 **MSWMAC Vice-Chair Jessica Greenway moved to approve the October minutes.**

7
8 *October minutes were approved by consensus.*

9
10 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/ITSG/Master Schedule:**

11 **SWD:**

12 Interim Lead Planner Thea Severn reported that on November 7th, someone placed a case
13 in the pit at the Bow Lake Transfer Station that began to smoke. Transfer Station
14 Operators cleared the station and called 911. A HazMat team responded. It appears that
15 someone cleaned out a chemistry set. The station was closed for about five hours. There
16 were no injuries or damage. An investigation is underway to identify where the case
17 came from.

18
19 Garber asked if the division thought that this might have been deliberate mischief.
20 Severn answered that it did not appear so, but that there would be further investigation.

21
22 MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte noted that the Solid Waste Division recently developed
23 a list of host city contacts to call in the event of closures and emergencies at the transfer
24 stations. He thanked Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates for calling him to
25 notify the City of Tukwila of the closure at Bow Lake Transfer Station. The City of
26 Tukwila appreciated the prompt notification.

27
28 King County and the Port of Seattle have reached an agreement on the eastside trail. The
29 Fisher Flour Mill property on Harbor Island will be transferred to the Port of Seattle. The
30 property is being appraised and the Solid Waste Division will be reimbursed for the
31 current market value of the property from the current expense fund.

33 There will be a Cedar Hills Citizens Review Committee meeting in December. The
34 division will discuss the update of the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan (Site Plan).

35

36 In response to questions, Severn said the site development plan is a separate document
37 from the Comp Plan and is on schedule to be updated after the Comp Plan is completed.
38 The requirement for the 1,000 foot buffer is in the current Site Plan. Changes to the
39 buffer could only occur if a reduced buffer was approved as part of the updated Site Plan.

40

41 Garber commented that the Site Plan needs to be updated in order to extend the capacity
42 of the Cedar Hills Landfill. Severn noted that more detailed information on the capacity
43 of the Cedar Hills Landfill is scheduled for Comp Plan discussions in the spring.

44

45 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza said that he recently toured the Landfill and noticed an
46 abundance of wildlife. He said that environmentalists will be watching for any changes
47 to the Site Plan.

48

49 Severn said that the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station will be reopening in mid
50 February, although the division does not have a specific date yet. There will be an
51 opening ceremony when it is ready and MSWMAC will be invited.

52

53 SWAC:

54 Yates reported that the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) discussed their
55 comments on the Conversion Technologies Report. The committee is working on a letter
56 to send to council.

57

58 ITSG:

59 Van Orsow said that the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) meeting in
60 October was attended by Auburn, Bellevue, Kirkland, Federal Way, and Redmond. A
61 matrix was presented showing the different recycling service levels in each city. This
62 matrix provides a baseline for recycling services throughout King County, and statistics
63 that may be used for comparison. This information will be very useful for cities to use as
64 ideas when they make changes in their contracts.

65

66 Recycling Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford gave a report on the Product
67 Stewardship tour to Canada.

68

69 Severn gave a presentation on the Self-Haul Level of Service: Part II, which will be
70 presented today. One of the highlights of that presentation is to consider how transfer
71 stations might recover the 60 percent of recyclable items that are in the waste stream.

72

73 Schedule:

74 Yates said that there are no changes to the master schedule. Pelozza commented that it is
75 an excellent schedule.

76

77 Garber suggested that the December 14th meeting of MSWMAC be a joint meeting with
78 SWAC since both committees will have the same presentations on their agendas. This
79 would also provide an opportunity to meet SWAC members.

80

81 Greenway said she thought this was a great idea.

82

83 ***Members agreed by consensus to the joint meeting.***

84

85 Yates said that she will present the idea to SWAC next week and let MSWMAC know
86 the outcome. Garber suggested that MSWMAC could extend their meeting until 3:00
87 p.m. if the committee has business it would like to conduct after SWAC leaves.

88

89 Garber noted that SWAC has been receiving updates on MSWMAC meetings. She said
90 that while SWAC is a public meeting MSWMAC is not. She asked if MSWMAC
91 members had any concerns with SWAC having these updates. Garber said she felt that as
92 long as business discussed in caucus is not disclosed to SWAC, she is okay with the
93 updates.

94

95 ***MSWMAC agreed by consensus for SWAC to continue receiving MSWMAC updates.***

96

97 **2008 Budget Preview**

98 Finance and Administration Manager Ann Berrysmith reviewed the division's 2008
99 budget. Revenues from disposal fees appear to increase sharply in 2008, primarily
100 because of the rate increase. Revenues from the landfill gas to energy contract are
101 expected to begin by the end of 2008. In 2009 and 2010, the division expects to receive a
102 little more than one million dollars in revenue from this project.

103

104 Pelozza said he thought the recycling revenue would be higher. Gaisford said that the
105 revenues are from recyclables collected at the transfer stations and a fee charged to
106 garbage customers in unincorporated King County. Pelozza asked for the current
107 recycling rate. Gaisford answered that it is 45 percent.

108

109 In response to a comment, Severn said that recycling at the transfer stations does not
110 generate net revenue.

111

112 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said that recycling revenue helps offset the cost of
113 collection services. MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris stated that without recycling,
114 collection rates would be higher.

115

116 Berrysmith said that in 2008, the debt service amount is essentially the same as 2007.
117 Interest on borrowing in 2007 will not be paid until 2008.

118

119 The per ton contribution to the Landfill Reserve Fund has increased slightly from \$5.76
120 to \$5.94 per ton. This is based on the current projected Cedar Hills Landfill closure date
121 of 2016. Fife-Ferris asked what this fund is used for. Berrysmith answered that the fund
122 pays for projects at the Cedar Hills Landfill. After the Landfill closes, the remaining
123 funds will be transferred to the Post Closure Maintenance Fund.

124

125 Berrysmith said that the expenditure line labeled "Non Programmatic Administration" is
126 a catch-all for many services that are provided centrally by the county, such as the phone
127 and email systems.

128

129 In the budget request, the division is asking for three new engineers. Two engineers will
130 work on implementing the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, and the
131 third engineer will work on the Capital Asset Maintenance Program.

132

133 The division is also requesting two transfer station operator positions for the new
134 Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station.

135

136 The division has also requested four truck driver positions.

137

138 Van Orsow asked if fuel was budgeted into the transportation cost. Berrysmith said that
139 it is allocated across the business units that use fuel.

140

141 Berrysmith said that in 2008 the division will be changing the way garbage is ‘tipped’ at
142 the Landfill. The division will be phasing in tippers and phasing out walking floor
143 trailers. There are four utility workers that are needed to operate the tippers. However
144 the use of the tippers will reduce the amount of rock needed at the Landfill, which will
145 offset the cost of the utility workers.

146

147 Pelozo asked why legal support fees decreased in 2008. Berrysmith answered that the
148 Prosecuting Attorney’s Office uses a model based on actual expenditures to create budget
149 numbers for the agencies it serves. This model creates an 18 month delay in budgets.

150

151 MSWMAC member Mark Relph commented that “Overhead Allocation” and “Non
152 Programmatic Administration” comprise ten percent of the total budget. He remarked
153 that is rather high for a utility. Berrysmith said it is high, and she could provide more
154 detail at a later time if members are interested. Garber said she would like to see this
155 information.

156

157 Greenway asked if the capital budget is separate from the information that was presented
158 to MSWMAC today. Berrysmith said yes, and noted that the capital budget is less
159 straightforward due to year-to-year carryovers. Greenway said that she would be
160 interested in seeing the capital budget.

161

162 Berrysmith agreed to bring additional information to MSWMAC's December meeting.

163

164 She said copies of the 2008 Budget Request are available upon request. Members can let
165 staff know if they're interested in a copy.

166

167 **British Columbia Product Stewardship Tour Report**

168 Gaisford reported that on October 2nd the Northwest Product Stewardship Council
169 sponsored a tour to British Columbia, Canada to see their product stewardship programs.
170 Seventy people attended the tour, including some SWAC and MSWMAC members,
171 elected officials, recycling staff, and representatives from the Washington State
172 Department of Ecology.

173

174 Presentations were given by provincial and local government staff, as well as product
175 stewardship organizations such as Product Care.

176

177 The tour included a beverage depot, a take back center that is operated by the Save-On
178 grocery chain, and a paint bulking facility that also accepts other household hazardous
179 waste (HHW) products.

180

181 The paint facility was similar in design to the Factoria Transfer Station's HHW area, but
182 larger and privately funded. The beverage container depot accepts a large range of
183 beverage containers. Consumers pay a deposit on the containers, depending on the
184 container type. Some beer bottles are washed and refilled instead of being recycled.

185

186 The Save-On grocery chain take back center is called "Changes." The take back center,
187 which is located at the front of the store, has become a profit center for the store. The
188 store offers store credit to customers who then use it in the stores.

189

190 Fife-Ferris said that manufacturers also provide coupons if you bring back packaging.

191 The facility is very clean.

192

193 Knight commented that it is an incredible system. The manager of the Changes center
194 was an enthusiastic advocate of the program, even though he did not consider himself an
195 environmentalist.

196

197 Fife-Ferris stated that from the store's point of view it makes good corporate sense to
198 offer this service. They create a market share and separate themselves from other
199 retailers with this program. Gaisford added that they also take back milk containers,
200 which are not a part of the legislation, hence offering one of the few places to dispose of
201 these types of containers.

202

203 Gaisford said that the legislation is set up differently from U.S. legislation, in that it is
204 framework legislation. Representatives from the province identify products and a third
205 party organization works with the manufacturers set up the take back programs, often
206 working with third party organizations to run the programs. The government approves
207 the final program. Using this approach, two new products are added every three years.

208

209 Gaisford said that Washington State Senator Adam Kline commented during the tour that
210 Washington needs similar framework legislation. He said he would discuss the idea with
211 colleagues and staff. California is looking at similar framework legislation.

212

213 In Metro Vancouver the cost savings from the product stewardship programs are in the
214 millions of dollars. The costs of the programs are covered by the product manufacturers.
215 Product stewardship programs account for 15-17 percent of total recycling tonnage.
216 Because the program is funded by the private sector, the province is saving
217 approximately \$60 million annually.

218

219 Garber asked if the cost of these programs translates into higher prices for products.
220 Gaisford said that the province does not dictate price. In some cases an "eco-fee" is
221 charged. However, there are no fees charged for pharmaceutical product stewardship
222 programs. Gaisford said that the fee may be invisible or visible to the consumer.

223

224 Greenway asked what happens to the materials that are taken back at these facilities.
225 Gaisford said that they go to a materials recovery facility (MRF) similar to the ones that
226 accept curbside recyclables in Washington State.

227

228 Fife-Ferris wondered how applicable this program is to our region. She said that an
229 umbrella organization was created with cooperation from the private sector to get the
230 hard-to-recycle items out of the waste stream. If a ban on certain materials in curbside
231 recycling programs were instituted in Washington State, residents would be resistant to
232 the idea. Fife-Ferris said that it would be nice to see a statewide model for the hard-to-
233 recycle items using product stewardship programs. The disposal fee should be on the
234 products, not on the municipalities.

235

236 Gaisford said that some products are better candidates for product stewardship than
237 others, for example, fluorescent light bulbs, paint, and pharmaceuticals. He said these
238 products would be good pilot projects.

239

240 More information on the Product Stewardship Tour can be found at:

241 <http://www.productstewardship.net/BCTourPresentations.html>

242

243 **Transfer System: Self-Haul Level of Service: Part II**

244 Severn presented data on the Self-Haul Level of Service. This can be viewed at:

245 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/MSWMACSelfHaulLOS211092007.ppt>

246 (Note: please click “save-as” and save the file to your computer to view accompanying
247 presentation notes)

248

249 Pelozza said that while he was touring the Cedar Hills Landfill he saw a large quantity of
250 mattresses being disposed of at the Landfill. He asked if there is a way to recycle these
251 products. Severn answered that there are mattress recycling options in other parts of the
252 United States, but there is not currently a processor in this area. In the San Francisco
253 area, St Vincent de Paul is recycling mattresses. Gaisford said there is also a recycling
254 facility in Oregon that can take mattresses, but it is a small one. Pelozza suggested that the
255 division have a scrapper come in and breakdown the mattresses. Pelozza said that when

256 you compress a mattress it will just rise again, and it is not decomposing properly in the
257 Landfill. Severn said that mattresses do require special handling, so on November 15 the
258 division will begin charging the special waste fee for mattresses brought to Cedar Hills.

259

260 Pelozza also said that while touring the Landfill, he noticed a large truck from Boeing
261 dumping cardboard and paper into the landfill. Pelozza asked if the division contacts the
262 larger companies and encourages them to recycle these items. Gaisford said that
263 currently the division does not. Gaisford said there will be a presentation on business
264 recycling at next month's meeting.

265

266 Severn said that the Landfill does get some confidential documents that people want to
267 see buried. It is unclear why shredding these documents is not sufficient, but some
268 companies like to see the documents buried.

269

270 Garber said that the City of Newcastle is improving Coal Creek Parkway. This is
271 resulting in the demolition of some homes. A vendor has a new German machine that
272 recycles 95 percent of the demolition waste. It is very fast and efficient. It is smaller in
273 scale to the machine at the Waste Management facility in Woodinville, and more suitable
274 for demolition debris. The vendor has recycling contacts for all of the materials that are
275 produced from the process. The vendor stated that he could greatly reduce the amount of
276 tonnage that goes into the Cedar Hills Landfill. MSWMAC member Joan McGilton
277 asked if Garber could provide the name and contact info of the vendor. Garber said that
278 she hopes to schedule him to come and speak to MSWMAC.

279

280 Gaisford ask if the recycling was done on site. Garber said yes. The machine has a
281 Mercedes Benz engine in it with much greater fuel efficiency than similar machines.
282 Garber said that the machine is so quiet that you can carry on a conversation while
283 standing near it.

284

285 Greenway asked if the division is recommending a fee for any recyclable item that is
286 brought to the transfer stations. Severn answered yes, the recommendation is some fee to
287 reflect cost.

288

289 In response to the division's recommendation to charge a fee for recycling, Knight said
290 that a big education campaign is going to be needed to implement this recommendation.
291 The general public has the idea that not only is recycling free, but that cities make a profit
292 from the recyclable items. Knight said that with curbside service the customers are not
293 always charged for the recycling bins. The message has been that if you pay for garbage,
294 you get free recycling.

295

296 Gaisford said that the division's website encourages customers to reduce their garbage by
297 recycling and therefore offset the new rate increase. Pelosa asked how this would be
298 presented to the general public. Greenway said that the message needs to be, 'all disposal
299 costs something, but recycling costs less than landfilling'. Greenway said that the cities
300 need to be consistent and clear with their educational messaging.

301

302 Iriarte suggested that King County produce a video with this message; it could be shown
303 on public broadcast channels. Fife-Ferris said that the county does have a video that
304 illustrates the recycling process, but it might not be specifically geared towards the
305 message that recycling is not free. Fife-Ferris noted that the video is posted on the
306 Division's webpage. Pelosa pointed out that there are still members of the public who do
307 not have cable television and the message would have to be a broad, multi-media
308 approach.

309

310 Pelosa suggested that this might be handled through the Suburban Cities Association
311 (SCA). Knight asked how viable it was to use SCA as a venue to express this message.
312 Cities programs are similar, but there are variations. It might take the will of an elected
313 body to be the pioneers in order to launch a new program. Garber said that this issue
314 should be brought to SCA's attention. This is something that needs to be coordinated
315 with the Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Pelosa said that PIC is very effective, and
316 this subject would be a good one for them to handle. Garber said that she gives
317 MSWMAC updates to the SCA, but SWAC has appointees from SCA on their
318 committee. This issue might be more appropriate coming from them.

319

320 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked how the City of Seattle operates its mandatory
321 recycling programs. Severn said that they have a ban on putting recyclables in the
322 garbage. Fife-Ferris said that Seattle has ‘garbage police’ who look through cans. Seattle
323 also puts the burden of enforcement on the haulers. Fife-Ferris said that the City of
324 Bellevue does not have the staff to do enforcement; however they would not mind seeing
325 a ban in place. Severn noted that the City of Seattle has had solid waste inspectors for a
326 long time.

327

328 Severn said that if anyone had any additional comments or questions they could email her
329 at Thea.Severn@kingcounty.gov or call, at (206) 296-4498.

330

331 **2008 MSWMAC/ITSG Work Plan Preliminary Discussion**

332 Garber said that she had some very preliminary thoughts on the ITSG work plan and that
333 nothing has been developed as yet. Garber said that MSWMAC should think over a few
334 ideas and discuss possible items at the December or January meetings. Garber said to
335 bear in mind that depending on the outcome of the election, some of the elected officials
336 currently on MSWMAC might not remain on the committee in the upcoming year.

337

338 Garber said some questions MSWMAC should consider for a discussion of ITSG’s
339 workplan include what ITSG’s relationship should be with MSWMAC for the Comp Plan
340 process. Should ITSG always see Comp Plan presentations first or should they be
341 viewed for the first time at MSWMAC?

342

343 Garber stated that she would ask MSWMAC to refamiliarize themselves with the
344 Governance Report and be prepared to discuss this issue at a future meeting. That report
345 can be viewed at:

346 <http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/planning/documents/GovernanceReport.pdf>

347

348 Other issues to review in regards to the Governance Report are:

- 349 ▪ A possible extended term for the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) and broader
350 reopener clause,
- 351 ▪ Host city mitigation,

- 352 ▪ Dispute resolution, and
353 ▪ How to involve other cities through PIC.

354

355 McGilton said that this agenda item will generate a lot of discussion and there might not
356 be time with the current agenda for such a large topic. Garber said at the next meeting
357 MSWMAC can discuss the ITSG work plan, and the Governance Report discussion can
358 be held at a later time. Garber noted that governance has to be coordinated with PIC and
359 that there cannot be much delay with this topic. Garber said at the January 11th
360 MSWMAC meeting, the meeting is scheduled to last until 3:00 p.m. if necessary. Garber
361 suggested that after the regular Comp Plan items are discussed MSWMAC discuss
362 governance. Garber asked that for the January 11th meeting, MSWMAC members arrive
363 at 11:30 a.m.

364

365 **Adjourn**

366 The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

367

368 Submitted by:

369 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff