

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 11, 2008

11:45 – 2:30 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
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Doug Jacobson	City of Bothell	Public Works Director
Sabrina Combs	City of Bothell	Special Projects Administrator
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
David Baker	City of Kenmore	Deputy Mayor
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Staff
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Chief Policy Advisor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Chris Eggen	City of Shoreline	Councilmember
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Josh Marx, SWD Staff

Bill Reed, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Interim Lead Planner

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

Beth Mountsier, KCC Staff

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. Everyone
3 present introduced themselves.

4
5 Garber introduced new MSWMAC members Chris Eggen from the City of Shoreline,
6 and Sabrina Combs from the City of Bothell.

7
8 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway congratulated MSWMAC member Joan McGilton
9 on her successful reelection as the Mayor of Burien.

10
11 **Approve November and December Meeting Minutes**

12 **Greenway moved to approve the November minutes.**

13 MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris amended Lines 230-231 on Page 9 to read, “If a
14 ban on certain materials in the curbside recycling program were instituted in Washington
15 State, residents would be resistant to the idea.”

16 *November minutes were approved as amended.*

17
18 **MSWMAC member David Baker moved to approve the December minutes.**

19 *December minutes were approved.*

20
21 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/ITSG/Master Schedule:**

22 **SWD:**

23 Interim Lead Planner Thea Severn said that the King County Council has approved the
24 ‘Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan’, with an amendment to change the
25 title to ‘Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.’ In order to minimize
26 confusion with the title change, the division has provided labels for MSWMAC members
27 to adhere to their current copy of the plan. Extra labels are available to those who need
28 them.

29
30 The division is in its second week of the implementation of the new rate increase. There
31 have been no complaints received by the division as yet.

33 MSWMAC member Linda Knight asked if there has been an increase in the amount of
34 litter since the new rates went into effect. Severn said that she will monitor this in the
35 first quarter.

36

37 The Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station is tentatively scheduled to reopen to the
38 public on February 16th. The grand opening ceremony is scheduled for February 13th.
39 A tour will be conducted at 10:00 a.m. and will include information on new services,
40 green building features which earned the building a Leadership in Energy and
41 Environmental Design (LEED) gold rating, and the Thornton Creek restoration project.
42 Invitations to MSWMAC members will be transmitted shortly. The division has
43 proposed new hours of operation, weekdays 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The proposal is
44 currently in the public comment period. MSWMAC member Mark Relph stated that the
45 City of Shoreline's staff have been in communication with the division on this.

46

47 Severn said that there have been changes in the Solid Waste Comprehensive Management
48 Plan (Comp Plan) schedule. A new year has been added, and items that were in the long
49 term category have moved up into short term. MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked
50 what the arrows indicated. Severn replied that they indicate work that will be ongoing
51 through out the time period. Pelozza asked that changes made to the timeline somehow
52 displayed more prominently.

53

54 Severn directed the committee's attention to the budget proviso handout that was
55 provided. Garber asked King County Council staff Beth Mountsier to clarify the contents
56 of the proviso. Mountsier said that during the budget process she was not involved with
57 the Solid Waste Division's budget, but she will learn more about the proviso at a meeting
58 between King County Council and Executive staff next week, and will follow up with
59 Chair Garber.

60

61 SWAC:

62 Garber said that there will not be a Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) update
63 this month since SWAC last met jointly with MSWMAC.

64

65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

ITSG:

MSWMAC and ITSG member Rob Van Orsow stated that the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) met on January 03rd and received the same presentation from the division that will be shown to MSWMAC today.

WPR: Goals Development I: Presentation and Discussion

Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented Waste Prevention and Recycling (WPR) Goals Development Part I. It can be viewed at:

<http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/GoalsMSWMAC01112008.ppt>

Gaisford said that the accompanying handout is a companion piece to the presentation that summarizes earlier discussions and presentations.

Fife-Ferris asked how the division gets its data for the nonresidential recycling rate.

Gaisford replied that the division receives an annual report from the Department of Ecology (Ecology) that provides total recycling tonnages. The division subtracts the hauler-provided single and multifamily recycling data. What remains is commercial recycling tonnage. The data from Ecology has improved, but they are not required to separate their data by waste generator.

MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini asked whether other jurisdictions which have higher recycling goals are meeting them. Gaisford replied that it depends on what you count in your recycling rate. For example, biosolids and construction recycling are often included in other jurisdictions' recycling rates.

Armanini commented that there are two issues at hand. One is that a goal can say anything and another is that it is very difficult to make straight comparisons between recycling rates. Gaisford agreed, saying that regardless of how goals are stated or rates measured, most jurisdictions are taking similar steps to improve their recycling programs.

Greenway said that King County can accurately measure its reduction of the waste stream by measuring how much waste goes to Cedar Hills Landfill. Gaisford said that is why we

97 have the goal that we do, and it leads to the question of having a goal for reduction of the
98 recycling stream too.

99

100 Pelozo asked for a definition of the term diversion. Gaisford replied that each jurisdiction
101 has its own definition.

102

103 Garber asked if it is possible for a national organization to standardize the definitions of
104 terms. Gaisford replied that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has a list of
105 definitions, but those definitions do not quite match up with local conditions. Division
106 staff member Bill Reed added that the division has been using Ecology's definitions.

107

108 MSWMAC member Joan McGilton asked about the timeframe for the goals discussion.
109 Gaisford said that the intent today is to introduce ideas, and next month the division will
110 present potential goals. In March and April, MSWMAC will see program packages that
111 match up with different goals.

112

113 Pelozo said that with the Cedar Hills Landfill expected to close in 2021, the division's
114 priority should be on extending the life of the landfill. Severn said the division is
115 scheduled to revise the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan this year. That plan will give
116 a better sense of which of the ideas for extending the life of Cedar Hills in the Solid
117 Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan the division should pursue. The final
118 closure date of the landfill will be determined by those actions. Severn added that waste
119 export is more expensive than disposal at Cedar Hills; the specific price that will be
120 charged at the time of the landfill's closure cannot be predicted at this time.

121

122 Armanini said that the private sector tries to reduce excess in order to maximize profit.
123 The public sector has different motivations, but could use that notion to promote waste
124 reduction and recycling through its rates.

125

126 In response to a question, Gaisford said that construction and demolition (C&D) waste is
127 treated separately in the Comp Plan, but does not have a goal. Gaisford said that ITSG

128 also raised the question of commodity based goals, for example, a goal to recycle 80
129 percent of paper.

130

131 MSWMAC member Linda Knight asked if the division has considered setting goals and
132 tracking municipal solid waste (MSW) and C&D separately. Gaisford replied that is an
133 option.

134

135 Armanini said that looking at recycling rates by generator is valuable in showing where
136 to focus future efforts. She added that tracking recycling rates is as important as setting
137 goals, as it helps to show some of the reality of the difficulties that are faced in getting
138 generators to recycle. Armanini noted that multifamily generators dispose of less waste
139 than self-haulers. She asked if there should be a goal for self-haulers. Gaisford said that
140 there has not been a self-haul recycling goal in the past.

141

142 Greenway commented that a significant waste prevention issue for our society is plastic
143 bags. She suggested that MSWMAC discuss options, such as a ban or fees, to minimize
144 the use of plastic bags.

145

146 Fife-Ferris said that legislation of this type are only effective at the state level. She
147 suggested that MSWMAC members talk to their state legislators.

148

149 Greenway proposed that MSWMAC gather and report information about what has been
150 done in other jurisdictions to take back to our cities to start the process of lobbying at the
151 state level.

152

153 Garber said MSWMAC members will receive an electronic copy of today's presentation.
154 She asked members to direct any ideas on the topic to Gaisford at
155 jeff.gaisford@kingcounty.gov before the next meeting.

156

157 **2008 MSWMAC/ITSG Workplan: Discussion**

158 Garber said that MSWMAC's duty is to set ITSG's workplan for the year. She suggested
159 basing the workplan on the Solid Waste Division Timeline schedule. Garber asked for
160 additions to the workplan.

161

162 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin suggested adding governance issues to the workplan.
163 Garber agreed that governance issues certainly should be part of MSWMAC's work, but
164 suggested that the discussion of the next agenda item may result in MSWMAC setting up
165 a subcommittee so that ITSG can focus on the Comp Plan process.

166

167 Garber said that she hoped that briefings with approval by motion to affirm direction
168 would be accepted rather than milestone reports.

169

170 Mountsier said that there are multiple ways for council to give feedback and direction.
171 She said that when council gives feedback on the Governance Report, it may include
172 their instructions for briefings or reports.

173

174 Armanini said that incredible resources were expended in the production of formal
175 milestone reports. The Comp Plan has to be approved by council, therefore briefings are
176 more efficient.

177

178 Rivkin said that councilmembers do not always attend briefings. Rivkin stated that
179 formal milestone reports may not be required. Regional Policy Committee (RPC) needs
180 to discuss some Comp Plan issues, and those issues need to be identified in order to
181 provide focus.

182

183 Mountsier said that in addition to RPC, a new standing committee called the Parks and
184 Utilities, chaired by councilmember Jane Hague, will be dealing with solid waste issues.
185 In the past, the planning process has been slowed by dual referrals. She is concerned
186 about producing an end product without agreement on policy decisions made early in the
187 process. A mechanism is needed to ensure that everyone is informed along the way.

188

189 Garber said that she hopes, as probably everyone does, that the solution does not require
190 schedule delays.

191

192 Rivkin said she does not envision piece meal approval of formal milestone reports rather
193 opportunities for engagement and discussion. Garber said that milestone reports take a
194 long time to get approval and council needs to understand MSWMAC needs to move
195 forward consistently. Briefings are efficient because they are already being prepared for
196 MSWMAC.

197

198 Rivkin said MSWMAC needs to focus on key issues in order to maximize early input
199 from council on the drivers of the process.

200

201 Mountsier said that the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) has identified solid waste as a
202 top priority for 2008.

203

204 Rivkin said that MSWMAC members and not just division staff should be involved in
205 briefings to council. Garber said that MSWMAC will develop a list of key issues and
206 discuss who should participate in each briefing, at the next meeting.

207

208 Greenway asked when host city mitigation will be discussed. Garber said that falls under
209 interlocal agreement (ILA) issues which should be discussed in caucus because it could
210 lead to contract negotiations. Hlavka suggested that ILA issues be scheduled for
211 discussion before 2:00 p.m. when many cities have to leave the meeting.

212

213 Armanini said that the Solid Waste Division's Timeline schedule does not address the
214 relationship between ITSG and MSWMAC or how ITSG should report to MSWMAC.

215 Armanini added that repeating presentations to both committees duplicate staff effort and
216 is a waste of resources. Garber suggested that division staff give joint briefings to ITSG
217 and MSWMAC until draft sections of the Comp Plan are available for review.

218

219 Rivkin said that ITSG can provide its recommendations on reports in strike-out format,
220 which is not possible with briefings. Rivkin said that MSWMAC should review the
221 schedule to determine when it is worthwhile for topics go to ITSG before MSWMAC.

222

223 Fife-Ferris said that she is uncomfortable with joint meetings. She agrees that there is
224 redundancy but without analysis and vetting there is no need to have ITSG present unless
225 they maintain a forum to discuss issues. Garber replied that ITSG needs to attend
226 presentations so they will have the education and background to provide input when draft
227 sections are ready.

228

229 Rivkin said that city staff, like recycling coordinators, with substantive knowledge should
230 not be left out of the process. Rivkin added that the division needs to think about how to
231 get people up to speed more quickly, rather than giving six months of detailed briefings
232 before identifying policy questions.

233

234 Knight said MSWMAC needs the technical education to understand the solid waste
235 system before policy questions can be answered.

236

237 Armanini said that Gaisford's presentations are walking MSWMAC down a narrowing
238 path that leads to the policy questions.

239

240 Intergovernmental Staff Liaison Diane Yates said that there is no one way to get through
241 the process, and the division will present information any way that MSWMAC wants.

242

243 Greenway said one way to make meetings more effective is to lead each new topic with a
244 purpose statement and identify what action, if any, is required of MSWMAC.

245

246 Knight said that MSWMAC's agendas and the planning schedule do that.

247

248 Garber said that the question of whether ITSG and MSWMAC get separate briefings will
249 not be answered in the time available today. She said that she would talk with Yates
250 before the next meeting to identify issues that require input from ITSG.

251

252 Yates said the question is one that the whole group should discuss.

253

254 Fife-Ferris asked who attends ITSG meetings. She advised those around the table to send
255 representatives to ITSG to make it a real working group. Fife-Ferris said the burden is on
256 cities to attend.

257

258 Yates said she announces ITSG meetings at the quarterly recycling coordinators'
259 meetings and regularly calls individual cities to ask them to attend.

260

261 Rivkin added that ITSG is not well attended, which is reflected in the minutes. Knight
262 agreed, adding that most of the members who attend ITSG also attend MSWMAC. She
263 said she is concerned about the amount of time that dual attendance requires.

264

265 Armanini said that MSWMAC members should receive the ITSG minutes. She said that
266 inevitably larger cities with more staff are going to be the ones that attend ITSG. She
267 added that the ILA process is going to generate even more meetings, so this is a great
268 time to look at the roles the committees play. She said MSWMAC should not forget the
269 Solid Waste Advisor Committee (SWAC) which includes haulers and recycling
270 companies and has a lot of expertise. Periodic joint meetings of SWAC and MSWMAC
271 would be valuable.

272

273 Mountsier suggested that MSMWAC should utilize ITSG in the same manner that
274 council utilizes council staff.

275

276 Relph asked who chairs ITSG. Fife-Ferris answered that there is no chair. ITSG is a
277 working group facilitated by the division.

278

279

280 **ILA: Discussion**

281 Division staff was excused while cities caucused on the interlocal agreement strategies.

282 There were two outcomes reported from this discussion. MSWMAC would like to form

283 a subcommittee to work further on governance issues. MSWMAC wants to hear RPC's
284 intentions or direction regarding the Governance Report.

285

286 **Adjourn**

287 The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

288

289 Submitted by:

290 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff