

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 13, 2009
11:15 – 2:00 p.m.
King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center
Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Joan Clark	City of Auburn	Recycling Coordinator
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
Dini Duclos	City of Federal Way	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
John MacGillivray	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Glenn Boettcher	City of Mercer Island	Maintenance Director
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Peter Landry	City of Normandy Park	Public Works Director
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Chief Policy Advisor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Tom Gut	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Chris Eggen	City of Shoreline	Councilmember
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Matt Larson	City of Snoqualmie	Mayor
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Assistant Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff
 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
 Kevin Kiernan, Division Director
 Josh Marx, SWD Staff
 Bill Reed, SWD Staff
 Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager
 Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison

Cities

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association
 Ken Miller, City of Federal Way

Visitors

Robert Kommer, Summit Biofuels

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber of Newcastle called the meeting to order at 11:20 a.m.

3
4 Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

5
6 **Approval of December Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

7 **Mark Relph of the City of Shoreline moved to approve the January minutes.**

8
9 *The January minutes were approved by consensus.*

10
11 **Updates: SWD**

12 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan suggested that the date of the April
13 MSWMAC meeting be changed to April 24th. This allows sufficient time between the
14 March and April meetings for the division to prepare comp plan chapters for review.

15 **Relph moved that the date of the April MSWMAC meeting be changed from April**
16 **3rd to April 24th.**

17
18 *The motion passed by consensus.*

19
20 Kiernan suggested that MSWMAC consider cancelling the May and June meetings.
21 MSWMAC will have reviewed all chapters of the comp plan by that time and the
22 division will use that time to finish the document. With the completion of the comp plan
23 it may also be reasonable for MSWMAC to review their workplan for the coming year.

24 **Frank Iriarte of the City of Tukwila moved to cancel the May and June meetings.**

25
26 *The motion passed by consensus.*

27
28 **Updates: SWD**

29 Kiernan stated that though the exact figures are not yet available, the division waived in
30 excess of \$100,000 in disposal fees in response to the flood. The division also issued
31 over 700 vouchers to citizens for free disposal, 200 of which have been redeemed for an

32 average cost of \$50 per waiver. There were about \$70,000 of direct costs from contracts
33 and overtime for flood response.

34

35 In response to a question, Kiernan noted that though FEMA may reimburse the county
36 for a portion of the direct costs, it does not reimburse the County for disposal fees.
37 Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn said that is something to consider
38 in the debris management plan. FEMA may reimburse disposal fees when they are
39 claimed by cities but not when they are claimed by the county.

40

41 Kiernan shared photographs of Solid Waste Division equipment being towed up the hill
42 to the Landfill during the snow event.

43

44 Kiernan said that MSWMAC had previously requested information about mitigation
45 costs. He noted that some of the mitigation includes two employees providing litter
46 control around transfer stations at an approximate annual cost of \$120,000, pressure
47 washing sites for odor control at an annual cost of approximately \$75,000, and additional
48 landscaping maintenance at Houghton and Algona. Mitigation associated with the capital
49 costs for the ramps to I-5 at Shoreline are still being researched.

50

51 At Cedar Hills an employee monitors for odor in the area around the landfill each
52 weekday morning, there is litter control on the access roads to the site, and the division
53 maintains a call tracking data base that captures information about neighborhood
54 concerns. The Community Litter Clean-up Program also mitigates the effects of improper
55 disposal. It deals with covers junk vehicles, illegal dumping and clean-up on public lands
56 such as the area around the landfill. Kiernan hopes to have more information about
57 mitigation costs at the next meeting.

58

59 Kiernan said recycling at Bow Lake will be discontinued beginning March 16th to
60 facilitate construction at the site. The division is distributing a flyer identifying
61 alternative recycling services in the area. Phase I of the construction project is scheduled
62 to begin in the next couple of months.

63

64 Kiernan said the division plans to continue full service to commercial customers
65 throughout construction at Bow Lake. Self haul service may be impacted during the day
66 though it will be available evenings and weekends. It is the division's goal to provide 30
67 days notice about changes in service. SWD is exploring options that would limit the
68 impact of construction to self haul service.

69
70 Kiernan said that tonnage has not returned to pre-2008 levels. This lower tonnage has a
71 direct impact on the budget. The impacts were absorbed in 2008 by controlling expenses
72 and significantly decreasing the number of hours worked by regular part time (RPT)
73 employees in Operations. Those practices will be continued through 2009 and are being
74 considered in preparing the 2010 budget.

75
76 Kiernan noted that the Illegal Dumping Fee Waiver Ordinance has been approved by the
77 council. In response to a question he noted that the ordinance will be implemented
78 through a voucher program that is separate from the flood voucher program. He said to
79 contact SWD Staff Dinah Day at 206-296-0484 for more information on Illegal Dumping
80 Fee Waivers. There is a limited budget for the fee waivers.

81
82 Kiernan said that the division expects to receive its first payment for landfill gas soon.
83 Though the check will be small, it is a significant milestone in the effort to convert
84 landfill gas to energy. Ingenco plans to begin commercial operations in April which will
85 result in approximately \$1,000,000 annual income to the division. MSWMAC members
86 will be invited to the official ribbon cutting ceremony for the plant.

87
88 Kiernan noted that the division expects to receive the draft Ernst and Young audit report
89 in April.

90
91 Kiernan said that the division has identified a list of projects for potential funding from
92 the federal stimulus package. Though the energy section of the package specifically
93 mentions recycling there is no certainty that any funding will be received.

94

95 **Updates: SWAC**

96 The January SWAC minutes are available on the SWAC webpage at the link below:
97 <http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/swac.asp>

98

99 **Updates: Master Schedule**

100 SWD is also beginning the procurement process for consulting services to site the new
101 NE Lake Washington and South County stations. Work on the Cedar Hills Site
102 Development Plan is proceeding. The scoping meeting for the Environmental Impact
103 Statement (EIS) for that plan is planned for April. In addition, work on a rate study is
104 expected to begin later this year.

105

106 Joan McGilton of the City of Burien asked if the division had found construction costs to
107 be lower than expected as a result of the economic slow down. Kiernan responded that
108 three of the bids for Phase I construction at Bow Lake, essentially the earth moving part
109 of the project, were less than \$9,000,000 while the engineer's estimate completed before
110 the economic slowdown was \$14,000,000. In addition, more contractors attended the
111 pre-bid meeting for construction of the next disposal area at Cedar Hills than has been
112 seen for quite some time.

113

114 Matt Larson of the City of Snoqualmie asked if the 2016 closure date for Cedar Hills
115 listed on the master schedule is accurate. Kiernan responded that the date is tentative. The
116 decrease in tonnage along with settlement and operational changes at Cedar Hills, such as
117 the use of tippers and increased compaction, could result in up to two additional years of
118 life. In addition, the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan is looking at fairly simple
119 alternatives that could add another five to seven years to the life of the landfill assuming
120 they pass environmental review. Other more complicated alternatives could add even
121 more time.

122

123 Larson asked what would happen after Cedar Hills closes. Kiernan responded that
124 transfer system upgrades are needed regardless of which disposal alternative is chosen.
125 Severn noted that the comp plan does not include a disposal decision for after Cedar Hills
126 reaches capacity and closes. The technology continues to change and it is not necessary
127 to make a choice about post-Cedar Hills disposal within this planning period.

128

129 Garber asked if it is possible to amend the comp plan if contrary to expectations, a
130 disposal decision is needed during this planning period. Kiernan responded that the
131 amendment process is complex. An amendment is possible but it is unlikely to be
132 needed.

133

134 **Collection chapter discussion**

135 Jon Spangler of the City of Redmond asked how the division differentiated the content
136 between the chapters. Severn responded that the content of each of the chapters is closely
137 linked but that the WPR chapter has a broader focus than the Collection and Processing
138 chapter. Kiernan noted that the close relationship of the content of these chapters is why
139 it is important to review them together.

140

141 Nina Rivkin of the City of Redmond asked if the division knew the status of House Bill
142 1718 which is referenced in the sidebar of page 6. She suggested that if the bill is not
143 moving forward perhaps the content should be mentioned more broadly instead of being
144 connected to the bill. Yates said the bill died in committee. Severn responded that the
145 text will change to reflect that, but it will still be included and a note made that if the
146 state's Beyond Waste recommendations are implemented during the planning period,
147 they will be incorporated into the county's plan.

148

149 In response to a question about including glass with co-mingled recyclables, SWD Staff
150 Bill Reed said that materials recovery facilities (MRF) typically experience a
151 contamination rate of approximately 6% for co-mingled recyclables. Severn said that co-
152 mingled collection increases recycling participation.

153

154 Larson commented that it does not seem likely that King County would reach the 80%
155 recycling goal set by Washington State's Beyond Waste Implementation Work Group
156 through the measures listed in the WPR chapter. Severn commented that what is included
157 when measuring the 80% goal is not clear. If car bodies, concrete and other materials
158 that the county does not use in its calculation are included the goal may be more
159 attainable than it appears.

160

161 Larson asked if construction debris recycling is being incentivized in public works
162 projects. Kiernan responded that it has been addressed in policy and the topic will be
163 discussed in the Environmental Stewardship chapter. SWD Staff Josh Marx mentioned
164 that the Link Up program helps to develop markets for recyclable materials.

165

166 Rivkin asked why the 2nd recommendation under single-family collection services on
167 page 2 of the Collection chapter lists only cities in the responsibility column. Severn
168 responded that the recommendation was for the couple of remaining cities that do not
169 already offer curbside collection of food scraps and food-soiled paper. Linda Knight of
170 the City of Renton suggested that even after the task is completed, the recommendation
171 should remain, with the county and cities included in the responsibility column to
172 maintain focus on this recommendation.

173

174 Iriarte commented that including food scraps and food-soiled paper with yard waste
175 would require that yard waste be collected every other week all year long as opposed to
176 monthly in the winter. This could require changes in city collection contracts. Kiernan
177 suggested that garbage collection could occur every other week if food scraps are
178 collected with yard waste, mitigating the costs of more frequent yard waste collection in
179 the winter.

180

181 Spangler asked the meaning of the second recommendation on page 3. Severn responded
182 that multi-family recycling would increase if consistent curbside collection standards
183 were adopted throughout the county. Marx noted that adopting standards is only one of
184 the strategies to increase multi-family recycling listed on page 18-19. Severn told
185 members that the table in the final draft of the comp plan will include page numbers so
186 readers can read the background information for each recommendation.

187

188 Knight commented that financial incentives for multi-family garbage collection can
189 increase interest in recycling. Rivkin suggested adding a recommendation about financial
190 incentives stating that future growth in King County will be focused toward multi-family
191 development. Garber noted that financial incentives are listed in the 1st recommendation

192 on page 3. Susan Fife-Ferris of the City of Bellevue noted that though financial
193 incentives are important to building managers, residents do not experience rate changes
194 as a direct result of their behavior.

195

196 In response to a question, Fife-Ferris said that the City of Bellevue is in the process of
197 reviewing building codes for developers to ensure that handling garbage and recycling is
198 addressed as an essential service in building design.

199

200 Spangler asked if the disposal rate shown on the graphic on page 12 was per capita. Reed
201 responded that the information is gathered by commercial haulers and is reported per
202 household. Severn noted that progress toward per capita goals for garbage is determined
203 by dividing the residential tonnage collected by the number of people in the county's
204 system.

205

206 John MacGillivray of the City of Kirkland noted that while the challenges to
207 appropriately recycling shredded paper are discussed on page 10, a clear solution isn't
208 presented. He suggested including language encouraging residents to minimize
209 shredding. Fife-Ferris responded that other governmental entities encourage shredding as
210 a method of limiting identity theft. She suggested that identifying the need for a unified
211 approach to dealing with shredded paper is a more viable solution. Garber noted there is a
212 recommendation addressing this on page 2.

213

214 Spangler suggested that the sidebar on page 15 of the Collection chapter should be moved
215 to the WPR chapter. Garber suggested that a reference to the WPR chapter could replace
216 the sidebar.

217

218 Referring to the chart on page 16, MacGillivray said that less frequent collection of
219 recyclables may have the unintended consequence of decreasing recycling rates. If space
220 is not available in the container when needed, the materials may be disposed instead of
221 recycled. Knight responded that reducing the volume of containers may encourage people
222 to think about what they are consuming. Garber noted that there are divergent viewpoints
223 on this issue.

224

225 Severn noted that written comments on the chapter are valued. Comments should be sent
226 to Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates not later than Friday, April 3rd.

227

228 **WPR chapter discussion**

229 In response to a question, Severn said that the plan will include a list of common terms
230 including Zero Waste of Resources. Rivkin suggested that a definition of Zero Waste of
231 Resources be included on the first page of the chapter.

232

233 Rivkin suggested that the order in which the policies are presented be changed to match
234 the order of priority listed in WPR-1. She noted that though a significant effort was made
235 to highlight waste prevention, the verbiage in the chapter does not seem to reflect it as the
236 highest priority. She said it may be a result of the paucity of data on waste prevention.

237 She noted that it is difficult to measure and report actions that do not occur.

238

239 Fife-Ferris suggested that creating a stand alone section to address waste prevention may
240 help to highlight its importance. Chris Eggen of the City of Shoreline agreed and
241 suggested that a separate section would make waste prevention more visible to the public.

242 Knight noted that WPR goals are complicated and interconnected. Kiernan directed
243 attention to the waste prevention goals and discussion on pages 7 and 12.

244

245 Joan Clark of the City of Auburn suggested that the word aspirational, used in WPR-3, be
246 changed to a simpler word.

247

248 In response to a question, Garber noted that mandatory recycling is intentionally not
249 included as a policy as a result of previous MSWMAC discussions.

250

251 Rivkin suggested that the sentence structure in the third recommendation under data
252 reporting and tracking is hard to follow and could be simplified by using commas.

253

254 Spangler suggested that in most cases where the responsibility column of the
255 recommendations reads “county,” it should be changed to “county in cooperation with

256 cities” to highlight the tasks with which cities may be involved. Dini Duclos of the City
257 of Federal Way said that she preferred the way it is written currently. McGilton agreed.

258

259 In response to a comment, Severn said that the language of the 2nd recommendation under
260 management of construction and demolition debris is written to ensure that collaboration
261 with other regional governments regarding definitions is attempted though the division
262 will write definitions for county use if the attempt is unsuccessful. Garber suggested that
263 the meaning could be clarified if the recommendation was broken into two sentences.

264

265 In response to a question, Severn said that the date on the recycling goals listed on page 7
266 was changed to 2020 to match the date of the recycling goal. Spangler suggested that
267 getting to Zero Waste of Resources by 2030 would require different goals. Garber
268 responded that the mandates listed in the first version of the chapter were designed to
269 reach those goals but were removed in response to MSWMAC request. Garber suggested
270 that the plan reflect the intent to periodically re-evaluate goals.

271

272 Spangler said there was a typographical error on page 7 under per capita waste disposal
273 rates; the “15” should be changed to “20”. Spangler suggested that the waste disposal
274 goals be re-written to compare current conditions with the goal, removing mention of
275 2001 goals.

276

277 In response to a comment, Kiernan said he expects significant technological changes to
278 occur concerning beneficial use and energy production.

279

280 **Public Comment**

281 Robert Kommer of Summit Biofuels addressed the committee remarking that beneficial
282 use and energy production are not addressed sufficiently in the Collection or WPR
283 chapters. He said that the RW Beck Conversion Technology report incorrectly focused
284 only on technologies that had the proven ability to process 1,000,000 tons of waste each
285 year.

286

287 He said that anaerobic digestion at the transfer stations could increase the recycling level
288 to 80 percent by 2015. He said that transfer stations are not currently being designed to
289 harmonize with the goal of Zero Waste. The majority of funding in those stations is being
290 invested in compactors, which supports long-hauling waste.

291

292 He said that the transfer stations should be material recovery facilities, which could be
293 built in 18 months. These facilities are currently being built, though not in the United
294 States. Full recovery facilities allow the garbage to create energy and the county to
295 maintain ownership of the materials. Currently, disposing of garbage is an income. When
296 the landfill closes it will be an expense.

297

298 Kiernan noted that the group reviewed only two the chapters in the comp plan at this
299 meeting. Garber said that the group recognizes that there are several technologies to
300 consider in the future. Kommer responded that the federal government is currently
301 providing money for renewable energy. Kommer said that the economies are better at the
302 transfer station level.

303

304 **Adjourn**

305 The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m. MSWMAC reconvened in caucus until 1:55 p.m.

306 Submitted by:

307 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff