

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 24, 2009

11:15 – 1:20 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Pelozza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
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
Gina Hungerford	City of Kent	Conservation 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
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
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	Assistant Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Ann Berrysmith, Finance and Administration Manager
Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager
Jane Gateley, SWD Staff
Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
Kevin Kiernan, Division Director
Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison

Cities

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

Visitors

Sharon Hlavka, Green Solutions

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber of Newcastle called the meeting to order at 11:24 a.m.
3 Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

4
5 **Approval of December Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

6 **Chris Eggen of Shoreline moved to approve the March minutes.**

7
8 *The March minutes were approved by consensus.*

9
10 **Updates: SWD**

11 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said the division is continuing to see
12 declines in tonnage. There was an eight percent tonnage decrease in 2008 from 2007 and
13 there has been an additional four percent decrease thus far in 2009. SWD is managing to
14 the decreased revenue. The 2010 budget is being prepared based on revised tonnage
15 projections. Everything is on the table. SWD will brief advisory groups and council mid-
16 year.

17
18 Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue asked if recycling tonnage is decreasing by similar
19 amounts. Kiernan said it is. Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff
20 Gaisford said that commercial recycling has decreased by a greater percentage than
21 residential recycling.

22
23 Kiernan said the large photograph on the wall at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer
24 Station has been reprinted as a billboard by 4Culture and is being displayed in 40
25 locations throughout the county to celebrate Earth Day.

26
27 Kiernan said that King County has received positive press on the landfill gas-to-energy
28 facility. The facility is fully constructed and is expected to go into commercial operation
29 in a few weeks. MSWMAC will be invited to tour the facility and view the tippers this
30 summer.

31

32 Kiernan said that SWD recently opened bids for the construction of disposal area seven at
33 Cedar Hills. The engineers estimate for the construction was \$12 million. The division
34 received two bids under \$8 million and a total of seven bids under \$9 million.

35

36 Kiernan said that SWD excavation work for phase one construction has begun at Bow
37 Lake. Impacts to self-haul service will most likely begin in the middle of May. SWD is
38 discussing options to limit that impact with contractors.

39

40 Kiernan said that SWD held a scoping meeting for the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan
41 EIS on Monday, April 20th. The purpose of the meeting was to receive input on the
42 elements of the environment that the public wants SWD to investigate during the
43 environmental review of the landfill development alternatives. Approximately 25 people
44 attended. Kiernan said that there appeared to be confusion about the difference between
45 Cedar Grove and Cedar Hills among some of those that attended

46

47 Kiernan noted that SWD is issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP) to consultants for siting
48 new transfer stations in the north and south county. SWD is interested in including two
49 city representatives on the five member review panel. The work will be technical and
50 related to procurement procedures. The task requires a significant time commitment;
51 about ten hours for review of each proposal;, followed by approximately five meetings
52 over a four month period to reconcile scoring and to conduct interviews of short-listed
53 firms. The work is planned to begin in September and conclude in late 2009 or early
54 2010. The public and other groups will be involved later in the siting process.

55 Kiernan asked MSWMAC members to let Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates know
56 within the next six weeks if they are interested in participating on the panel.

57

58 Bill Peloza of Auburn asked what elements had extended landfill life from the previously
59 projected closure date of 2016 to 2018. Kiernan said that settlement of the waste, the
60 decrease in tonnage resulting from the economic downturn and aggressively saving
61 airspace by recycling rock, re-using daily cover and other operational changes have
62 resulted in the extended landfill life. He said that the 2018 closure date refers to when the
63 landfill is projected to be closed under the current site development plan.

64

65 **Updates: Schedule**

66 Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn said that the Environmental
67 Stewardship chapter did not coalesce as a cohesive chapter. SWD decided instead to
68 disperse the text throughout the plan in relevant chapters. SWD will e-mail selected
69 sections of text to the committee for review.

70

71 Severn said that the division has set September 3rd as the anticipated release date for the
72 preliminary draft plan, which will allow the division to consider comments and produce
73 the plan. There is a 120-day review period for the preliminary draft plan. MSWMAC is
74 scheduled to review the plan in October. Once revisions have been made, the final draft
75 plan will be issued for adoption. .

76

77 Kiernan noted that feedback and comments from the advisory committees added value,
78 but also time to the Comp Plan update process. He said SWD values comments from the
79 committees. Kiernan asked for input from MSWMAC about the update process
80 particularly in relation to advisory group involvement. Garber said that she understood
81 the process had to be done a chapter at a time even though it made review more difficult.

82

83 Severn handed out the MSWMAC work plan for the balance of 2009 and early 2010. To
84 give staff time to pull the full draft of the Comp Plan together, SWD proposes to cancel
85 the May meeting and schedule a tour of the landfill and gas-to-energy facility in June.

86 The July 10th meeting will include presentations on the financial plan and the Cedar Hills
87 Site Development Plan. The August meeting will be cancelled and the September 11th
88 agenda will include a presentation on the Emergency Plan. Review of the preliminary
89 draft of the Comp Plan will be on the October 9th agenda, perhaps as a joint meeting with
90 SWAC. If necessary, the review could continue at the November 13th meeting, along
91 with a budget presentation and an update on transfer facilities. The December meeting
92 will be cancelled and in the first quarter of 2010, the committee will receive a
93 presentation on the rate study and review comments on the preliminary draft plan.

94 Severn said the Annual Report is at the Executive's Office. She said SWD would like to
95 provide copies of the Annual Report to committee members electronically. This would

96 limit costs and save paper. MSWMAC members agreed to receive the document
97 electronically. If a member would like a paper copy they can contact Severn.

98

99 **Updates: SWAC**

100 Joan McGilton of Burien said that there has been significant turn-over in SWAC
101 members recently. She suggested that a joint meeting between the committees would be
102 valuable.

103

104 McGilton reported that SWAC elected a new Chair, Joe Casalini and a new Vice Chair,
105 Judy Stenberg. McGilton said that SWAC discussed an increased emphasis on
106 sustainability, rates in rural and urban areas, and prioritizing curbside collection including
107 bulky items.

108

109 McGilton said SWAC learned that 85 percent of self-haul tonnage is brought by
110 residential customers. She said that SWAC member Jerry Hardebeck said he sensed
111 frustration that city collection contracts are not on the same schedule and that the same
112 services are not provided in each of the cities.

113

114 McGilton reported that Hardebeck suggested the division could encourage cities to move
115 towards sustainability by creating a certification program patterned after the Leadership
116 in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program. Eggen said that a sustainability
117 program for cities called STAR was presented at the recent Green Cities Conference in
118 Portland, Oregon.

119

120 **Updates: LHWMP Plan Update**

121 John McGillivray of the City of Kirkland reported that approximately 40 people from
122 cities, sewer districts, small business and others attended the April 7th Local Hazardous
123 Waste Management Program (LHWMP) Plan Update Workshop in Renton. The plan was
124 last updated in 1997.

125

126 McGillivray said attendees discussed aligning potential new services with a planned rate
127 increase. They also discussed the need to set targets and goals, product stewardship, and a

128 medicine take-back program. Attendees discussed the need to distill education and
129 outreach materials into something that is easier to distribute. More information about the
130 plan update is available at <http://www.govlink.org/hazwaste/about/planupdate09.html> .

131

132 Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way said the LHWMP Management Coordination Committee
133 has take steps to enhance service equity. One of the steps is to fund a HHW collection at
134 the Supermall in Auburn that will be open every other week-end.

135

136 Gaisford said the Supermall site has been added using funding previously spent on
137 recycling latex paint. He noted that the LHWMP Plan, the Comp Plan and Sewer
138 Districts are all addressing pharmaceuticals disposal.

139

140 Linda Knight of the City of Renton said she would like to have the LHWMP video play
141 on Renton's cable channel as a service for the general public and suggested that others
142 might want to view it as well. She said it is important to show the public examples of a
143 government program that is producing good results at a reasonable cost. Gaisford said
144 copies could be made available. The video will be posted on the Local Hazardous Waste
145 Plan Update website <http://www.govlink.org/hazwaste/about/planupdate09.html>. DVD
146 copies of the video will also be available to any city that requests a copy.

147

148 In response to a question, Kiernan said that pet waste can be disposed in the landfill.
149 Severn noted that haulers prefer that waste to be double bagged. Fife-Ferris said that pet
150 waste is more of a stormwater issue. She said Snohomish County has done a significant
151 amount of education and outreach on the issue and suggested them as a resource.

152

153 **Finance Chapter**

154 Garber asked how the policy recommendations from the Governance committee are
155 reflected in the Finance chapter policies. Severn said that content from the Governance
156 committee recommendations appears in both the policies and in the text of the chapter.

157

158 Kiernan discussed the Solid Waste Fund and Solid Waste Division Fund Structure
159 handouts. Fife-Ferris suggested that the fund structure handout be included in the Comp
160 Plan to inform the reader.

161

162 McGilton asked for the distinction between closed landfill costs and custodial landfill
163 costs. Kiernan responded that a custodial landfill is one which was closed prior to
164 regulatory requirements for post-closure maintenance funds. SWD policy is to provide
165 funding necessary to maintain custodial sites. This is not explicitly required by
166 regulation. In contrast, the closed landfills are facilities that closed after state and
167 federal regulations went into effect with specific post-closure care and funding
168 requirements.

169

170 In response to a comment, Kiernan said that the landfill reserve fund pays cash for
171 landfill refuse cell construction and closure. Projects with a useful life longer than the
172 twenty-year bond period, such as transfer stations, are funded primarily by bond sales.

173

174 Fife-Ferris asked if the majority of refuse in the First NE Landfill was excavated out of
175 the site during construction of the new Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station. She
176 asked if the same will be true of Bow Lake. Kiernan replied that though some refuse
177 remains at First NE and will remain at Bow Lake, most of the volume of the pre-existing
178 landfills will be excavated and disposed at Cedar Hills. He said that the Houghton
179 Landfill is considerable larger than either First NE or Bow Lake.

180

181 Kiernan said the language in FIN-7 will be revised to make it clear that it refers to fees
182 for recyclables that are set by the division.

183

184 Jon Spangler of Redmond referred to FIN-2 and asked why the policy requires a financial
185 forecast and cash-flow projection of only three years. Finance and Administration
186 Manager Ann Berrysmith said that three years is required by the county budget office.
187 Kiernan said that the division looks out further than three years in many planning efforts
188 including the rate study and the Comp Plan.

189

190 Spangler suggested the language in FIN-5 be change from “tons” to “weight.” Severn
191 responded that the division would consider the suggestion.

192

193 In response to a comment, Severn said that language about the impact of product
194 stewardship will be added to the Finance chapter based on MSWMAC and SWAC input.

195 In response to comments suggesting product stewardship programs for appliances and
196 mattresses, Kiernan said that although the division participates in efforts to advance
197 product stewardship, it is really an issue the state needs to address.

198

199 John MacGillivray of the City of Kirkland suggested that the wording in the second
200 paragraph of page three be changed to “...as low as reasonable” to match the wording in
201 FIN-3.

202

203 Pelozza asked if SWD had projected the possible costs of exporting solid waste in 2018.

204 Kiernan responded that decisions have not yet been made about disposal options after the
205 landfill closes. However, if export were chosen and began today, it would cost \$16
206 million more than disposal at Cedar Hills. Future cost projections have been made by
207 adding three percent a year to options and their associated costs but the relative savings
208 remain constant.

209

210 Van Orsow suggested that the final sentence of the sidebar on page three be changed to
211 clarify that it applies to revenue sources for WPR programs. He suggested that the
212 sidebar on page four be changed to use the name “Republic” instead of “Allied Waste.”

213

214 In response to a question, Kiernan said that the next three-year rate period will being in
215 2011. MSWMAC will discuss the upcoming rate study in the first quarter of 2010.

216

217 Spangler suggested that the word “could” in the second paragraph on page ten be
218 changed to “would”.

219

220 Referring to the fourth paragraph on page four, Spangler asked how funds for the Local
221 Hazardous Waste Management Program (LWHMP) are collected. Severn responded that

222 LHWMP is funded by moderate risk waste fees which are collected as part of sewer and
223 garbage rates.

224

225 Spangler suggested that the language in the sidebar on pages four and five be changed to
226 make it clear that the \$4.25 surcharge is per ton. In response to a question, Kiernan said
227 that surcharges collected, but not paid as incentives, are added to the fund balance.

228

229 Spangler suggested that the language in the second paragraph on page seven be changed
230 to avoid mention of deposits, which may cause confusion. He suggested that the
231 language more closely match the discussion of other funds.

232

233 Spangler said it is not clear why the discussion on the second half of page eleven is
234 included in the Finance chapter. Garber agreed and suggested that a few sentences
235 explaining the link between finance and a regional approach to solid waste management
236 would be helpful.

237

238 Referring to the post-closure maintenance fund discussed on page eight, Van Orsow said
239 it is confusing that SWD is not collecting money for post-closure maintenance of the
240 Cedar Hills Landfill.

241

242 Eggen said that the word “responsible” in the second paragraph on page 12 is misspelled.

243

244 Pelozza suggested including a graphic showing how money is moved into the post-closure
245 maintenance fund. In response to a question, Kiernan said rent is included in disposal on
246 the pie chart on page seven. Severn said the chart was a placeholder and would be
247 changed before the draft plan is issued.

248

249 **Host City Mitigation Text**

250 Kiernan directed MSWMAC to the transportation route map that was developed to aid
251 discussion about impacts of solid waste trailers on public roads. The map shows the
252 routes SWD trucks take to and from transfer stations, and includes the number of miles
253 traveled on city streets, state highways and interstates.

254

255 Kiernan said state law provides that cities may charge counties to mitigate impacts
256 directly attributable to solid waste facilities. However, in order for SWD to provide
257 mitigation, a city must identify actual impacts and any mitigation funding provided to a
258 city must be used to address those impacts.

259

260 Kiernan noted that cities hosting transfer facilities benefit from the shorter distances the
261 hauler needs to travel from the point of collection to the transfer facility, which should
262 result in lower collection fees. In response to a question, Kiernan said that cities can
263 charge haulers road use fees to mitigate their use of city streets.

264

265 Fife-Ferris said that part of the traffic to a transfer station will be from haulers bringing
266 waste from outside the host city. The impacts of those trips are specifically related to the
267 facility and not the host city. Yates said that according to state law impacts resulting from
268 collection are not considered to be directly attributable to the solid waste facility.

269 MSWMAC Vice Chair Jessica Greenway of Kirkland said that host cities bear that
270 burden but there is no legal way to mitigate the damage other than what is already being
271 done through litter control, facility design, landscaping and other non-monetary means.

272

273 In response to a question, Kiernan said that the legislation allowing SWD to redirect the
274 business and occupation taxes it pays for transfer stations from the state to the host city
275 was not introduced in the legislature this session due to the state's current budget crisis.

276 Joyce Nichols of the city of Bellevue said that is tied to similar efforts for all public
277 facilities and is unlikely to move forward at this time. The group agreed to leave
278 discussion concerning that option in the Comp Plan.

279

280 In response to a question, Severn said ITSG (Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group) is
281 defined in the Planning chapter.

282

283 **Public Comment**

284 There were no public comments.

285

286 **Adjourn**

287 The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m. MSWMAC reconvened in caucus until 1:45 p.m.

288

289 Submitted by:

290 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff