Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee

April 11, 2014 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:35 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Members	
Diana Quinn	*Algona*
Bill Peloza	*Auburn*
Joan Nelson	*Auburn*
Susan Fife-Ferris	*Bellevue*
Alison Bennett	*Bellevue*
Sabrina Combs	*Bothell*
Maiya Andrews	*Burien*
Joseph Cimaomo Jr.	*Covington*
Chris Searcy	*Enumclaw*
Rob Van Orsow	*Federal Way*
Micah Bonkowski	*Issaquah*
John MacGillivray	*Kirkland*
Mary Jane Goss	*Lake Forest Park*
Diana Pistoll	*Maple Valley*
Stacia Jenkins	*Normandy Park*
Jon Spangler	*Redmond*
Linda Knight	*Renton*
Tom Gut	*SeaTac*
Frank Iriarte	*Tukwila*
Paula Waters	*Woodinville*

King County Staff
Ann Berrysmith, SWD Finance &Administration Mgr.
Grover Cleveland, DNRP Director's Office Staff
Tom Creegan, SWD Staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Mgr.
Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff
Laila McClinton, SWD Staff
Pat McLaughlin, SWD Division Director
Mike Reed, King County Council Staff
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison
Guests
David Della, Waste Management
Glenn Hayman, Hayman Environmental
Kevin Kelly, CleanScapes
Eleanor Parks, Citizen

Minutes & Agenda Review

The March minutes were approved with the following change.

- On page 6, under number one, change "040" to "2040."

Updates

SWD

The Executive Branch of King County has begun using boards as a method of tracking and coordinating projects and ensuring alignment with the King County Strategic Plan. The Executive has a Tier 1 board, the Department of Natural Resources and Parks has a Tier 2 board and the division has a Tier 3 board. Information from the division's board will be shared with MSWMAC at a future meeting.

On March 25, Kiernan briefed the Algona City Council on the status of the South County Recycling and Transfer Station Project. Copies of the presentation, which included SWD's proposal to site the facility at SWD-owned property in Algona and options for mitigating potential impacts, were available at the MSWMAC meeting. A follow up meeting with Mayor Hills took place and the division is optimistic that an agreement can be reached.

As part of a Solid Waste Association of North America (SAWNA) regional symposium on April 9, approximately 50 participants toured the Cedar Hills Landfill, Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station and the new South Seattle Transfer Station.

Tonnage during first quarter 2014 was up 6,600 tons compared to first quarter 2013. Approximately one third of the increase was due to a tonnage increase at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station, which was likely related to the closure of Seattle's North Transfer Station.

The Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station received the Platinum certification level of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system.

In addition to numerous local outreach activities, SWD's EcoConsumer recently provided advice on setting on setting up a recycling program to a non-profit operating in Ghana, Africa. Closer to home, an article on ParentMap magazine's website looked at 10 Creative Green Ways Families Can Save Some Green, KOMO TV segments focused on eco-babies and green kitchens, a Seattle Times column examined tool sharing, and presentations on plastics.

The division's LinkUp program has designated textiles as a new focus material for 2014. King County and Seattle residents and businesses throw away nearly 40,000 tons of textiles each year – that's about four percent of all disposed garbage. The division is working with Seattle Public Utilities and will collaborate with non-profit and for-profit collectors to educate the public about textiles suitable for reuse and recycling.

The MSWMAC work plan includes an initial discussion of Green Fence in May. Haulers will be invited to participate in the discussion. In June, the work plan includes an opportunity for further discussion and possible action.

SWAC
SWAC and MSWMAC Liaison Stacia Jenkins gave the SWAC update. SWAC discussed the rate analysis. There was discussion about how costs could be shifted to transportation and other external costs if the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station is not built. The majority of meeting time was spent in passing the following motion.

KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
MOTION ON TRANSFER PLAN REVIEW FINAL REPORT DATED MARCH 2014

I move that SWAC recommend Executive and Council approval of the Transfer Plan Review Final Report, including the following key recommendations of the report:

- Proceed this year with a new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (RTS) using current design and permits (with minor modifications to retain flexibility).
- Continue siting evaluations for a South County RTS.
- In collaboration with stakeholders, continue to evaluate implementation of operational approaches that would provide service for the northeast county without

building an additional transfer station, and compare trade-offs and benefits with the adopted Transfer Plan.
- To focus on zero waste of resources by 2030

Other
The Sound Cities Association (SCA) did not provide a recommendation on the Transfer Plan Review Report at this time. The SCA/RPC caucus through its members still has questions that will be provided to SWD and the King County Auditor as soon as possible. The questions primarily deal with Factoria, Shoreline and impacts on transportation.

Transfer Plan Review Report
MSWMAC received a presentation on the Transfer Plan Review Report. The same presentation was provided to the King County Council Committee of the Whole (COW) and the Regional Policy Committee (RPC).

The report includes the following recommendations:
- Proceed this year with the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station using the current design and permits. This would include making minor modifications to ensure future flexibility.
- Work with stakeholders to continue developing the optimal "no-build" options for the Northeast and further compare the trade-offs and benefits with the adopted Transfer Plan.
- Continue the siting process for the South County Recycling and Transfer Station.

Comments included:
- A member requested that a copy of the matrix used at the transfer plan meetings be updated to include the options identified in the presentation and emailed to MSWMAC members.
- The division asked commercial haulers for cost impacts at the beginning of the transfer plan review process. That information allows the division to provide rough order of magnitude cost impacts. The contracts with haulers are negotiated and controlled by the cities.
- Consider adding the capital costs per household to the matrix. If the capital costs of the base plan is $1 per month how much are the others?
- Hauling/transportation costs are an important component of the actual cost per household.
- It is difficult to calculate transportation costs when the location of a possible new station could be anywhere from Kenmore to Issaquah. Some cities transportation costs may be higher. Council is considering the issue from a regional perspective.
- Balance the capital, debt service and operating costs with the curbside costs. One less station may be the less expensive option.
- Council staff's review of garbage rates for local jurisdictions do not show that host cities have lower costs than cities that are further away from that service. Others

noted that collections costs are influenced by the services the city chooses to receive from the haulers as well as distance from transfer stations.

- The Committee of the Whole is reviewing this issue including transactional capacity and rate impacts. Members requesting details of Council staff's review were directed to the Council's website.
- Facilities primarily providing services to urban areas must be within the Urban Growth Boundary.
- Transactional capacity means the amount of time to go from waiting in line to when a customer leaves the station. The bottleneck is not the transaction at the scale house but is rather the amount of time it takes for customers to unload.
- Extending hours alone is not sufficient to deal with transactional capacity. Incentive pricing may be needed. Staying open longer will increase costs per ton as no additional tonnage will be received to cover those additional operating hours.
- Remember that there may be noise and zoning requirements that limit the ability to extend operating hours.
- Cities were asked to consider their tolerance or interest in these various options.

Budget Proviso Response: Financial Policies

MSWMAC received a presentation on the financial policies agreed to by the Financial Policies Subcommittee. Comments included:

- Referring to the city mitigation policy member asked that "stakeholders" be defined so that is it clear that the term means more than just the cities requesting mitigation. Others responded that the language was left purposely vague to allow for greater flexibility in response to circumstance.
- A member said that it was not necessary to have a policy regarding debt financing because it is already in place for the County.

Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study

MSWMAC received a hard copy of the draft evaluation summary of the best practices, a ranking sheet that groups the practices by recommendation, and a copy of the evaluation criteria. Members were reminded that the detailed write-ups for each option will be available to MSWMAC members in advance of the next meeting.

Members were asked if any of the recommendations were surprising to them, if there were any recommendations they disagreed with and for their input on the implementation plan. Comments included:

- This summary appears to overly weight the benefits and doesn't look closely at the costs. Gaisford noted that more detailed cost information is included in the detailed write-ups.
- Staff clarified that best practice number nine, "Ban disposal of organics, in mixed waste, at transfer stations where recycling options exist" refers to self-haul.
- The goal of the project is to decide which of these practices to further pursue; to narrow the field and determine where to look more deeply.
- Many of these practices appear to be linked.

- The division believes that the consultants had sufficient information to make these recommendations.
- A member asked that as much as possible please tell the group of the impact of the options on rates.
- Members noted that it seems a bit futile to provide feedback when there are so many options.

It is difficult to determine the optimal balance of information to provide to MSWMAC – digestible pieces versus large chunks. A member requested a "map" of the process. Other methods of reviewing the information and providing feedback were considered. MSWMAC members will be asked via email to be part of a subgroup to review the information in greater depth.

Public Comment

Eleanor Parks appreciated the positive conversation between the City of Algona and King County regarding the siting of the new South County Recycling and Transfer Station and commended them for their collaboration.

A copy of the presentation provided to the City of Algona was distributed at the MSWMAC meeting and is available here.