

# Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee

March 13, 2015 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:50 p.m.  
King Street Center 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

## Meeting Minutes

<b>Members</b>	
Joan Nelson	<i>Auburn</i>
Bill Peloza, Chair	<i>Auburn</i>
Alison Bennett	<i>Bellevue</i>
Sabrina Combs	<i>Bothell</i>
Brian Roberts	<i>Burien</i>
Barre Seibert	<i>Clyde Hill</i>
Laura Techico	<i>Des Moines</i>
Chris Searcy	<i>Enumclaw</i>
Rob Van Orsow	<i>Federal Way</i>
Gina Hungerford	<i>Kent</i>
John MacGillivray	<i>Kirkland</i>
Mary Jane Goss	<i>Lake Forest Park</i>
Diana Pistoll	<i>Maple Valley</i>
Carol Simpson	<i>Newcastle</i>
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	<i>Redmond</i>
Linda Knight	<i>Renton</i>
Beth Goldberg	<i>Sammamish</i>
Chris Eggen, Vice Chair	<i>Shoreline</i>
Rika Cecil	<i>Shoreline</i>
Frank Iriarte	<i>Tukwila</i>
Paula Waters	<i>Woodinville</i>
Zach Schmitz	<i>Woodinville</i>

<b>King County Staff</b>
Anna Fleming, SWD Staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Manager
Beth Humphreys, SWD Staff
Kevin Kiernan, SWD Assistant Director
Josh Marx, SWD Staff
Laila McClinton, SWD Staff
Pat D. McLaughlin, SWD Director
Bill Reed, SWD Staff
Mike Reed, Council Staff
Thea Severn, SWD Planning & Communications Manager
Diane Yates, SWD Staff

<b>Guests</b>
Doreen Booth, SCA
David Della, Waste Management
Laura Moser, Waste Management

### **Minutes & Agenda Review**

The February minutes were approved as written.

### **Updates**

SWD

FEMA has accepted the King County Operational Disaster Debris Management Plan for participation in the Public Assistance Alternative Procedures Pilot Program for Debris Removal. This pilot program allows a one-time, two-percent federal cost share increase for debris removal operations following a major disaster or emergency declaration. The financial value of this additional two-percent can be huge as Snohomish County's experience with the Oso landslide demonstrated. Submittal of SWD's plan to FEMA for acceptance under the pilot program began in November 2013, and ongoing maintenance of this plan is the responsibility of SWD.

A cultural competency and equity review of the Spanish-language curbside education program *Recicla Mas ¡Es facilísimo!* will be completed this year. The review will start with an

evaluation of the community education activist partnership, the *Facilitadores de Reciclaje*. Equity Matters, hired by SWD to complete the project review, will analyze the cultural competence and equity of the Facilitadores and the overall project design. The review is being completed to find ways for the program to be more effective at engaging the Hispanic/Latino community in King County for increased recycling and composting practices.

On February 27, SWD employees gave presentations to the Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) Evergreen Chapter's technical session on material management. The session focused on diversion and zero waste, and SWD highlighted its "Food: Too Good to Waste" and "Resource Recovery Pilot" programs. Both presentations were well-received.

On March 6, SWD's EcoConsumer project manager staffed an info table and led a student discussion about environmental issues at the first annual [Washington State Global Issues Network Conference](#) for middle school and high school students. About 200 students attended the conference.

Chair Bill Peloza recommended that the division share its updates by email with MSWMAC the Monday following the meeting rather than in the minutes so that the time-sensitive information is made available earlier.

## SWAC

MSWMAC Vice Chair and SWAC applicant Chris Eggen provided a brief overview of the February SWAC meeting, which included:

- An recap of the Transfer Plan workshop
- Discussion of Chapter 4 of the Comp Plan, which will be brought back for further discussion after the 70 Percent Recycling Subcommittee meeting.
- An update on the reorganization of the division to align with the three product families of waste prevention, resource recovery, and waste disposal, and an introduction to the Product Family Champions.

## State Legislation

Jeff Gaisford provided a [state legislation update](#), with a focus on paint stewardship legislation and the Governor's Toxics Reduction Act.

## **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan Presentation/Discussion/Feedback**

Gaisford presented the division's proposed plan for engaging stakeholders in discussion about the collection and processing policy questions outlined in the [Decision Matrix](#). The five overarching policy questions are:

1. Should system partners mandate curbside collection? i.e., garbage, recyclables and organics
2. Should system partners mandate separation of materials in curbside collection programs? i.e., garbage, recyclables and organics

3. Should system partners agree that materials will be added to recycling collection programs that are supported by adequate processing capacity and capability and markets for materials?
4. Should an enforcement program be implemented to support separation of materials in curbside programs i.e., garbage, recyclables and organics. Who should be responsible for enforcement?
5. What should the Solid Waste Division do at transfer stations to facilitate resource recovery? i.e., mandate separation of materials coming to the transfer stations? Recover recyclable materials from the tipping floor? Provide rate incentives/disincentives?

The division intends to engage MSWMAC and SWAC in discussion this month and in April to gather thoughts, questions, and concerns related to major policy decisions. The 70 percent recycling subcommittee will meet after the March 20 SWAC meeting, and discussion from both advisory committee meetings will be brought to the subcommittee meeting to identify areas of agreement and of divergence. The division is looking to the 70 percent subcommittee to make policy recommendations to the advisory committees.

Comments included:

- Consider slowing down the schedule because of the sensitive nature of these questions for elected officials.
- Additional data (including cost data if available) needs to be provided before cities or MSWMAC is able to make any major policy recommendations.
- Eggen reported that these policy questions were briefly discussed at the Sound Cities Association (SCA) Public Issues Committee (PIC) on Wednesday night. Two people spoke in favor of mandates and one spoke against them. There will be more detailed discussion in May, possibly with a pre-PIC meeting.
- While more data and time may be needed before MSWMAC can take a position, it is valuable to begin the discussion.
- Consider the following approach. Rather than defining the steps each city should take, the division could provide a list of actions for cities to consider taking, along with supporting data for each option. Cities would then make decisions based on their unique political, economic, and social realities. Regional benchmark goals would be set for certain years and if cities have collectively been unable to reach the benchmark goals through individual action by that time, then the county would take action at a regional level through bans and mandatory separation at transfer stations.
- At the request of a member, Diane Yates will share a list of members of the 70 percent recycling subcommittee.
- Several members expressed an interest in trying to reach consensus despite political challenges in order to achieve 70 percent as quickly as possible.
- Director Pat D. McLaughlin acknowledged the challenging nature of these conversations as well as the aggressive timeframe. He pointed out that these decisions will affect other decisions the division will have to make shortly. A core assumption is that the county will achieve a 70 percent recycling rate by 2030, which necessitates dramatic improvements. If decisions are delayed and collective action is

not taken, the landfill will fill up much faster than planned. Extending the life of the landfill will benefit all cities and ratepayers.

- Consider educating city councils and the general public about the economics of the landfill and the cost of alternatives.
- It is preferable to give people incentives rather than tell them they have to do something.
- Education has the potential to play a powerful role in achieving 70 percent recycling.
- Low-cost options for low and fixed-income populations must be available.
- In April 2011, the city of Kent began a new contract that set rates for garbage collection based on the size of the customer's container, with no added cost for recycling or yard waste. The hauler is now reporting higher rates of contamination in the recycling because people are throwing some of their garbage into their recycling containers. The city is looking at adding a fee to curb contamination. If mandates are considered, it is important to take into account the cost of enforcement.
- Several members acknowledged that bold measures are needed to achieve the regional goals. Some policy recommendations require more data because they will likely encounter push-back from elected officials, while others do not necessarily need as much data.
- Part of the education challenge is that each of the 37 cities has a different contract, different rates, and different guidelines for customers. Customers are mobile and have to learn new rules every time they move.
- Severn pointed out that cities have reached consensus on policies in the past. For example, all cities now have curbside collection, wheeled carts, and yard waste collection. While it is difficult, it is not impossible to identify some things that all cities can agree on.
- Gaisford added that cities share a lot more commonalities than differences. For example, there is not a lot of variation in food and food-soiled paper collected. This may present an opportunity for collective action.
- The division is also having discussions with SWAC and directly with haulers and processors, whose partnership and support will be key to achieving regional goals.
- MSWMAC will look at the strategies again in April and identify any important data that is missing.
- The 70 percent subcommittee will also work on identifying data that is needed.
- [Materials](#) distributed at the last 70 percent subcommittee are now available on the website.

### **Interlocal Agreements: Review/Discussion**

Assistant Director Kevin Kiernan provided a brief overview of County and City Responsibilities under the Original and the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreements. Comments included:

- If the Northeast transfer station is not built and waste was to be redirected to existing transfer stations, the division would contact affected cities to discuss potential adverse impacts before any action is taken.
- The King County Council adopted a proviso in the last budget that requires the division to ask MSWMAC if there is anything they are interested in revisiting within the

Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement. The division does not have any contractual concerns, but is required to ask city partners if they do.

- Recommendations to change the agreement can be made at any time, and neither party is obligated to change the agreement based on one party's recommendations.
- Several members asked about the intended outcome of the County Council's action. The division cannot presume the County Council's intent.
- Changes in the ILA cannot be directly linked to changes in rates. The division will be conducting a rate analysis and presenting a rate study in 2016, which may lead to a rate change regardless of what happens with the ILA. If, however, a provision that costs money was to be added to the ILA, the rate may be affected.
- The report is due to council in August, and needs to leave the division by the middle of June.
- It was suggested that the division send an email to each city that is party to the Amended and Restated ILA summarizing the request for feedback and requesting a response by a certain date. If no response is given, the division will assume there is no interest in further discussion.

### **Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study: System Rate Structure: Scope of Work/Timeline: Review**

Based on comments received, the draft scope of work for the rates study that the division will undertake this year has been revised. The scope of work is currently undergoing another internal review and will hopefully be made public in April for procurement. The division will share the final scope of work with MSWMAC when it is available. The next project is the Request for Expressions of Interest related to exploring alternative technologies for managing a portion of the waste stream.

### **2015 Work Plan: Review**

The work plan for April will remain unchanged. In May, an action item on the ILA will be added to the agenda.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.