KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 16, 2007

Approved Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance	Others in Attendance
Carolyn Armanini	Jennifer Broadus
William Beck	Bob Dixon
Joe Casalini	Jeff Gaisford
Jerry Hardebeck	Rich Gelowicz
Joan McGilton	Sharon Hlavka
Suellen Mele	Kevin Kiernan
Max Pope	Mike Pearia
Carolyn Prentice	Marcia Pelley
Ray Schlienz	Thea Severn
Relaena Sindelar	Diane Yates
Judy Stenberg	Bill Ziegler

Action Items

Lines 11-12: **Approval of October minutes**
Lines 86-88: **Motion to have joint December meeting with MSWMAC**
Lines 193-195: **Motion to have SWAC final approval for the conversion technologies comment letter.**

Call to Order and Introductions

SWAC Chair Carolyn Armanini called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Approval of October Minutes

Interim Lead Planner Thea Severn offered a correction footnote for the October meeting minutes: Page 14, Line 397 "*(Note: The approximate two million dollars included costs other than just the hauling of primary recyclables. The amount for hauling of primary recyclables in 2006 was $1,074, 530.)"

SWAC member William Beck moved approval of the October minutes as amended.

The minutes were approved unanimously.

SWD Updates / MSWMAC Update / December Meeting

SWD Updates

Interim Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said that Theresa Jennings is now the Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks on a permanent basis.

Kiernan reported that on November 7th, someone placed a case in the pit at the Bow Lake Transfer Station that began to smoke. Transfer Station Operators cleared the station and called 911. A HazMat team responded and found that the case contained chemical samples. There were no injuries or environmental problems. Kiernan said that the station was closed for several hours.

King County and the Port of Seattle have come to a tentative agreement regarding the eastside trail property. The Port of Seattle will receive the Fisher Flour Mill property on Harbor Island. That property is in the process of being appraised. The Solid Waste Division will be reimbursed for the current market value of the property from the county's current expense fund. Armanini asked if there was language in the agreement to require the Port to locate an alternative intermodal site for the division. Kiernan answered that there is no language for an alternative site in the agreement.

SWAC member Ray Schlienz asked about the division's position on the land agreement. Kiernan said that the division is focusing on Cedar Hills Landfill capacity. With the addition of five to seven years, the closure date of the Landfill can be pushed to 2021. Kiernan said that the division is not pursuing another intermodal site at this time.

The next Cedar Hills Citizen Review Committee meeting is scheduled for December 6th. Beck commented that the CRC meetings used to be held on a monthly basis and were very confrontational. As relations between the community and the division improved, meetings have become less frequent.

Kiernan said that the reopening of the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station is targeted for mid-February. All the major structures are in place at the transfer station. SWAC will be invited to the opening ceremony.

MSWMAC Update

SWAC member Joan McGilton reported that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) had received a review of the 2008 Budget Request from division staff in their November meeting.

McGilton said that the larger part of the November meeting revolved around interlocal agreements (ILA). McGilton said that MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber is concerned that of the 37 ILA cities, only 18 participate on MSWMAC. There was discussion about how to get the remaining cities involved, as well as the Suburban Cities Association (SCA). MSWMAC also discussed the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group's (ITSG) 2008 work plan and the Governance Report.

McGilton said that she felt the division's schedule timeline handout has been very helpful, and that MSWMAC members David Baker and Sharon Hlavka will be taking that schedule to SCA.

SWAC Vice-Chair Jerry Hardebeck asked about the division's list of materials collected in curbside programs in the cities and unincorporated areas. Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford replied that this list of countywide services was shared with the cities so that they could have a discussion about whether we want to establish a baseline model of service. Hardebeck asked if the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan) update will require or suggest that there be uniformity of recycling services from city to city. Gaisford said this has been discussed with the cities, but cities may be unable to align their services with one another until their contracts are reopened. Hardebeck suggested the alternative of setting goals that are implemented over time instead of uniform countywide services taking place at once. For example, in five years all X, Y, and Z materials will be collected countywide. McGilton suggested that Hardebeck could attend a SCA meeting to discuss that issue.

Armanini thanked the division for providing reusable coffee mugs for SWAC members, and suggested that SWAC members bring their own reusable beverage containers.

December Meeting

Armanini stated that the December SWAC meeting needs rescheduling. If SWAC cancels a meeting it will affect the timeline for the Comp Plan update process. Armanini suggested three options: an alternate date of December 17th, a longer meeting in January, or a joint meeting with MSWMAC on December 14th. She said that MSWMAC is enthusiastic about having a joint meeting with SWAC

SWAC member Relaena Sindelar moved to have a joint meeting with MSWMAC on December 14th.

The motion passed unanimously.

Armanini informed SWAC that lunch will be provided for the joint meeting. Armanini said that since SWAC is a public meeting, the joint meeting on December 14th will also be open to the public. The chairs of the committees will discuss who will chair the meeting.

Legislative Update:

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates presented a matrix of upcoming solid waste legislation. Once the legislative session starts, she will add another column to that matrix to update the committee with the status of each bill. That matrix can be viewed at: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SWAC2008LegislativeUpdates.doc

Yates said that this year, there is legislation on the federal level that involves solid waste and railroads.

Kiernan explained the proposed federal legislation. He said that railroads have certain exclusions from local permitting and health regulations. Those exclusions have been broadly interpreted for solid waste rail loads. SWAC member Joe Casalini said that Allied Waste always complies with local regulations regardless of federal exclusions. Kiernan said that the division supports the House version of the legislation. Yates said that King County works with the Ferguson Lobby Group out of Washington, D.C.

Hardebeck asked if the exclusions from regulations also include flow control, and landfill permitting. Kiernan said that he was not certain if the regulations had been interpreted that broadly.

SWAC member Suellen Mele said that under the "Viability and Key Players" section of the matrix, the supporters identified are just potential partners; the final decision to endorse the legislation has not yet been made.

Conversion Technologies Report: Draft Letter

Armanini said that Sindelar has volunteered to fold SWAC's comments on R.W. Beck's Conversion Technologies Report into a draft letter. Beck suggested language regarding Cedar Hills Landfill permits and legal agreements.

Armanini suggested sending the letter to King County Executive Ron Sims instead of the King County Council.

SWAC discussed using bulleted key points in the letter as a way to emphasize information, or bold keywords similar to examples found in fundraiser solicitations.

Mele said that she had personal concerns about airborne contaminants that an incinerator would produce. These contaminates are global in nature and not just confined to a regional area. This is not a comment she has heard here at SWAC; it is her own environmental perspective.

Beck pointed out that extending the life of the Landfill can reopen the lawsuit that had been settled between residents and the Solid Waste Division. Beck pointed out that Kiernan was involved with the lawsuit and remembers how contentious it was. Beck suggested that the class action lawsuit citation be added as a footnote.

SWAC discussed the difference between waste disposal and waste processing. Armanini said that there is waste processing in landfilling, and with incineration technologies there

is a degree of processing. SWAC member Max Pope said that incineration technology does not eliminate the need to landfill byproducts.

Mele said that there is a solid waste hierarchy in Washington State law: reduction, recycling, incineration or landfilling after source separation, and incineration or landfilling without source separation. By state law incineration and landfilling are grouped together. Casalini said that in Europe they changed their waste hierarchy earlier this year.

Casalini said that over the last 25 years the northwest waste stream has changed drastically. Keeping materials available for recycling is important because of continuing growth in recycling markets. Casalini said that the northwest recycling markets have become very rich in recycling materials. He said that there are a number of papers published and available online that discuss conflicts with funding and materials that exist when recycling and incineration compete.

Sindelar pointed out how just having LEED legislation has impacted building materials recycling.

McGilton said that Garber had informed MSWMAC of a vendor that was using a portable machine to demolish houses in Coal Creek. Of that debris, 80 percent was recycled. Gaisford said that SWAC will be discussing construction and demolition recycling options at the December meeting.

Prentice stated that “feeding the incinerator” or the impact an incinerator has on recycling goals, is not as important a concern. Prentice suggested that there are ways to solve this issue with contracts, or importing waste. Mele asked what incentive would there be to import waste. Sindelar said that revenue earned from the incineration facility might be considered an incentive. Armanini replied that waste stream markets are competitive and the division would not necessarily generate a profit. Armanini noted that importing waste is a potential solution for a problem that does not have to be created in the first place.

Armanini said that according to state and King County regulations, waste reduction is the highest priority. Importing waste could jeopardize that.

Mele said that she has met with vendors of incinerator technology and they refer to "put or pay" contracts, which is an industry practice. Mele thought that if these companies could afford to build their facilities without guaranteed tonnage contracts they would have already built them.

Armanini said that there needs to be emphasis placed on flexibility and to keep informed on emerging technologies. This Comp Plan period is for five years. The focus should be on what needs to be accomplished for this period.

SWAC discussed the timing and implications of having their comment letter sent during the budget process. Although SWAC can not anticipate what provisos might be added before the final adoption of the budget, SWAC wanted to have their comment letter with the message, "to not waste any more public money on incineration technologies," to the Executive before the final adoption decision. If there are no incinerator technology provisos added, SWAC will still send their comment letter, but will spend more time finalizing comments.

SWAC discussed various edits to their letter. The draft produced by Armanini and Sindelar will be emailed to all members for review.

Beck moved that the draft letter be approved via email by a majority of SWAC members before transmittal to the Executive.
The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Transfer System Level of Service Part II: Presentation and Discussion</u>

Severn gave a presentation on the Transfer System Level of Service: Part II. That presentation can be viewed at:
http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SWACSelfHaulLOSII11162007.ppt

Armanini asked about the rationale in trying to provide uniform service countywide. Severn said that input came from some ITSG members; it was based on fairness and the public's confusion on different material acceptance policies.

Mele said that product stewardship programs have a hard time competing with the division if it offers free recycling. The manufacturers are reluctant to charge for the cost of this service if the division provides it for free. Severn said that the division plans to charge a fee for televisions next year at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station. There will be future discussions on fees for services and materials.

Armanini said that if customers are already paying for disposal, how does the division plan to make recycling a more economical choice. Severn said that recycling would have a lower fee than garbage disposal.

Hardebeck asked if there will be a ban on the disposal of yardwaste at the new Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station. Kiernan said that yardwaste will not be banned when the station reopens in February. Hardebeck said that if the station is capable of accepting separated yardwaste for recycling, why not phase it in as a pilot program. Armanini said that Hardebeck raises a good point. Severn said that could be one of the recommendations for the Comp Plan update.

Hardebeck said that at the Enumclaw Transfer Station customers are charged the garbage disposal rate if they have yardwaste and garbage, and the scale operators will not let you drive over the scale a second time with just yardwaste. Severn said that separated yardwaste for recycling is accepted at the Enumclaw station. Customers can make two trips over the scale, but would then pay two minimum fees, so it might be more expensive than just paying the garbage minimum fee.

Mele asked about the demographic makeup of the self-haulers. Severn said that they are mainly residential. The tonnage is 85 percent residential and 15 percent small business. However, 90 percent of the trips are residential and 10 percent are from businesses.

Prentice asked if self-haul customers will understand why they are being charged a transaction fee. Severn said that it is not a new cost; the cost is included in the disposal fee now. This is a different way of assessing the fixed costs of the transaction. Kiernan said that it is very hard to educate self-haulers because their trips are infrequent and unpredictable.

Hardebeck said the next time there is a rate study he would like the division to have a discussion with SWAC.

Armanini asked if the transaction fee is based on operational costs rather than capital costs. Kiernan said that the fee has not been calculated yet.

Hardebeck asked if the tipping fee is increasing to 15 percent. Severn replied that the minimum fee will increase from $15.50 to $17.25.

Armanini said that some cities have mandatory collection services, but this caused some problems. Other cities do not want to mandate service. Severn said that in the last three years service subscription to curbside services have increased.

Beck asked if recycling newspaper costs money. Severn said that all recyclables hauling costs money, even if there is income associated with the commodity.

SWAC applicant Bob Dixon said that he is from Vashon Island and if those residents have to pay for recyclables then those recyclables will not go into the recycling stream. He said that there is not a uniformity of transfer services, and separated yardwaste is not collected at Vashon. Armanini said that there will be a public process and if there are additional concerns from residents, they will have time to make comments.

Severn said that in many places it appears that curbside recycling is free, but there is a cost to recycle these items. Armanini said that Lake Forest Park's contract embedded the cost for recycling in the garbage rate. There used to be a commodities credit that showed up to offset service, but this has vanished from billing.

Gaisford said that in unincorporated King County they still have the commodities credit. Sindelar said that explaining this fee will be critical in maintaining the incentive to recycle.

The Division's Summary of Recommendations are as follows:

- Supplement curbside service
- Provide high level of recycling opportunities
- Balance uniformity of service with local demand
- Design future facilities for flexibility & maximum recycling opportunities
- Explore options to add more recycling to current facilities
- Move toward mandating separation of recyclable materials at the transfer facilities
- Include a transaction fee
- Price recyclables to encourage recycling, but still reflect that there is a cost

OPEN FORUM

Armanini reminded SWAC that the next meeting will be on December 14th with MSWMAC at 11:45 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Submitted by:
Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff