

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
January 18, 2008**

Approved Meeting Minutes

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini
William Beck
Joe Casalini
Jerry Hardebeck
Joan McGilton
Suellen Mele
Max Pope
Carolyn Prentice
Ray Schlien
Judy Stenberg
Joe Tessier
Richard Gelowicz

Others in Attendance

Gemma Alexander
Jennifer Broadus
Josh Marx
Kevin Kiernan
Grace Reamer
Bill Reed
Diane Yates
Bill Ziegler

Action Items

Lines 06-08: Approval of December and November minutes
Lines 112-118: Motion to table the Conversion Technologies draft letter

1 **Call to Order and Introductions**

2 SWAC Chair Carolyn Armanini called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.
3 Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

4
5 **Approval of November and December Minutes**

6 **SWAC member Bill Beck moved to approve the December and November meeting**
7 **minutes.**

8 *The motion passed unanimously.*

9
10 **SWD Updates / MSWMAC Update / December Meeting**

11 SWD Updates

12 Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that council approved the Solid Waste Transfer
13 and Waste Export System Plan, with a title change to the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste
14 Management Plan. The division has printed labels with the new title and date of adoption
15 for SWAC members to adhere to their copies of the plan.

16

17 The division implemented the rate increase on January 1st. The transition has gone
18 smoothly with no complaints from customers. There has been no increase in illegal
19 dumping around transfer facilities.

20

21 The Shoreline Transfer and Recycling Center opening ceremony will be held on February
22 13th, with tours of the new station. The station will be open to the public on February 16th.
23 The new operating hours will be from 7:30 to 5:00 p.m. Customers requested extended
24 hours.

25

26 Kiernan reported that budget proviso P3 mentions SWAC on Lines 1595-1601:

27 *P3 PROVIDED FURTHER THAT:*

28 *The solid waste division shall work with the metropolitan solid waste management*
29 *advisory committee, the solid waste advisory committee and council staff to develop a*
30 *decision process for contract negotiations with participant cities. The division and these*
31 *persons shall address key recommendations from the third party review of the recent solid*
32 *waste planning effort, and with the executive shall revise the solid waste financial plan*
33 *regarding the host city mitigation funding designation.*

34

35 The division is just beginning to work out the implementation of the proviso. Armanini
36 said that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC)
37 talked about the proviso at their January meeting and council staff said that they would
38 report back with more information. Armanini stated that SWAC will also receive this
39 information.

40

41 MSWMAC Update

42 MSWMAC and SWAC member Joan McGilton reported that another topic of discussion
43 at MSWMAC was the Governance Report. This discussion relates to how MSWMAC
44 influences the interlocal agreement (ILA) process, and includes: the solid waste interlocal
45 forum (SWIF), dispute resolution, financial policies, and host city mitigation. This is an
46 ongoing topic for MSWMAC.

47

48 MSWMAC also discussed the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG). ITSG
49 permanence has been approved by the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) but has not
50 moved through the entire council. MSWMAC is concerned that only larger cities are
51 staffing ITSG. In addition to ITSG attendance, MSWMAC discussed ITSG's role and
52 work plan. MSWMAC considered joint meetings in order to avoid repetitive
53 presentations. The importance of SWAC was noted.

54

55 **Legislative Update:**

56 Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates distributed a handout on the 2008 Legislative
57 Agenda. Yates noted that new information is printed in red. The legislature is now in
58 session. New recycling bills have been introduced by State Representative Maralyn
59 Chase. Once developed, the division's position will be reported to SWAC. SWAC
60 member Suellen Mele said Washington Senate bill 6502 on mercury reduction and
61 product stewardship has just been added. The 'Secure Medicine Return' bill will be
62 revised to eliminate reference to a fee and be reintroduced with a new bill number. King
63 County is one of many agencies that support this bill.

64

65 Armanini thanked Yates for all her hard work and effort with the legislative update
66 matrix.

67

68 Yates asked SWAC members who have not already done so to turn in their Annual
69 Financial Disclosure Form.

70

71 Armanini circulated an article from the Puget Sound Business Journal titled 'New waste-
72 to-energy firm claims nearly \$1B in financing.' Armanini stated that the article is written
73 from a perspective of support for waste-to-energy. She said it was interesting that they
74 used the words "claims to have financing" and that Schmidt-Pathmann says that
75 "opposition from the landfill industry" is the reason no waste-to-energy facilities have
76 been built in the last 15 years in the United States.

77

78 Beck said that the article’s comment that, “advance thermal recycling turns 100 percent of
79 the waste into usable products” raises a red flag.

80

81 Hardebeck announced that Cleanscapes Inc. will deliver recycled carts to the City of
82 Shoreline next week. These carts are made from the highest percentage of post consumer
83 recycled plastic available on the market. This is the equivalent of 8.6 million plastic
84 bottles.

85

86 **Conversion Technologies Report: Draft Letter**

87 Armanini said in November SWAC was concerned about potential budget provisos
88 regarding conversion technologies. A letter was drafted, and it has gone through several
89 revisions. Since the budget contained no provisos relating to conversion technologies,
90 Armanini asked SWAC how they wanted to proceed.

91

92 Beck said that the issue appears to be moot. Kiernan said The Solid Waste Transfer and
93 Waste Management Plan (Transfer Plan) addresses the direction of the transfer system.
94 That plan has been adopted and is financially supported by the rate increase. The
95 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan) will incorporate the work
96 that was done in the Transfer Plan.

97

98 SWAC discussed the Comp Plan process, and the fact that both council and cities have to
99 approve the Comp Plan.

100

101 Mele said it makes sense to examine all available technologies, and that was done in the
102 Transfer Plan. There was no evidence to support the move to incineration technologies.
103 Her interest is in extending the life of the Cedar Hills Landfill before moving to waste
104 export. Armanini said that SWAC had reached consensus that the division should
105 continue to monitor conversion technologies while moving forward with waste export.
106 Mele asked whether SWAC should make a statement on conversion technologies to
107 council now, or when the Comp Plan moves forward. Armanini suggested that SWAC

108 should wait to see what happens with the conversion technologies report at RPC, and be
109 prepared to make a statement when RPC acts.

110

111 **Beck moved to table development of a Conversion Technology Letter and to monitor**
112 **the topic on the SWAC agenda.**

113

114 SWAC member Prentice asked who will monitor the progress of the conversion
115 technologies report at RPC. Armanini said that the division will report to SWAC and
116 added that SWAC members can watch council meetings on television and online.

117

118 *The motion passed unanimously.*

119

120 **WPR Goal Development Part I: Presentation and Discussion**

121 Division Staff Josh Marx gave a presentation entitled ‘Waste Prevention and Recycling
122 (WPR) Goal Development Part I.’ This presentation can be viewed at:

123 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SWACGoals01182008.ppt>

124

125 Mele asked why there has been more success in the residential sector than in non-
126 residential in meeting the goals. Kiernan said that the residential sector is more uniform
127 and easier to program for. The non-residential sector is heterogeneous including
128 generators as varied as schools, manufacturing, and tourism. It is harder to develop non-
129 residential programs that will have as much impact.

130

131 In response to a question, Division Staff Bill Reed said that other regions have not split
132 residential and nonresidential disposal data and goals like King County has. However,
133 staff can combine the residential and nonresidential numbers to provide a direct
134 comparison with other jurisdictions at a later time.

135

136 Armanini asked if there was any movement towards national standards for definitions of
137 recycling terms. Reed answered that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has
138 developed standards that are not widely used due to local conditions.

139

140 Armanini said that everyone is trying to do more recycling, but King County does not
141 necessarily require a numeric goal. SWAC member Richard Gelowicz said that numeric
142 goals do not always provide a direct comparison of actual recycling rates. A goal of 100
143 percent sends a great message but may not be achievable without including non
144 sustainable practices such as burning. Mele stated that a 100 percent goal changes the
145 mentality of those working towards the goal. Zero Waste of Resources is a design
146 principal that forces a different way of thinking about the problem. Armanini said that the
147 task is to craft a goal that is meaningful and still creates that mental shift.

148

149 SWAC member Joe Casalini said that it is important to balance higher goals with the
150 incremental costs required to achieve them. The lifecycle cost of an operating system is
151 geographically driven; what works in other jurisdictions may not work here.

152

153 Reed said that cost benefit analysis is an integral part of the analysis of potential program
154 options. The division will identify situations where it is more costly to increase recycling.
155 Although desirable it might not always be cost effective. Gelowicz said there must be a
156 market for the material, for example glass is heavy and helps the diversion rate but it is
157 costly and problematic to process and market. Marx said that six months ago the division
158 presented criterion for evaluating potential programs, which included economic
159 considerations. He noted that in addition to economic costs and benefits, the division has
160 a model that looks at environmental impacts and assigns them a dollar value. The
161 economic cost/benefit and environmental model will be applied to the potential waste
162 prevention and recycling packages and the results will be presented to SWAC.

163

164 SWAC discussed product stewardship framework legislation. British Columbia passed
165 one regulation which sets up a process through which producers take back and recycle
166 their products. A list of all the products covered by the regulation is updated with new
167 products every year. Producers must submit a recycling plan to the provincial
168 government, and report annually on the plans implementation.

169

170 Armanini said that there is a lot growth in the multifamily sector. The tonnage is currently
171 less than other generators, but the importance of the sector should not be minimized.

172 Mele said that it is important that newly constructed buildings be set up to be able to
173 accommodate recycling and commented on the importance of encouraging green building
174 practices.

175

176 Gelowicz said that a baseline must be set before goals can be. Whatever is included in the
177 measurement, goals need to require improvement over current performance.

178

179 Referring to the ‘Waste Generation Trends’ slide, Casalini stated that the upward trend in
180 waste generation and recycling is regional and reflects regional growth. SWAC members
181 commented that this slide should be considered in goal setting.

182

183 Prentice asked if the current Comp Plan goal captures waste reduction. Marx replied that
184 the division’s highest priority is waste reduction. In the current Comp Plan the qualitative
185 goal encompasses waste reduction. Reed said that the current Comp Plan does not have a
186 specific goal for waste generation.

187

188 Mele said that a large portion of an individuals’ environmental footprint is housing and
189 construction. Washington state’s “Beyond Waste” program includes an initiative on green
190 building that might be useful to the division. She suggested a green building goal may be
191 needed. McGilton said that renovation is 30 percent more energy efficient than new
192 construction. There must be some commitment to stop the demolition-to-landfill process.

193 Marx replied that as was discussed at the C&D presentation in December, there are
194 several policies and programs that the Comp Plan can contain to increase green building
195 practices and C&D recycling which will be presented with the packages in March.

196

197 Hardebeck said that in negotiating municipal contracts there is enormous pressure to keep
198 costs down for the customers. However, customer rates are a potential tool to motivate
199 recycling. Kiernan said that rate setting is often viewed as arithmetic, but it is a policy
200 tool, that policy makers should consider. Casalini said there comes a point where

201 increasing customer rates will no longer be effective. Reduction of consumers' waste can
202 only go so far without infrastructure change in packaging. Policy makers using rates as a
203 tool must be reasonable. Armanini said that rates are only one factor influencing
204 behavior. Reed said that the division is doing a study on 2006 data that will look at the
205 relative importance of rates together with other factors.

206

207 Prentice asked about diapers. Reed said that diapers and kitty litter are two growing
208 components of the waste stream and are problematic to deal with. Marx said that lifecycle
209 analyses that have been done by objective interests have found no clear answer to the
210 question of whether cloth or disposal diapers are better for the environment. Casalini said
211 that in the 90's his company ran a diaper recycling pilot program. There was no market
212 for the materials recovered.

213

214 SWAC member Judy Stenberg said that multifamily recycling programs should be a focus
215 in the Comp Plan. Kiernan said that another consideration is mixed use buildings that do
216 not fit into our existing category. SWAC members commented that influencing
217 multifamily rates is challenging because tenants are a migratory population, and do not
218 pay directly for disposal. Stenberg said that there may be new opportunities as the
219 population shifts towards multifamily residents. Marx said that one strategy is to work
220 with local land use and building agencies to require space for recycling in order to receive
221 a permit. Reed added that one jurisdiction requires property managers to submit recycling
222 plans.

223

224 **OPEN FORUM**

225 The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

226

227 Submitted by:

228 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff