

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)  
June 20, 2008**

**Meeting Minutes**

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini  
William Beck  
Joe Casalini  
Bob Dixon  
Suellen Mele  
Ray Schlienz  
Relaena Sindelar  
Joe Tessier  
Dave Whitley

Others in Attendance

Gemma Alexander  
Sharon Hlavka  
Kevin Kiernan  
Sean Kronberg  
Yolanda Pon  
Thea Severn  
Diane Yates  
Bill Ziegler

Action Items

**Lines 85-86: Approval of May minutes.**

**Call to Order and Introductions**

SWAC Chair Carolyn Armanini called the meeting to order.  
Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

**Approval of May Minutes**

Approval of the minutes was postponed until a quorum was present.

**Updates: SWD / MSWMAC / Other**

SWD Updates

Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that he and SWAC member Suellen Mele attended a meeting of the Beyond Waste Implementation Working Group of the state's Climate Action Team. This diverse group has identified eight tasks for completion in September. Mele added that the group has already been working for over a year. There was clear recognition that life cycle analyses show greatest greenhouse gas impacts upstream of garbage disposal. This has resulted in a focus on waste prevention.

In the first two weeks that Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station has operated with expanded recycling services, 90 televisions have been collected. Large quantities of other materials have also been collected, so there is a clear need for the service. Computer

20 monitors are not accepted for recycling because there are other options available in the  
21 Shoreline area, and the division does not want to compete with its Take It Back Network  
22 partners.

23

24 Armanini presented a handout on Costco's new electronics recycling program. Although it  
25 is not being widely promoted, the program accepts a wide range of materials, pays for  
26 shipping, and offers a rebate for some electronics.

27

28 On June 11 the Regional Policy Committee approved the Ordinance 14971 Business Plan.  
29 The Business Plan is scheduled to go before the Utilities Committee on June 24. The waste  
30 prevention and recycling (WPR) presentation that was scheduled for RPC on June 11 was  
31 not heard, and will be on the next agenda. SWAC applicants, Bob Dixon and Mike Pearia  
32 are scheduled for their interviews before the Utilities and Parks Committee on June 24th.

33

34 The division's test of a potential mattress recycling technology at Cedar Hills Landfill  
35 proved unsuccessful. Wires in the mattresses got caught in the machinery, and the machine  
36 did not provide good separation of materials. The overall throughput of the system was too  
37 low to process the quantity of mattresses necessary.

38

39 Kiernan pointed out the new compostables bin in the conference room. King Street Center  
40 has recently begun collecting compostable paper and food waste.

41

42 Division staff attended a meeting of the Mercer Island Utilities Board to provide an update  
43 on the Comp Plan. Staff will be briefing the Duvall City Council and the Four Creeks  
44 Unincorporated Area Council in July. Division staff are available to present to any group at  
45 SWAC members' suggestion.

46

47 Thea Severn, who has been serving as the Interim Lead Planner, has been hired as the  
48 Planning and Communications Manager.

49

50 SWAC member Bill Beck said that he recently attended a tour of the Cedar Hills Landfill  
51 and encourages anyone who hasn't seen the landfill recently to do so. Anyone who is  
52 interested can call Intergovernmental Liaison, Diane Yates, to schedule a tour.

53

#### 54 MSWMAC Update

55 Armanini reported that she has resigned from MSWMAC and Lake Forest Park has  
56 appointed a new representative. At their last meeting, MSWMAC passed a motion  
57 encouraging the division to include the following issues in the WPR chapter of the Comp  
58 Plan: (1) ensuring that WPR goals are measurable and achievable during the planning  
59 period; (2) the need to collect appropriate data to guide WPR efforts; and (3) flexibility for  
60 cities to tailor programs to meet WPR goals, including alternatives to bans countywide.

61

62 In response to a question, Kiernan said there is a range of positions among cities regarding  
63 bans. Some cities oppose bans while others advocate for early implementation of bans.  
64 Severn added that cities are concerned about what is achievable and need to focus efforts  
65 where there is more potential for improvement. For example, cities having a primarily  
66 single family residential population don't want to focus on business programs. MSWMAC  
67 members also recognize that the major effort involved in a ban comes upfront in the  
68 development of infrastructure and education programs, which must be timed as each city's  
69 contract comes up for renegotiation. The actual implementation and enforcement of a ban  
70 may be a less significant effort

71

72 Dixon asked if there has been any attempt to make the contracts more uniform. Kiernan  
73 replied that the Comp Plan will include collection standards, and there has been a lot of  
74 discussion about standards among the cities.

75

#### 76 Cedar Hills Capacity

77 Severn said that after the presentation on Cedar Hills' capacity last month, there was no  
78 time left for questions. She asked members if they had any comments or questions now.

79

80 Sindelar asked how the division tracks the numbers that influence Cedar Hills' closure date.  
81 Severn replied that the closure date is forecast based on the permitted space remaining, the  
82 density of the waste, which is influenced by compaction, settlement and operating  
83 procedures, and the tonnage of waste coming in. Kiernan added that this year's tonnage is  
84 down approximately six percent, which will affect the forecast.

85

86 **Noting a quorum had been reached, Armanini moved approval of the May minutes.**

87 *The minutes were approved unanimously.*

88

89 Casalini commented that tonnage also finances the system, and asked how services would  
90 be financed if Zero Waste goals are achieved. Mele replied that Washington's Beyond  
91 Waste plan has a section on finance, which addresses the question of how to finance solid  
92 waste services without disincentivizing recycling. Armanini added that reduced  
93 consumption affects all public services, which are funded through B&O and other taxes.

94

95 In response to a question, Severn said the Cedar Hills Operating Plan is expected to be  
96 completed next summer. Kiernan added that the plan will require a SEPA process,  
97 including public comment and review. The council's final approval of the revised plan will  
98 constitute a decision on Cedar Hills operations.

99

#### 100 **Disposal Options Criteria**

101 Severn's presentation is available at:

102 [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CH\\_Disposal\\_Criteria\\_SWAC\\_ppt\\_062008.pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CH_Disposal_Criteria_SWAC_ppt_062008.pdf)

103

104 Armanini asked what the value is in spending time on disposal options now, when the  
105 decision is so far in the future. Severn said the division wants to identify the broad criteria  
106 categories now in order to prepare for possible partial early diversion from Cedar Hills.  
107 Ideally, the evaluation criteria should be the same for disposal options before and after  
108 Cedar Hills closes. Also, by identifying its priorities early, the division will allow the  
109 private sector sufficient lead time to position for competition when Cedar Hills closes. She  
110 added that it is noteworthy how many pilot projects to develop new disposal technologies

111 are being implemented around the country. There is a lot for the division to track, and these  
112 criteria will help the division evaluate new technologies as they are developed.

113

114 In response to a question, Severn said these framework criteria will be included in the  
115 disposal chapter of the Comp Plan. When the time comes to make a decision about  
116 disposal, the criteria will be developed more fully.

117

118 SchlienZ asked how nonquantifiable items will be weighted. Kiernan replied that it is a  
119 challenge to measure considerations such as social equity or contract flexibility, and these  
120 issues will require discussion throughout the decision making process.

121

122 Mele asked that compatibility with recycling be included as an environmental criterion as  
123 well as in its current location. Armanini said she sees no problem with repetition within the  
124 plan, because some topics are relevant in more than one place.

125

126 Severn said that the approach of looking at many technologies that deal with specific  
127 segments of the waste stream is a new one. In the past, there was an assumption that one  
128 disposal method would be selected for the entire waste stream.

129

### 130 **Financial Policies**

131 Severn's presentation is available here:

132 [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Financial\\_Policies\\_1\\_SWAC\\_ppt\\_062008.pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Financial_Policies_1_SWAC_ppt_062008.pdf)

133

134 SchlienZ asked about the purpose of the grants. The grants, which have been in place for  
135 about 18 years, are used to fund waste prevention and recycling (WPR) education programs  
136 and special recycling events. In the 1980's, money was collected for an incinerator reserve  
137 fund. When plans for an incinerator were halted, the approximately \$20 million in the fund  
138 was reallocated between a fund to remediate abandoned landfills such as Houghton, and a  
139 fund for recycling grants. Very little of the original recycling grant fund remains today, and  
140 this year the division has proposed moving the remainder to fund construction.

141

142 Yates added that there are three funding sources for recycling: Washington State  
143 Department of Ecology's Coordinated Prevention Grant, the Solid Waste Division's Waste  
144 Reduction and Recycling Grant and Local Hazardous Waste Management Program  
145 (LHWMP) funds. Curbside garbage bills as well as transfer station charges include an  
146 LHWMP fee.

147

148 Kiernan said the division is an enterprise fund, which means that it collects rates from the  
149 system's users and spends that money on the system. The division maintains an operating  
150 fund and reserve funds. Area Seven of the landfill was built using reserve funds, so there  
151 was no debt. Other reserve funds include an environmental reserve fund, which pays for  
152 environmental protection systems, a post-closure maintenance fund and a capital equipment  
153 recovery fund, which is used to purchase replacement equipment such as bulldozers and  
154 other large machinery. Some, but not all, of these funds are required by law. All of the  
155 funds are established in King County code for specific purposes. The division has long  
156 taken a fiscally conservative approach and has been criticized for maintaining large  
157 reserves. This conservative tradition began under former division director Rod Hanson.

158

159 In response to a question, Kiernan said that Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station was  
160 partially debt funded. The general rule used by the division is to only debt fund projects  
161 that will outlast their financing.

162

163 Armanini suggested changing the language of the first proposed policy to, "The Basic Fee  
164 shall be as low as *reasonable*, while covering all costs of effectively managing the system  
165 and providing service to customers."

166

167 Armanini said that as an enterprise fund, it is implicit in state law that assets of the division  
168 should be used exclusively for the benefit of the system. She said that especially with the  
169 county's general fund shrinking, now is a good time to state it explicitly as a policy. She  
170 asked how that policy would be enforced.

171

172 Kiernan replied it is the responsibility of the Executive and compliance may be monitored  
173 by the state auditor. The division is currently scheduled for a state audit, and will update  
174 SWAC when it takes place.

175

176 Severn said another proposed policy is the full reimbursement to the division for the  
177 transfer of any of its assets.

178

179 Severn said one policy question that should be addressed is whether recycling fees should  
180 be based on cost of service or should be set to encourage recycling over disposal as long as  
181 there is a net benefit to recycling that material.

182

183 In response to a question, Kiernan said the division is studying how to identify and measure  
184 recycling costs. For example, Shoreline has higher staffing levels than disposal tonnage  
185 would demand because of the extra recycling services provided.

186

187 Armanini commented that that is really a self haul issue.

188

189 Kiernan said that the division has discussed internally, and with the hauler servicing the  
190 City of Shoreline, the question of whether commercially collected organics should be  
191 consolidated at the transfer stations rather than hauled directly to composting facilities. The  
192 logic that led to the development of a garbage transfer system in the first place could be  
193 applied to commercially collected recyclables as well.

194

195 Mele commented that she is grateful to the division for setting recycling fees that do not  
196 undercut the Take It Back Network partners. She said it is complicated to balance between  
197 incentivizing recycling with low rates and supporting private sector efforts to recycle.

198

199 Kiernan said another consideration is whether to charge a transaction fee to self haulers.  
200 Armanini suggested this could be a programmatic response to the umbrella policy stating  
201 that the user pays for service.

202

203 **OPEN FORUM**

204 Armanini noted that there was only one agenda item for the July meeting, which could be  
205 discussed in August. Draft Comp Plan chapters are also scheduled for preliminary review  
206 in August, but will not be ready for the July meeting.

207

208 Noting that there was no longer a quorum, Armanini said SWAC could not move to cancel  
209 the July meeting. Armanini said SWAC will expect to cancel its July meeting. Yates will  
210 email absent members and then send an official cancellation notice if there is no objection.

211

212 Dixon asked about the code requiring public art, saying that the text is unclear. Severn  
213 agreed, saying that historically, transfer stations have been included but landfill  
214 construction has not. Kiernan added that the division does not simply contribute funds to  
215 the county, but uses its one percent for art at solid waste sites, often with a focus on  
216 recycling education.

217

218 The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

219

220 Submitted by:

221 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff