

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
January 16, 2009
Meeting Minutes**

Members in Attendance

William A. Beck
Joe Casalini
Bob Dixon
Richard Gelowicz
Mike Pearia
Ray Schlien
Relaena Sindelar

Others in Attendance

Jeff Gaisford
Jane Gateley
Jerry Hardebeck
Kathy Hashagen
Kevin Kiernan
Victor Okereke
Yolanda Pon
Grace Reamer
Thea Severn
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann
Jay Watson
Taisa Welhasch
Diane Yates
Bill Ziegler

Action Items

There was not a quorum at this meeting so no formal action was taken.

Call to Order and Introductions

Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates noted that a quorum was not present. SWAC Vice Chair Joe Casalini called the meeting to order at 9:43 a.m. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Casalini said that he had attended the King County Council's reception honoring King County Boards and Commissions in December where the work of the county's volunteer committees, including SWAC, was acknowledged.

Approval of November Minutes

The December SWAC meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather conditions. Because there is not a quorum at today's meeting, official action cannot be taken on the November meeting minutes. SWAC Member William A. Beck suggested that line 39 of the meeting minutes be changed to "responsive and responsible bidder."

16 **Local Hazardous Waste Management Plan Update**

17 Program Administrator of the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)
18 Jay Watson introduced himself and discussed the proposed process for updating the
19 LHWMP Comprehensive Plan.

20
21 LHWMP is an intergovernmental program created in response to a Washington State statute
22 enacted in 1990. The law requires that local governments prepare a hazardous waste
23 management plan. LHWMP developed a single plan for all of the members of the program
24 in King County. Program partners include Seattle Public Utilities, Public Health - Seattle
25 and King County, the cities, King County Water and Lands Resources Division and King
26 County Solid Waste Division. Jeff Gaisford is the current chair of the Program's
27 Management Coordinating Committee. Program funding is derived from a portion of sewer
28 and solid waste fees from residences and businesses throughout King County. Revenues
29 from businesses and households are tracked separately.

30
31 Watson said his attendance at today's SWAC meeting is a part of the first phase of the
32 LHWMP Plan Update Process. This phase is presenting the proposed Plan update process
33 to all those who might be interested. The most recent LHWMP Plan was written in 1997.
34 In the first and second quarters of 2009 there will be a series of workshops designed to
35 identify major issues in the Plan update. One new issue is the need for emergency planning
36 as evidenced by the recent flooding in Pacific and Snoqualmie. Another issue is the need to
37 improve household hazardous waste collection in South King County. The hope is that the
38 series of workshops will be well attended by those who have an interest in the issue. A
39 separate outreach effort is being planned for the general public, beyond the workshops, that
40 will provide a convenient and accessible means of following the Plan update process and
41 commenting on it. More information about the update process is available at:

42 [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Proposed%20LHWMP%20Plan%20Update%20Processv2%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Proposed%20LHWMP%20Plan%20Update%20Processv2%20(2).pdf)
43

44
45 In response to a question, Watson noted that currently all business are charged the same
46 amount regardless of their size. He acknowledged that the concern about fee equity is valid

47 but the challenge is to balance equity with efficiency and administrative feasibility in the
48 collection of those fees, because LHWMP's fees come from a number of jurisdictions and
49 sources – sewer as well as solid waste.. He said that LHWMP is in the process of looking at
50 consultants to help review the billing processes for greater equity opportunities. Guest
51 Jerry Hardebeck suggested that the fee structure consider volume noting that commercial
52 haulers collect volume information.

53
54 In response to a question, Watson noted that the delivery of HHW to collection sites is
55 seasonal and sporadic. Materials are retained by citizens until it is time to clean out garages
56 or basements. Additionally, which products are determined to be hazardous changes when
57 manufacturers change their formulations of those products as was the case with latex paint.

58
59 Guest Taisa Welhasch noted that the Department of Ecology prepares an annual report
60 tracking trends in how much HHW is generated. The report is available at
61 <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/pubs/0707048.pdf>. The information about moderate risk waste
62 (HHW and CESQG waste) is in Chapter 6, (pages 107-123). The moderate risk waste
63 collections trends are outlined in pages 111-113.

64
65 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford noted that LHWMP goals
66 include working “upstream” with manufacturers to help them avoid creating materials that
67 would be considered HHW and to include handling and other instructions on the packaging.

68
69 More information about LWHMP is available at:

70 [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/LHWMP%20Program%20Flyer%20v3%20\(2\).](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/LHWMP%20Program%20Flyer%20v3%20(2).pdf)
71 [pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/LHWMP%20Program%20Flyer%20v3%20(2).pdf)

72
73 **Updates: SWD / MSWMAC / Other**

74 **SWD Updates**

75 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said that the Solid Waste Division's Green
76 Tools program is a semi-finalist for a \$100,000 grant for Innovations in American
77 Government from the Harvard/Kennedy School's Ash Institute for Democratic Governance.

78

79 The Solid Waste Division is now using tippers at Cedar Hills. This process empties trailers
80 more quickly. Cycle time is from 6-8 minutes as opposed to 20 minutes when using
81 walking floors. This technology has also reduced near term maintenance costs and
82 eliminated stuck loads.

83

84 The 2009 Budget has been adopted. There are two provisos affecting the Solid Waste
85 Division. The first is related to funds for landfill post closure maintenance. The second is
86 related to interlocal agreements with the cities.

87

88 The December snow storms presented a challenge to some of the division's operations. The
89 road conditions impacted the division's ability to move transfer trailers between the stations
90 and the landfill. A number of transfer trailers operating on Christmas Eve had to be towed
91 to the landfill.

92

93 Previous consulting studies reviewing roof structures at older transfer stations
94 recommended that the Houghton and Factoria be closed for safety when 6 inches of snow
95 accumulated on the ground. As a result of the storms, the Factoria station was closed for
96 three days and the Houghton station was closed for more than a week. Other stations were
97 open on normal schedules, though some closed early when commercial collection was
98 suspended.

99

100 Once the streets were passable there was a surge of garbage to the transfer stations. In
101 response to hauler requests, the division extended hours at Houghton, Factoria, Renton and
102 Cedar Hills to handle the solid waste backed up in the system. SWAC Member Richard
103 Gelowicz noted that recycling centers are still processing the backlog from the storms.

104

105 Then the rains came and flooding ensued. Soon afterward the cities of Snoqualmie, Pacific,
106 and North Bend began placing containers for flood debris. The division waived disposal
107 fees on the 439 tons of waste that were received in those containers. The Solid Waste
108 Division will place containers in cities that were most greatly impacted by the flooding the

109 weekend of January 16th. The cities receiving containers are Carnation, Duvall, Issaquah,
110 North Bend, Pacific and Snoqualmie. The Division will pay for transportation and disposal
111 of the flood debris collected. Unlike previous emergencies, the Division will not waive fees
112 on debris brought to transfer stations by self haulers. A possible exception may be citizens
113 living near the Cedar River. SWD continues to gather information to help with that
114 decision.

115

116 The Solid Waste Division is considering entering into on-call contracts with commercial
117 haulers and recyclers. Those contracts would allow the division to respond more quickly in
118 future emergency response situations.

119

120 **Landfill Gas-to-Energy Project:**

121 The landfill gas facility is being tested in phases. The first phase of testing began this
122 month. The facility is anticipated to be operational in the first quarter with a ribbon cutting
123 event in March.

124

125 **Utility Audits:**

126 The utility audit is progressing. Preliminary findings are due the end of January or early in
127 February. The audit focused on the following areas:

- 128 • Leachate management
- 129 • Overhead
- 130 • Overtime
- 131 • Rent on Cedar Hills Landfill
- 132 • Fleet management system

133 The firm of Ernst and Young is conducting the audit, per Initiative 900, under contract to
134 the State of Washington. The findings will be discussed at SWAC when they have been
135 released by the State. The discussion may occur as early as March or April.

136

137 In response to SWAC member Ray Schlien's questions, Kiernan said a Request for Proposal
138 (RFP) will be advertised soon for a consultant to work on the siting process for two new
139 transfer stations. The division has a short list of 3 consultants to interview for the Factoria

140 Transfer Station project. The division is planning to begin the Houghton Safety and
141 Mitigation Project next fall.

142

143 SWAC member Mike Pearia asked about the impacts of reduced waste volumes on
144 revenues. Kiernan said that 2008 tonnage was down 8 percent. The division forecast the
145 same reduced tonnage levels for 2009. To compensate for the reduced tonnage, Kiernan
146 said the division will be looking at some reductions in hours for regular part time staff who
147 work in operations. However, the tonnage decline is somewhat offset by the drop in diesel
148 prices. The Division has benefitted from the current economic situation by receiving the
149 lower than anticipated bids for the Bow Lake Transfer Station project. The engineering
150 estimate for that project was estimated to be about \$14 million, but bids came in around \$8
151 million.

152

153 Yates asked that SWAC members complete the annual financial disclosure forms provided
154 today.

155

156 MSWMAC Update

157 Kiernan reported that MSWMAC provided comments on the Disposal chapter of the comp
158 plan at their last meeting. Their minutes are available with the rest of the materials for
159 today's meeting if SWAC members wish to review MSWMAC's comments.

160

161 Membership

162 Yates noted that the King County Code specifies that SWAC may have up to 20 members.
163 Individuals are appointed to SWAC by the Executive. The appointments of Sean
164 Krohnberg, Bill Ziegler and Jerry Hardebeck are pending. The reappointments of Bob
165 Dixon, Joan McGilton, Max L. Pope, and David Baker are also pending. Mike Pearia has
166 been appointed though he is awaiting a confirmation interview.

167

168 Those positions, combined with the members already in place, leave two positions open.
169 The first is a position for a manufacturer located in King County. Despite recruitment

170 efforts, no one has applied for that position. The final position is for a representative of the
171 Waste Management Industry.

172

173 Kiernan informed members that King County Councilmember Lambert has nominated
174 Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann to the Waste Management Industry position. This method of
175 nomination is allowed by county code and executive policy and is normal practice for most
176 committees, though it is unusual for SWAC.

177

178 **Comp Plan Working Chapter Review: Disposal**

179 Kiernan noted that this chapter of the plan addresses only topics related to disposal. Other
180 important topics will be covered in other chapters of the plan.

181

182 The draft disposal chapter discusses options to extend the lifespan of the Cedar Hills
183 Landfill including increased waste prevention and recycling and partial early waste
184 diversion. This draft of the disposal chapter also includes a range of alternatives for
185 managing and developing the Cedar Hills Landfill in the future which are explored in more
186 detail in the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan.

187

188 The Cedar Hills Site Development Plan is the blueprint for managing the landfill. An
189 update to the Site Development Plan is moving forward in a parallel process that will
190 include environmental review and public comment. The recommendation of which landfill
191 management and development alternative to pursue will be part of the Site Development
192 Plan process. That recommendation, instead of alternatives listed in this document, will
193 appear in the final draft of the comp plan disposal chapter. SWAC will have the opportunity
194 to discuss the alternatives, including costs and benefits that are part of the Site
195 Development Plan process.

196

197 Kiernan said that there has been a change in approach since the most recent comp plan
198 update was approved. Previously, the plan focused on filling the landfill and moving on to
199 other disposal options. Now, the focus has changed to extending the life of Cedar Hills.

200

201 Despite recommendations from external consultants received during the Solid Waste
202 Transfer and Waste Management Plan process, the division is not recommending disposal
203 within the 1000 foot buffer as a method of extending landfill life. Disposal in that area
204 would have significant unavoidable environmental impact for neighbors, would impact
205 wildlife habitat and the steep slopes would result in significant operational challenges.

206

207 In response to a question, Kiernan noted that if the 8 percent decrease in tonnage received
208 at Cedar Hills as a result of the recession continues it will add to the life of the landfill.

209

210 Engineering Services Section Manager Victor Okereke commented that landfill capacity
211 forecasting is conservative and is based on historical data. In response to a question,
212 Okereke said that the division plans for 1300 pounds of waste to be disposed in each cubic
213 yard though actual density approaches 1400 pounds. Kiernan noted that conservative
214 estimates are a responsible choice when the timeframe for response is so long. Building a
215 new disposal cell requires about eight years from the time a decision is made until the cell
216 is ready to accept waste.

217

218 Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn noted that the comp plan will include
219 a glossary. Additionally, the division continues to experiment with various presentation
220 methods. The final draft of the comp plan will go through a formalized process including an
221 EIS. The document will be posted on the website for public comment. Copies will also be
222 placed in public libraries. The division will offer to brief cities and unincorporated area
223 councils when the completed draft is ready for review.

224

225 SWAC members may provide comment on the disposal chapter to Yates via email through
226 January 31st. SWAC will see the revised chapter when the draft of the entire plan is
227 distributed.

228

229 In response to a comment Severn noted that the amount of recycled materials collected at
230 the transfer stations are weighed when they arrive at the recycler.

231

232 **Open Forum**

233 There were no comments during open forum.

234

235 **Adjourn**

236 The next meeting is scheduled for February 20th. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

237

238 Submitted by:

239 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff