

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC)
April 17, 2009
Meeting Minutes**

Members in Attendance

David Baker
William A. Beck
Jerry Hardebeck
Sean Kronberg
Joan McGilton
Suellen Mele
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann
Ray Schlien
Judy Stenberg
Bill Ziegler

Others in Attendance

Ann Berrysmith
Tim Crosby
Jane Gateley
Kathy Hashagen
Kevin Kiernan
Yolanda Pon
Grace Reamer
Thea Severn
Diane Yates

Action Items

Line 10-11: Approval of March Minutes

Call to Order and Introductions

SWAC Vice Chair Judy Stenberg said she would be chairing today's meeting in the absence of Chair Casalini. She noted that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Approval of March Minutes

SWAC Member William Beck suggested that the chemical formula on line 167 be deleted and replaced with nitrogen oxides. SWAC Member Suellen Mele changed line 118 to "...some rural counties than urban counties..."

SWAC Member David Baker moved approval of the March minutes. *The motion was approved by consensus.*

Updates: SWD / MSWMAC / Other

Stenberg said there will not be a MSWMAC update at this meeting since that group has not met since the last SWAC meeting.

18

19 SWD Updates

20 Stenberg noted the certificate of appreciation for former SWAC Chair Carolyn Armanini
21 and said she would pass it around the room so members could appreciate the beautiful
22 graphics. Stenberg asked the division to thank Dave Kallstrom for his great work.

23

24 Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said the division is continuing to see declines
25 in tonnage. There was an eight percent tonnage decrease in 2008 from 2007 and there has
26 been an additional four percent decrease thus far in 2009. SWD is managing to the
27 decreased revenue. The 2010 budget is being prepared based on revised tonnage
28 projections. Everything is on the table. SWD will brief advisory groups and council mid-
29 year.

30

31 Kiernan said that King County has received positive press on the landfill gas-to-energy
32 facility. The facility is fully constructed and is expected to go into commercial operation in
33 a few weeks.

34

35 In response to a question, Kiernan said that SWD recently opened bids for the construction
36 of disposal area seven at Cedar Hills. The engineers estimate for the construction was \$12
37 million. The division received two bids under \$8 million and a total of seven bids under \$9
38 million.

39

40 Kiernan said that SWD is issuing the notice to proceed for phase one construction at Bow
41 Lake. Impacts to self-haul service will most likely begin in the middle of May. In response
42 to a question, Kiernan confirmed that the division will issue a press release to inform the
43 public when details are firm.

44

45 Kiernan said the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program held a scoping work shop
46 for their plan update in Renton on April 7th. Over 40 people attended. More information is
47 available at <http://www.govlink.org/hazwaste/about/planupdate09.html> .

48

49 Kiernan said that SWD will hold a scoping meeting for the Cedar Hills Site Development
50 Plan EIS on Monday, April 20th from 4:30 – 8:00 p.m. at the Greater Maple Valley
51 Community Center. The purpose of the meeting is to receive input on the elements of the
52 environment that the public wants SWD to investigate during the environmental review of
53 the landfill development alternatives. In response to a question, Planning and
54 Communications Manager Thea Severn said that notice of the meeting had been sent to
55 addresses within two and a half miles of the landfill.

56

57 Kiernan said that a local reporter is developing a story about transfer trailer weights.
58 Occasionally, a SWD truck and trailer will carry a load that is over the permitted gross
59 vehicle weight. The permit is based on road wear, not on safety. SWD tractor trailers can
60 safely carry significantly more than the permitted weight.

61

62 Kiernan said MSWMAC has discussed potential options for host city mitigation for the
63 impacts of transfer facilities on their communities. State law provides that cities may charge
64 counties to mitigate impacts directly attributable to solid waste facilities. However, in order
65 for SWD to provide mitigation, a city must identify actual impacts and any mitigation
66 funding provided to a city must be used to address those impacts.

67

68 Kiernan directed SWAC to the transportation route map that was developed in response to
69 MSWMAC's discussion about impacts of solid waste trailers on public roads. The map
70 shows the routes SWD trucks take to and from transfer stations, and includes the number of
71 miles traveled on city streets, state highways and interstates.

72

73 Severn handed out the SWAC work plan for the balance of 2009 and early 2010. To give
74 staff time to pull the full draft of the Comp Plan together, SWD proposes to cancel the May
75 meeting and schedule a tour of the landfill and gas-to-energy facility in June. The July 17th
76 meeting will include presentations on the financial plan and the Cedar Hills Site
77 Development Plan. The August meeting will be cancelled and the September 18th agenda
78 will include a presentation on the Emergency Plan. Review of the draft Comp Plan will be
79 on the October 16th agenda, perhaps as a joint meeting with MSWMAC. If necessary, the

80 review could continue at the November 20th meeting, along with a budget presentation and
81 an update on transfer facilities. The December meeting will be cancelled and in the first
82 quarter of 2010, the committee will receive a presentation on the rate study and review
83 Comp Plan comments.

84

85 SWAC Member Suellen Mele suggested that a legislative review be added to the work plan
86 in January 2010. Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates said that the work plan does not
87 include all agenda items, just major work plan elements.

88

89 Severn said that the division expects the Comp Plan process to move more quickly from
90 draft to final than was experienced during the last plan update.

91

92 Kiernan said the committee will review the Finance chapter today. The division will
93 distribute the Environmental Stewardship chapter electronically and ask for written
94 comments. Then the Comp Plan chapter review process will be complete.

95

96 In response to a question, Kiernan said that SWD's budget is funded by user fees and is not
97 directly impacted by the budget shortfall in the county's general fund. However, the
98 division is affected indirectly through the hiring freeze and other countywide cost saving
99 measures.

100

101 Severn said the division would like to provide copies of the Annual Report to committee
102 members electronically. This would limit costs and save paper. SWAC members agreed to
103 receive the document electronically. SWAC Member Joan McGilton requested that a hard
104 copy be brought to the next meeting so members can see it.

105

106 **Comp Plan Working Chapter Review: Finance chapter and Host City Mitigation**

107 Finance chapter

108 SWAC Member Jerry Hardebeck suggested that a policy be added to encourage
109 sustainability. He said rates should be set to discourage self-haul that reflect the true cost of
110 that service. Commercial collection is more efficient and sustainable because a truck

111 already passes most houses. Additionally he suggested that the transfer system be used to
112 transfer recyclable materials from haulers. Consolidating loads for processing would reduce
113 traffic.

114

115 Mele said that the transaction fee discussed on page ten appears to conflict with FIN-6.
116 Severn replied that if implemented, the transaction fee would be based on the costs of
117 providing the transaction that are constant regardless of the amount of waste disposed and
118 would be the same at each station.

119

120 Hardebeck said that he believes rates drive behavior. He said the current rate structure does
121 not recognize that it costs more to provide service to rural areas.

122

123 Severn said that utilities such as water, sewer, electricity and solid waste have historically
124 charged the same price for services regardless of the actual cost of providing the service in
125 different locations.

126

127 Mele said that her concern is to shift people toward the most sustainable method of
128 collection, which in most cases is curbside collection. Noting that bulky items are one of
129 the main reasons people visit the transfer station, she suggested additional focus on curbside
130 pick-up of bulky items.

131

132 In response to a question, Severn said that most self-haulers are residential and that they
133 bring about 85 percent of self-haul tonnage. The remaining tonnage is from businesses. She
134 said that all customers except certified haulers are considered self-haulers. Severn noted
135 that more than 90 percent of residents subscribe to curbside service.

136

137 Stenberg asked if the division had experienced a decrease in self-hauler transactions as a
138 result of self-haulers making less frequent trips in order to save money. Severn said that
139 traffic is down but that curbside continues to be the less expensive alternative. In response
140 to a comment, Severn said that frequency of collection related to food scrap recycling is
141 discussed in the Collection and Processing chapter.

142

143 SWAC Member Sean Kronberg said that FIN-3, keeping disposal fees as low as reasonable,
144 and FIN-7, setting fees to encourage recycling, appear counter-intuitive. Kiernan said that
145 FIN-7 refers to recycling rates while FIN-3 is specifically about disposal rates.

146

147 Kiernan said that disposal fees are based on forecasted costs. The division is looking to
148 recover its costs; not to increase rates to encourage behavior changes.

149

150 Guest Tim Crosby said that for the unincorporated areas, the Washington Utilities and
151 Transportation Commission (WUTC) does not allow rates that encourage recycling, but
152 only that reflect cost of service.

153

154 Mele suggested that a paragraph be added to the section about influences on future costs
155 explaining that once producers become more engaged and take more responsibility for their
156 products, government can be less involved and associated costs to the division will
157 decrease.

158

159 Host City Mitigation

160 Severn noted that it is not clear in which Comp Plan chapter this text will be placed. In
161 response to a comment, Severn said that MSWMAC has received the document and it will
162 be discussed at their next meeting. Kiernan noted that the division is guided by RCW
163 36.58.080 as listed at the bottom of the page. Baker said that MSWMAC input may be
164 more important as mitigation appears to be more of a cities' issue. McGilton said she
165 appreciates the diversity SWAC brings to the discussion and would like to be able to report
166 SWAC's comments to MSWMAC.

167

168 Baker asked if the county and state could ask the division for mitigation regarding the use
169 of roads. Kiernan responded that the division paid for widening Cedar Grove Road for
170 improved access to the Cedar Hills Landfill. Other than that, the amount of traffic on any
171 county or state road attributable to the division is not a significant percentage of the total

172 traffic on the road. It would be difficult to establish the need for mitigation directly
173 attributable to the division. Severn noted that the division pays fuel taxes that support roads.

174

175 McGilton asked about the status of the Governance Report proposal to change state law in
176 order to allow the division to redirect the Business and Occupation taxes it pays from the
177 state to the host cities. Kiernan responded that the proposal has not moved forward given
178 the state's current budget crisis.

179

180 Kiernan discussed the mitigation provided by the division at the stations, which includes the
181 litter crew. He said that there is also a benefit to cities that host a transfer station as it results
182 in their hauler traveling a shorter distance to unload their collection vehicles, which should
183 be reflected in lower collection rates.

184

185 In response to a question about the design of the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer
186 Station, Kiernan said that the division has purchased two properties adjacent to the current
187 station. The property allows the new station to be built entirely at the lower elevation and
188 avoids developing the Eastgate property. The division hopes to surplus the 14 acre property
189 along Interstate 90.

190

191 **Open Forum**

192 SWAC Member Ray Schlien asked for information about the construction schedules for
193 Houghton and Factoria. Kiernan replied that the designs for Houghton and Factoria are not
194 yet complete, but the division anticipates construction at Houghton will begin in the 4th
195 quarter of 2009 and will continue into 2010. Construction is expected to take approximately
196 six months. Construction at Factoria is anticipated to begin in 2012 and last approximately
197 two years. Severn said the division will explore opportunities to provide some level of
198 service at Factoria during construction.

199

200 Hardebeck said he has sensed frustration over the years that city collection contracts aren't
201 on the same timetable and that consistent services are not provided from city to city. He
202 suggested the division could encourage cities to move towards sustainability by creating a

203 certification program patterned after the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
204 (LEED) program.

205

206 **Adjourn**

207 The next meeting is scheduled for July 17th.

208 The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

209

210 Submitted by:

211 Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff