

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
November 15, 2013 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.  
King Street Center 7th Floor Conference Room 7044-7045**

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>King County Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
April Atwood	Kris Beatty	Signe Gilson
Jerry Bartlett	Jeff Gaisford	Aaron Lawhead
Bill Beck	Kathy Hashagen	Larry LeSueur
Elly Bunzendahl	Laila McClinton	Megan McCain
Joe Casalini	Pat McLaughlin	
Jean Garber	Jim Neely	
Steve Gerritson	Thea Severn	
Kim Kaminski		
Keith Livingston		
Jose Lugo		
Joan McGilton		
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann		
Stephen Strader		
Bill Ziegler		

**Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

The October minutes were approved as written. There were no changes to the agenda.

**Updates**

SWD

[Ordinance 17677](#) authorized the Executive to sign the Amended and Restated ILAs. Five of the 37 cities in the system chose not to sign the Amended and Restated ILA. The ordinance instructed the division to begin discussions between the county and those cities that will be signatories to the ILA to address matters that may arise in the near future and could require amendments to the ILA. Discussion issues include latecomer provisions, the possibility of differential rates, potential alternative financing for future capital investments and more. This will impact the draft work plan for the committee.

The division is continuing work on the Transfer System Plan Review.

MSWMAC

MSWMAC discussed the ILAs and the Transfer System Plan Review and received the presentation on Construction and Demolition (C&D) debris.

## **Construction and Demolition Debris Management**

Prior to beginning the presentation, both Casalini and Kaminski recused themselves from discussion or voting on the topic. According to the King County Ethics Office they can remain in the room but not participate due to possible conflicts of interest.

SWAC received a [presentation](#) about proposed actions following expiration in 2014 of the existing contracts that manage Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris. The contracts were written some time ago and their primary purpose was to identify disposal options rather than being focused on recycling.

The division reviewed options and identified approaches.

- **No action** – violates ILA requirements
- **Add C&D to SWD system** – though there is a short term financial benefit this would result in earlier landfill closure
- **Issue new RFP and negotiate contracts** – as a result of the Carbone decision, reissuing RFPs may result in legal difficulties
- **Designate qualified facilities** – Allows any qualified company to sign an agreement to manage C&D and is consistent with the City of Seattle’s process for C&D disposal

SWD recommends that the division move forward with designating qualified facilities through certification/agreements that cover recycling expectations, fees, environmental liability and other conditions. This would also have the benefit of creating a common framework for handling C&D throughout the County. Facilities that handle single stream recycling would be outside of this system.

Comments included:

- Disposal of residue would be defined in the agreement and landfill or other disposal facility would be required to comply with regulations.
- Designated facilities would not be required to be located in King County.
- Agreements could be revised if there is no market for particular materials.
- Consider how markets for the materials could be created.
- The division would not have as much direct control over the system using this agreement.
- The City of Seattle will not begin certifying designated facilities until 2014. As a result, there is no local history to review though a similar system has been in place for some time in Portland or Lewis County.
- Consider a one to two year extension of existing contracts to see what can be learned from Seattle’s experience before implementation.
- Currently, 180k tons of C&D are disposed through contracted sources and 100k tons are disposed through the division’s transfer system. The 70 percent recycling goal does not include C&D.
- The fees received would cover the costs of increased enforcement.
- Increasing consistency across the region c/would increase recycling and make it more important for buildings to be designed for deconstruction.
- Consider increasing the focus on avoidance so materials do not need to enter the waste stream.

- Consider requiring recycling in building codes.

SWAC passed the following motion; 9 in favor and 3 opposed.

SWAC supports Solid Waste Division development of the designated facility option, pending but not limited to the findings of the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study, with priority placed on reduction of C&D waste, increased recycling, and development of markets for these materials.

### **Draft Transfer Plan Review Report**

SWAC received an update about the [Draft Transfer System Plan Review Report](#).

The comment period for the report has been extended to February 3<sup>rd</sup>. SWAC members were encouraged to send written comments as soon as possible. Comments have already been received from four SWAC members. In addition to interested citizens, seventeen cities also responded and ten of them supported the base plan. There appears to be a segment of the population concerned about how waste from the northeast portion of the County should be handled.

### **Carpet Recycling Presentation**

SWAC received a [presentation](#) about carpet recycling. About 23,000 tons of post-consumer carpet was disposed in 2012. Seventy percent of that carpet is constructed of nylon and are recyclable. There are few markets for materials such as polypropylene and calcium carbonate from carpets. However, carpets made from recycled bottles (PET) cannot be recycled because it is not economically feasible.

Several states are pursuing product stewardship legislation to force carpet manufacturers to be responsible for the materials they create but the industry is strenuously resisting. The division is also working to help contractors and haulers to deliver carpet free of contamination for recycling. The carpet removal field guide provides easy to use information for contractors. The guide shows how to keep the carpets suitable for recycling rather than disposal. Currently there is no data showing how much of carpet brought to recyclers is contaminated.

### **SWAC Member Presentation: WISErg Technology**

After being reminded of the committee's process to allow informational presentations, SWAC received information about [WISErg's hybrid technology](#). Anaerobic digesters called harvesters are placed near grocery stores and restaurants to receive their organic waste. The system creates energy and liquid fertilizer from the waste. It also provides the businesses with daily information about what is disposed to inform their ordering and management practices. In February, there will be a SWANA presentation on this topic in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor conference room of the King Street Center.

Comments included:

- Food which is still consumable could be sent to Food Lifeline rather than disposal.
- To be an economic success, a harvester requires an ongoing and reliable source for organic material. Placing a digester in a multi-family neighborhood could be economically challenging. For the meantime, WISErg will focus on providing this service to restaurants, grocery stores and other businesses with organic wastes.

### **Waste Conversion Technology: Mechanical Biological Treatment**

SWAC received a third [presentation](#) about Waste Conversion Technology: Mechanical Biological Treatment. Mechanical Biological Treatment is a term used in Europe and the United Kingdom for a system that integrates several mechanical processes with a biological process such as anaerobic digestion. More detailed information is available in the links placed throughout the PowerPoint presentation.

### **Open Forum**

There were open forum comments.