

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee
August 15, 2014 - 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>
Jerry Bartlett	Linda Bremer	Doreen Booth
Bill Beck	Mendy Droke	Jamie Clegg
Joe Casalini	Jeff Gaisford	Dwight Miller
Jean Garber	Kathy Hashagen	Gretchen Newman
Steve Gerritson	Beth Humphreys	Rob Van Orsow
Stacia Jenkins	Kevin Kiernan	Taisa Welhasch
Kim Kaminski	Annalisa Kimble	
Keith Livingston	Ross Marzolf	
Jose Lugo	Laila McClinton	
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann	Pat McLaughlin	
	Thea Severn	
	Diane Yates	

Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda

The May minutes were approved with the following revision. The Open Forum section was revised to read as follows.

Referencing an [EPA study](#), Schmidt-Pathmann said ten times more energy can be gained from burning waste that can be gathered from a landfill gas to energy plant. He also said that methane is thirty two to thirty five times more potent than carbon dioxide in terms of greenhouse gas effects. Other members disagreed.

The attendance for the June minutes was revised to show that Gerritson was not in attendance. The June minutes were approved as revised.

The Joint MSWMAC/SWAC meeting notes were approved as written.

Updates

SWD

On July 18, four members of SWAC and fourteen members of MSWMAC together with Deanna Dawson, the Executive Director of Sound Cities Association, toured the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and the adjacent Cedar Grove Composting facility. The division distributed a [fact sheet](#) about the landfill at the event.

The Cedar Hills fact sheet included the new projected date when the landfill is expected to reach capacity. The primary reason for the newly calculated date of 2030 is projected tonnage which is significantly influenced by the assumption that recycling will increase by one percent per year until it reaches 70%. The revised date also reflects changes in tonnage from the great

recession, new methods of compaction and other operational changes at the landfill, and revised settlement projections. The revised date is based on the current site development plan.

In 2013 the division received approximately \$1M for sale of landfill gas to BioEnergy Washington (BEW). For that same time period the division received \$1.2M from Puget Sound Energy for its portion of the value of carbon credits associated with the sale of power from the BEW plant.

The division borrowed \$17M (at 3.15%) that will finance construction of the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station over the next year. In addition, \$10M of outstanding bonds from 2007 was refinanced which will lower future annual debt service by \$70K per year through 2020 and by \$84K per year from 2021 to 2024.

Material recovery at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station continued to grow in June. Metal and wood recovery both surpassed the goal. Overall, the monthly goal of 235 tons was exceeded by 16 tons. The division plans to extend the pilot to other stations.

The division began its second year of partnership with community educators, the facilitadores de Reciclaje (facilitators or educators of recycling), and local Hispanic media with a tour of the Cedar Hills landfill. The group will tour the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station in late August.

The division is beginning the construction process at the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station. The City of Bellevue is assisting with communications with the public which will include door-to-door contact with facility neighbors.

MSWMAC

SWAC and MSWMAC Liaison Stacia Jenkins gave the MSWMAC update. MSWMAC had a similar agenda to SWACs. MSWMAC made a motion to show support of the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study.

Case for Change

The committee received a [presentation](#) about the need for change in the division. Members appeared generally in favor of the concepts. Comments included:

- The 70% recycling rate is included in tonnage projections and assumes a one percent increase in recycling every year until the 70% rate has been achieved.
- A member said that not all of the materials collected for recycling are actually recycled. He said landfills are not safe and will cost money for mitigation in the future. Making landfilling more expensive should be one of the goals otherwise recycling won't survive because it does not compete economically.
- Reviewing renewable energy options will be considered as part of the business planning process.
- A member said that they recycle both because it's the right thing to do and makes them feel good, and because it saves them money. Recycling at transfer stations doesn't have to be free. The division responded that it intends to explore the cost of services as part of its future rate study.

- A significant part of reaching the 70% recycling goal is beyond the full control of the division and will require policy decisions and collaboration with cities, haulers and other partners.
- A member noted that more emphasis on creating local markets for recyclable materials would be valuable as it reduces transportation related greenhouse gases and avoids exporting problems.
- The multifamily recycling rate is low because of lack of convenience, the difficulty of providing education because the population is more transient, and the fact that there are no direct financial incentives for increased recycling for that population. The key is to determine how to help people to accept and begin to practice changes in behavior.

Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study

Yates distributed [Advisory Opinion 1081](#) of the King County Board of Ethics regarding Conflict of Interest in Decision Making and reminded SWAC members that members are required to disclose potential conflicts of interest to the Division Director. Also they are required to disclose the potential conflict at a SWAC meeting and recuse themselves from discussion of the related topic.

Casalini, Lugo, Bartlett, Schmidt-Pathmann, and Kaminski disclosed potential conflicts of interest at the meeting and recused themselves from discussion of the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study (SSWMS). Yates asked that they send an email with that information to Pat.McLaughlin@KingCounty.gov and copy Diane.Yates@KingCounty.gov.

Once those members had recused themselves, there was no longer a quorum of the committee. Because it was unclear how or if action could be taken, discussion of possible support of the SSWMS was tabled. Assistance will be sought regarding the application of Robert's Rules in this situation.

Comments included:

- The division's budget request included a placeholder to fund consultant work related to the SSWMS.
- If the rate redesign includes a standing fee of some sort that is collected by the cities, consider having the portion of the fee that funds grants kept by the city rather than passing the funds through to the county. This would replace the grant program.
- Avoid rates which discourage recycling opportunities. Those rates would be detrimental to the mission of the division.

Product Stewardship

The committee received the third of three presentations about product stewardship scheduled for June, July and August. The third [presentation](#) is about paint stewardship.

The intent of paint stewardship is to move the responsibility for collection and disposal of left over paint to the industry that manufactures and sells the product. Legislation to require all producers to participate in a stewardship program has been passed in eight states. Attempted legislation in Washington in 2014 made significant progress but was not ultimately successful.

Legislation proposing paint product stewardship will be introduced again in 2015. SWAC agreed that the Chair and Vice Chair would send a [letter on behalf of SWAC](#) supporting the legislation.

Facilities to recycle paint are available in Oregon (facility operating at capacity) and California. It's not clear what amount of paint collected for recycling would be needed to attract a recycler to Washington. The price model per unit for recycling which was used as an example in the presentation would probably support shipping to California. However, a more detailed analysis would be needed to increase the level of certainty.

Department of Ecology Recycling Data

SWAC reviewed a handout about [Measuring Recycling in Washington](#) provided by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology.) Ecology collects, checks and cleans the self-reported data provided by recycling facilities and through a voluntary survey of unregulated facilities collecting recyclables from generators. Data collected includes the type of material, quantities and origin of the materials received and the quantities and destinations of outgoing materials.

Of the total recyclable material reported for 2012, 60 percent stays in Washington, 10% percent is sent to other states, the destination is not reported for 10% of the material and is 20% of is exported out of the country. Ecology adjusts the information received about the co-mingled recycling stream to account for contamination and residuals. Comments included:

- The numbers reported are for the state as a whole but can be disaggregated to some degree. However, the results are less clear when a commercial hauler collects in various counties. King County works with the City of Seattle to disaggregate data and report recycling rates.
- The primary current markets for exported recyclable materials are China, Korea, and Canada. Ecology does not track the final destination of recyclable materials.
- Washington State has a strong network of recycling collectors and processors.

More information is available online at www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/SWFA. Or, contact Gretchen Newman, the presenter at 360-407-6097, Gretchen.newman@ecy.wa.gov.

Open Forum

There were no comments in Open Forum.