

MSWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

July 12, 2024 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<u>MSWAC Members</u>		<u>King County Staff</u>
Troy Linnell	Algona	Eyasu Ayalew, Public Health Seattle/King County
Joan Nelson	Auburn	Eberley Barragan, SWD staff
Jon Gire	Bellevue	Sylvaine Bucher, SWD staff
Emily Warnock	Bothell	Shawn Carter, SWD staff
Kim Muromoto	Clyde Hill	Nori Catabay, SWD staff
Rebecca Kovar	Federal Way	Kinley Deller, SWD staff
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way	Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB staff
Tony Donati	Kent	Christine Kim, SWD staff
Jenna McInnis	Kirkland	Patty Liu, SWD staff
Penny Sweet	Kirkland	Laila McClinton, SWD staff
Alana DeRogatis	Mercer Island	Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff
Micah Bonkowski	Redmond	Nina Olivier, SWD staff
Aaron Moldver	Redmond	Yolanda Pon, Public Health Seattle/King County
Amy Tsai	Redmond	Terra Rose, King County Council
Meara Heubach	Renton	Hannah Scholes, SWD staff
Amy Tsai	Redmond	Andy Smith, SWD staff
Meara Heubach	Renton	Christopher Stubbs, SWD Deputy Director
Greg Stamatiou	Sammamish	Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff
Sarah Bruemmer	Shoreline	John Walsh, SWD staff
Jared Hill	Woodinville	
		<u>Guests</u>
		Carolyn Bowie, Dept. Of Ecology
		Erin Gagnon, DTG Recycling
		Mark Gingrich --
		Katie Jerauld, Dept. of Ecology
		Jeanette Jurgensen, Bin There Consulting
		Han Kirkland, Waste Management
		Brad Lovaas, WA Refuse and Recycling Association
		Laura Moser, Waste Management
		Eric Perry --
		Kaylie Wallin, Republic Services
		Wendy Weiker, Republic Services

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Sweet called the meeting to order at 11:28 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Heubach moved to approve the May and June minutes. Van Orsow seconded. Minutes passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Jerauld shared a few items beginning with stating that the Dept. of Ecology conducting rulemaking for a new rule regarding the [Battery Stewardship Program](#). This rule will guide implementation of [Chapter 70A.555 RCW Batteries—Environmental Stewardship](#). The new law creates an extended producer responsibility (EPR) program that will increase opportunity for people to recycle unwanted batteries. The [informal public comment period](#) has been extended to July 31. They are also conducting two satisfaction surveys regarding the [Light Recycle Washington Program](#) and [energy efficient lighting availability](#). These surveys are available until July 22. Lastly, Ecology is currently updating the 2010 Guidelines for Development of Local Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plans and Plan Revisions. In the meantime, Ecology has prepared a summary of new guidance that can be implemented now. If you are currently updating your county's solid waste plan, please review the [summary here](#).

SWD Updates

Stubbs provided the SWD update.

May Tonnage Update

Total tonnage delivered to Cedar Hills and King County Transfer stations was up 3% (1,700 tons) in May 2024 compared to May 2023. Self-haul transfer station tonnage was about the same as May 2023. Without Regional Direct, transfer station deliveries by commercial haulers decreased 1% (800 tons) in May 2024 versus May 2023. Meanwhile regional direct deliveries by increased 5,410%, or 1700 tons in May 2024 compared to May 2023. Total yard and wood waste collection was down approximately 16% (300 tons) compared to May 2023.

SCA Presentation 7/11

We presented on rates, C&D fee and fixed annual charge (FAC) to the Sound Cities Public Issues Committee. There were some great questions on the variation of rates by city, and some concerns raised about how the proposed rate increases will impact residents. Councilmember and SWAC member Amy Lam of Sammamish did a great job helping explain the differentials, augmenting the information provided by staff.

Algona Transfer Station Crane Replacement

Individual haulers have already been alerted to the closure and will be detoured to Bow Lake. The closure will take place while SWD replaces the two refuse cranes that maneuver waste from the main floor to the dumpsters below. The station will remain open to the general public with reduction in service lanes.

The closure will coincide with West Valley Highway S Lane reductions and nighttime closures related to the SCRTS project along the same stretch of roadway. Significant outreach is taking place to area residents and businesses, as well as general outreach to the larger South County area for residents to avoid the area if possible, during this time.

Signage will be placed at the station entrance several weeks in advance of the closure to alert repeat customers to the potential longer waits. Scale operators are also sharing information with customers about Bow Lake as an alternative location during this time.

Fixed Annual Charge

The notice went out to the haulers and cities at the end of May advising of the release of the draft allocation table for the 2025 FAC.

We held office hours for cities and haulers on June 11 and 13 to have questions answered and provide an opportunity for feedback to the county. Feedback is due to Lindy Honaker on June 28.

An updated draft FAC was released and sent to cities and partners on July 3. We are incorporating feedback received in June and there will be an additional opportunity to provide feedback until July 31.

The final draft will be released on Aug. 2, with the expectation of adoption by the county council in September 2024. Haulers and cities should be confirming that the data is correct to ensure accurate information, and customer notification by October 1.

Long-Term Disposal Decision Sub-Group

The MSWAC LTD Decision Sub-Group held their 2nd meeting on May 20, where they had the opportunity to deep dive into information provided by our consultants and discuss questions from cities.

After the meeting, some members shared concerns with the county regarding the information provided. We will update you more during scheduled discussion later on in this meeting.

Government Relations Administrator Recruitment Update

We have successfully completed the recruitment process for the Government Relations Administrator position and are in the final stages of this process.

Quarterly Hauler Forum

We held the quarterly hauler forum on June 24. There was good attendance and discussion.

Ardagh/SMI Update

Ardagh Glass Inc. announced on June 17, 2024, that they will be shutting down their glass furnaces and laying off 244 workers at their glass manufacturing plant in Seattle, on July 1, 2024. The reason for the halt in production is ongoing pressure from low-priced imports from China, Chile and Mexico, and market conditions.

Ardagh's facility is one of only two glass manufacturing plants in Washington, and by far the biggest market for recycled glass in the state.

Strategic Materials Inc. (SMI) cleans and sorts the recycled glass from curbside programs and transfer stations in King County and Seattle. It then sells most of it to Ardagh to make wine bottles (WA. Dept. of Commerce reported 73% of SMI material went to Ardagh in 2019). Part of Ardagh's operation is located on property owned by King County - SMI is a subtenant of Ardagh. Ardagh extended their lease with King County for ten years in 2022.

Ardagh expects the Seattle shutdown to be temporary and to restart manufacturing when market conditions improve. They believe this could last anywhere from 3-6 months or more.

The facility will operate with a skeleton crew and no impact to the King County lease is expected.

SMI informed us that they do not expect changes to their operations at this time and will continue to process and sell recycled glass (to other recyclers) from King County and the region. Glass is a heavy material, and it is expensive to transport long distances. It would be costly and perhaps not environmentally beneficial to recycle King County's glass if there was not a local glass recycling facility.

Passing of Dave Hill

We lost an incredible member of our community, former Algona Mayor Dave Hill. He was a long-standing member of our advisory communities and will be missed.

McInnis wanted to know more about the Ardagh/SMI situation and where SMI's material will go with Ardagh shut down. Scholes said that Ardagh is confident that they will be able to figure this out and they have assured King County that will be able to recycle as they have been. We will keep everyone updated as we learn more. McInnis said she will reach out to Kirkland's hauler and expressed concern about the recycling of glass.

Sweet shared similar concerns over the recycling of glass.

SWAC Update

No update.

Waste Acceptance Rules - Update

Barragan provided this update.

The waste acceptable rules regulate what we can and can't accept for materials bound to the landfill. As well as what we can and can't accept at the landfill. This rule ensures we are compliant with rules and regulations around public health, and it is also a policy to protect employees and the integrity of facilities. Since Barragan's last presentation in May, the updated draft has over gone several layers of review.

There are three key themes:

1. Addressing emerging waste
 - a. Example: cannabis waste
 - b. Example: waste containing arsenic
2. Clarifying prohibited wastes
 - a. Example: Lithium-ion batteries
 - b. Example: material that contain PCB
3. Allowing for flexibility
 - a. Example: animal excrement

Update timeline:

- King County Internal Review – Q3 2024
 - Barragan will return to MSWAC in September and give an update on the internal review.
- External Stakeholder Review – Q4 2024
- Public Comment Period – Q4 2024
- Final Rule – Q1 2025

Next Steps:

1. Draft submitted at September meeting
2. Two-week review period
3. Public comment period (additional opportunity to review)

We are confident that the new Waste Acceptance Rule will help protect the integrity of our solid waste system.

Transfer Station Recycling

Scholes and Carter gave this presentation.

Recycling at transfer stations is stagnant. We made a goal to divert 60,000 tons from self-haul customers by 2025. In 2022, SWD achieved about 52% of this goal. To keep working towards this goal, we've identified mattresses and yard waste as items that we can focus on at top load transfer stations. At top load transfer stations, mattresses and yard waste (and cardboard at the Algona Transfer Station) are not recycled. These are older stations that were built before recycling was around and utilized. These stations are the Algona Transfer Station, Houghton Transfer Station and the Renton Transfer Station.

Carter said that there are three moments for opportunity at top load stations:

1. We have over an estimated 11,000 tons of yard waste to be landfilled from top load stations annually.
2. Over 14,000 mattresses are landfilled from top load stations annually. By saving mattresses, we estimate 25,000 cubic yards of air space and a possible savings of 400,000 cubic yards of air space by 2040.
3. Increasing recycling helps us save landfill space and reach the zero waste of resources goal.

At top load stations, customers throw their material onto the floor and we sweep it into the chute that drops the material to the trailer below the floor that will be taken to the landfill.

As previously mentioned, yard waste and mattresses are not recycled at the Algona Transfer Station. We have taken actions to increase diversion of these materials from Algona like extra staffing at newer facilities, sending customers to other facilities for recycling and yard waste, and updating signage and modernizing facilities.

It is important to note that the South County Recycling and Transfer Station (SCRTS) is under construction and should be in operation by 2026 to replace the Algona Transfer Station and the North County and Recycling Transfer Station project (NERTS) to replace the Houghton Transfer Station is underway.

Sweet said that there are many subcontractors who use Houghton and asking them to drive to Factoria is a big stretch. She wondered if there is an opportunity to partner with Cedar Grove to help with this transition. Carter asked for more information on this idea. Sweet was not sure what this would look like but was thinking of something to help support people. Carter is not sure how this would work with Cedar Grove but the problem with the Houghton Transfer Station is the land and air space. We recognize the inconvenience of asking people to drive to another location, but we have done this in the past and have experience doing it – recently, with the new trailer restriction. We would ramp up to this change by sharing information ahead of time and updating the website and is not something that would be done overnight. We are also planning to have a handout to give to customers. Scholes added that the next slide shows part of the next steps to meet with cities that are close to facilities that are impacted because this is the kind of conversations we want to be having. This conversation will also be brought to SWAC to get their input as well.

Nelson said the first thing that came to mind was illegal dumping and could see this potentially being an issue. Education will be huge and would like to keep this conversation open, especially if there is an increase in illegal dumping.

McInnis said in the chat that perhaps there could be more conversation around the private companies that have drop offs, like Cedar Grove in Woodinville or Pacific Topsoils in Redmond.

Heubach understands that the county is in the process of getting a consultant for the redesign study and wanted an update on where we are in the process. Ockerlander said that we will follow up with Heubach.

Next Steps:

- Update Title 10 to ban mattresses and yard waste from disposal at top load stations by self-haul customers. We are still working out how this will look.

- Consultations with city partners – Q3/Q4 2024
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Process – Q3/Q4 2024
- County Council Approval – Q1 2025
- Create and implement a communications plan to communicate to self-haul customers the change in policy – Q4 2024/Q1 2025

Debris Management Plan – Support Letter

Ockerlander led this.

We will be looking for approval in August or September for the letter. We will be seeking feedback from the committees soon. The current draft plan is out for comments that are due July 16. There will be some technical assistance workshops in the fall.

Heubach said that the letter doesn't address some of the benefits to our systems by having the plan like reducing the number of materials that would go to the landfill. She suggested adding a piece about how we support the work for the materials diverted from the landfill and preserving air space at the landfill.

Ockerlander welcomed any other edits.

Long-term Disposal Discussion Update

Liu gave this update.

We had our 3rd subgroup meeting which revealed weaknesses in the study methodology. We had concerns and heard similar concerns from the cities. There are key criteria which we will be revisiting once the consultant addresses our concerns and we will not be moving forward until the consultants can address the concerns.

Long Term Disposal Study Concerns

- Combined Concerns
 - Application of MWP to both methods
 - Equity & Social Justice lens on other criteria
 - Missing and/or inconsistent use of criteria
 - Mixing capital expenses and operating expenses (CAPEX and OPEX)
 - Environmental Impact context
 - Costs associated with emergency/ catastrophic failure
- Waste Export by Rail Concerns
 - Costs/Reasoning related to new equipment
 - IMF upgrades and costs
 - Conservative contract costs
- Mass burn concerns
 - Costs on decommissioning facility
 - Siting-related costs
 - GHG impacts of site prep and construction
 - Ash amounts and disposal calculations
 - Clean Energy Transportation Act (CETA) impacts, energy sales, cost projections
 - Upgrade costs, compliance with updated EPA regulations
 - Questions on drayage calculations
 - Metal amounts and revenue

- Puget Sound Clean Air Agency – unclear if they looked at regional regulations

Van Orsow said that one of the things that the subcommittee voted on was to not look at digester technology but in L.A. there is a facility that is being replaced by a digester. The subcommittee thought a digester was not scalable in King County but the work in L.A. has made Van Orsow want to revisit digester technology as a viable disposable option and at least discuss it as a group.

Heubach wanted to know what environmental concerns are being studied for waste export by rail and if the impacts around the rail lines will be studied as well as the impacts around the intermodal facility. Liu did not know the answer and will bring this up to Tetra Tech.

Walsh followed up on Van Orsow's comment for clarification and asked if he wanted to look at anaerobic digestion as another option. Van Orsow said he did not have all the details in front of him but at the subcommittee meeting on June 17, there was a note about the facility in L.A. shutting down their facility to replace it with a large-scale digester. There are different laws in California that mandate diversion of organics which might be driving this but if it is economical viable there, it might be something that we want to revisit. The Solid Waste Division has been expressing interest in doing digester technology for a while, and it might have been inadvertently tabled by not having this new information.

Walsh said that SWD would follow up with the consultants. In the past, we separated pre-long-term disposal and anaerobic digestion because it tends to be more source separated feed stock (pre-long-term disposal) which is more of a Re+ thing. The impetus should be that pre-long-term disposal gets as much as possible out of the waste stream so there is a smaller piece to put into the LTD option. We will follow up with the consultant on this California facility and where this could potentially fit into one of the other options.

Sweet asked Walsh if the digester would be part of the pre-long-term disposal. Walsh said yes because he does not know of a digester that takes mixed municipal solid waste. It is usually source separated yard and food waste which is no longer trash and now considered recyclables.

Tsai thanked SWD for the list and wanted to know if there will be time for members to sit with this information. On siting related costs, there is also the siting option feasibility because there is certain amount of land and availability of land. Some of this is lacking that regional context and the specific practicality on what the regulations allow and the size of the land that would be required. This can be included under CETA, but there is also a better understanding if energy sales can't happen now, what are the potential opportunities for out-of-state sales and what would be the environmental benefits not contemplated in their analysis. Liu added that we are talking with Tetra Tech on analyzing markets for selling that energy and one of things we are talking about is regional and global environmental impacts. If out-of-state markets are identified, things like evaporation in hydro powered reservoirs would no longer be an analyzed environmental impact if the energy is going out of state, but things like greenhouse gases would.

Sweet wanted to know if this feedback has been delivered to the consultants. Liu said she would deliver it today to make sure that the feedback from MSWAC is captured before it is sent to Tetra Tech. Sweet followed up asking how we will be laying out the expectations for response. Liu said she will address this later.

Van Orsow asked if there could be additional input given later. He thought this was a great list but has not had time to go over the subgroup list of concerns and wanted to make sure everything was mentioned. Liu said that she consulted the letter sent over from the subgroup, the comments that were left by SWD and the cities on the matrices, and the comments that were made in the subgroup #3 meeting on the topic of WEBR and mass burn. There were a lot of questions asked in meeting #3 and Liu does not believe they were fully answered by Tetra Tech, so those questions are also included. If there is anything else, please let Liu know.

Sweet said she watched the video again and believed that Liu captured a lot of it.

Tsai stated that she assumed a more elaborate list would be sent to Tetra Tech and the missing and/or inconsistent use of criteria is going to be vague and suggested that Liu highlights what the missing and/or inconsistent use of criteria are so that they can be responsive to the concerns. Similarly, the ESJ concern might be hard for them as they did not seem to understand ESJ and how it could be applied. Tsai is not sure what the answer is and how they might respond to it, but it might be helpful to have further discussions with Tetra Tech to see how their analysis might go.

In terms of the LTD study timeline, we are meeting with the consultant team on July 16 and expect the updated comparative matrices with our concerns by the end of July. We are planning to have subgroup meeting #4 in August and will have the consultants at the beginning of the meeting to hear what they will be doing moving forward. We will also have workshop meeting #1 in August and hope to have the information corrected by then. At the end of August, we will have the draft report and there will be a two-week comment period for SWD and a minimum two-week comment period for the cities. The comments are due at the end of Sept. 2024. We expect the final report in late October.

Van Orsow asked what workshop #1 meeting is and how it differs from the subgroup meetings. Liu replied that the workshop meeting differs from the subgroup meeting because it is more open and not just for city representatives but also members of SWAC and other organizations interested in this topic. It is less city focused and less in-depth because the cities are the more high-stake partners in this decision, so this is a separate meeting to go over the information. Sweet added that this workshop is the result of the discussion that happened after the initial communication from members about the subgroup meetings. Sweet and Knight knew SWAC would feel remiss about not being included and wanted to make it available to representatives beyond MSWAC.

Tsai wanted to know if there is a city two-week review period or if it can be four weeks of review. Liu responded that there will be at least two weeks and it could be up to four weeks, but it will depend on when we get that draft report in. If they can get it in early August, the cities will have more time to make comments. We want to get city and SWD comments to the consultants by the end of September. Tsai wanted to know if the comment periods will be running concurrently. Liu said SWD will comment first and then the cities so that there aren't different versions being passed back and forth. Tsai asked if the cities could get the draft report during the SWD comment period so that they have more time to read the draft. Liu said that is ok.

Walsh said that some of this is a timing issue. By the time Tetra Tech got all the comments from the draft comparative matrix, we were already in the subgroup meeting #3 so Tetra Tech couldn't present new information. Recently, they have sent us memos on export and mass burn where they talk about the costs and environmental issues. SWD was wrapping up the review of the memos and will send it over to the cities for their review. In the memos, they have already made some of the changes like the WEBR cost per ton that has been dropped and so far, they have been responsive to some of the feedback. Walsh hoped that the upcoming consultant meeting goes well and believed that SWD and the cities are in alignment with the comments that are being made. Right now, it is just about providing feedback and working with them on addressing concerns.

When briefing partners, there are a few key criteria that will be used. These briefings will be to King County leadership (Department, Executive, Council), Cities, Advisory Committees, SCA, Open Houses, etc. The focus is on waste export by rail (WEBR) vs. mass burn. The 20+ criteria is too many to walk through in a briefing and makes it difficult to make a decision. Rather than walk through all the criteria, the plan is to have a smaller comparison table with less than 10 key criteria to focus the discussion on.

Evaluation Criteria	Waste Export by Rail (WEBR)	Mass Burn
Cost Per Ton	\$X/Ton	\$Y/Ton
Global Warming Potential (GHG Emissions)	X MTCO2e	Y MTCO2e
Local Jobs Created	X Jobs	Y Jobs
Criteria 4	A	D
Criteria 5	B	E
Criteria 6	C	F

All 20+ criteria will still be in the report and can be discussed upon request.

In the subgroup, we went through every single one of these. The full list of criteria:

- Operating History
 - Proven Performance
 - Safety Record
 - Environmental Compliance
 - Regulatory Compliance
- Logistics
 - Operating Life of Facilities
 - Siting/Design/Permitting/Construction Considerations
 - Compatibility with Current Collection System
- Capacity
 - Waste Acceptance
 - Waste Volume/Tonnage Flexibility
 - Residual Waste Management
- Environmental
 - Non-renewable Energy Demand
 - Water Consumption
 - Acidification Potential
 - Eutrophication Potential
 - Global Warming Potential
 - Smog Potential
 - Human Health Toxicity – Cancer Potential
- Economic
 - Capital Costs
 - Operating Costs
 - Cost per Ton
 - Financial Risk
- Social
 - Local traffic impacts
 - Local job creation

- Other potential neighborhood impacts

In the future, we will come back and have a deeper conversation with MSWAC and SWAC. We deliberately did not go into details to wait for the updated information.

Member Comment

Moldver mentioned that Redmond's Derby Days is July 13-14. r.Cup will be there again, and the reusable food boats will be tested out. Most of what is used in the beer garden will be reusable materials.

Heubach said that she is part of the local association of SWANA, and they are leading a free tour of Recology's MRF and the human body composting facility, Recompose. [Sign up](#) if interested.

She followed up by asking the group about future meeting times and wanted to know if the group was open to shifting to a different meeting day to help with attendance in 2025. Ockerlander said she would put together a survey.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.