

SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting
 July 19, 2024 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
 Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

<u>SWAC Members Present</u>
April Atwood, Marketing and Education
Jay Blazey, Manufacturer
James Borsum, Labor Representative
Robin Freedman, Waste Industry
Amy Lam, Local Elected Official
Brett Lohrman, Labor Representative
Laura Mork, local elected official
Leah Tischler, Public Interest Group
Heather Trim, Recycling Industry
Wendy Weiker, Chair, Waste Industry

<u>King County Staff</u>
Kris Beatty, SWD staff
Eberley Barragan, SWD staff
Kris Beatty, SWD staff
Nori Catabay, SWD staff
Shawn Carter, SWD staff
Jerome Cruz, Public Health – Seattle & King County
Bonnie Fluckinger, King County PSB
Brian Halverson, SWD staff
Christine Kim, SWD staff
Patty Liu, SWD staff
Laila McClinton, SWD staff
Pat McLaughlin, SWD Director
Amy Ockerlander, SWD staff
Nina Olivier, SWD staff
Andy Smith, SWD staff
Hannah Scholes, SWD Staff
Isabelle Trujillo, SWD staff

<u>Guests</u>	
Alissa Campbell, Recology	Andi Parnell, Sound Cities Association
Erin Gagnon, DTG Recycling	Rich Vahl, Waste Connections
Katie Jerauld, Dept. of Ecology	Diana Wadley, Dept. of Ecology
Martin Mudd	

Call to Order and Introductions

After introductions, Chair Weiker called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Lam moved to approve the June minutes. Atwood seconded. The minutes were approved 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 the 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 LightRecycling WA annual satisfaction surveys regarding the [Light Recycle Washington Program](#) and [energy efficient lighting availability](#). These surveys are available until July 22.

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](#). Lastly, Ecology has

prepared a summary of organics management funding opportunities for Washington and local governments and communities including new opportunities under the 2022 and the 2024 Organics management Laws. The summary is available on [Box](#). There are also two funding opportunities that may be of interest to local governments and communities – the [WSDA Compost Reimbursement Program](#) and the [USDA Composting and Food Reduction](#).

SWD Updates

McLaughlin provided the SWD update.

May Tonnage Update

Total tonnage YTD through May was above forecast by 14,828 tons. This tonnage is above the same YTD period in 2023 but less than 2021 and 2022.

SCA Presentation 7/11

We presented on rates, the construction and demolition (C&D) fee and the 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

As you may know, we are in the middle of rebuilding a new recycling and transfer station in Algona. The construction is going well, and you can see it start to take place as we are getting ready to construct buildings. Nonetheless, we still have the existing station that will remain in place while this construction is being completed. There is important maintenance work to be done as we are getting ready to replace the top load cranes. The current ones at Algona, Renton and Houghton are past their useful life and we are working to bring in a new system that will be more reliable.

In August, we will shut down the commercial access to the Algona Station while SWD replaces the two refuse cranes that maneuver waste from the main floor to the dumpsters below. Individual haulers have already been alerted to the closure and will be detoured to Bow Lake. The station will remain open to the public with reduction in service lanes.

The closure will coincide with West Valley Highway S Lane reductions and nighttime closures related to the South County Recycling and Transfer Station (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

As a reminder, 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 to 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 Oct. 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 are not satisfied with the analysis that Tetra Tech has submitted and have asked them to address our concerns and questions. We met with them on July 15, and McLaughlin was pleased that they understood SWD's concerns and are committed to addressing those gaps. We are expecting some updated information and plan to share it when it is received. Once we have confirmed that the issues have been addressed, we will schedule a 4th subcommittee meeting and will provide ample advanced notice to SWAC. No date has been established yet.

Weiker asked if more details can be provided on what King County is pushing back on the report. McLaughlin responded that when the consultant submitted their summary of the comparative analysis between the different disposal options, questions were raised on how they landed where they did like with the Clean Energy Transportation Act and what else was being assumed. There were questions about what different numbers meant when the environmental analysis was provided. For example, the water impacts had 7 million in one dimension and 15 million in another. There was a fundamental lack of clarity and whole list of things that were unclear and not being included. The analysis that they are providing must stand up to the critical view of the advisory committees and SWD, and it did not seem as if it would. Tetra Tech explained that this was just a summary, and they have a lot of the points that we are looking for and will include it when they submit their next wave of information.

Government Relations Administrator Recruitment Update

We have successfully hired a new Government Relations Administrator position to work alongside Ockerlander. Ali Blum is a long-standing contributor in our Recycling and Environmental Program and has done extensive work in Re+ and Organics Management working with various community organizations across our region. We are excited to have her in this capacity and she officially starts July 22. She will spend a lot of her time around these advisory meetings and will continue to support the important partnerships and relationships that SWD has in this regional system.

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.

This is something we are keeping an eye on and will let everyone know if we get more information.

Passing of Dave Hill

We lost an incredible member of our community, former Algona Mayor Dave Hill. He was a longstanding member of our advisory committees and an incredible icon in his community and in the county for many years. He was a great partner and challenger to King County, and really stood up for his community. He will be dearly missed.

Trim shared that Dave Hill was a character and a challenger, and he will be missed. On the topic of Ardagh, Trim wanted to know if they are required to tell SWD what they are doing because SWD has a contract with them. McLaughlin said that he does not have a specific answer. SWD's contract with Ardagh is a lease agreement and not specifically with the Ardagh materials. Weiker added that it is different every day on what they will and won't take.

MSWAC Update

No updates.

Halverson said that Ockerlander sent out the revised FAC tables on July 23. If you have any questions, please get them to Lindy Honaker by July 31. SWD will release the final table in early August, and this will be a more temporary table until the rates proposal is voted on by council. Once/if council approves the new rate, it will be official and SWD will post it.

Weiker asked that SWD pushes this through by the end of August, so haulers can give constituents notice by end of September and early October. She asked Halverson if this was accurate timing. Halverson responded that council typically gets to it by mid-September, and we hope to get it as early as possible. We are going to work ahead of time to make sure that all the communication items are ready to go so that when we receive the final vote, we are ready to send the communication out. Halverson is unsure if council will vote before the end of August. Ockerlander added that SWD has expressed to the Executive's Office and council the dates that it needs to be done for haulers to send out their notifications.

Waste Acceptance Rules - Update

Barragan provided this update.

As a reminder, the waste acceptance 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. Ex: cannabis waste
 - b. Ex: waste containing arsenic

2. Clarifying prohibited wastes
 - a. Ex: Lithium-ion batteries
 - b. Ex: materials that contain PCB
 - c. Ex: radioactive waste
3. Allowing for flexibility
 - a. Ex: animal excrement
 - b. Ex: damaged and expired food (frozen or packaged)

We are finalizing the King County Internal Review in Q3 of 2024. Barragan will return to SWAC in September and give an update on the internal review. The external stakeholder review and the public comment period are planned for Q4 2024. A final rule is expected in Q1 2025.

The next steps will begin with a draft submitted at the September meeting and Barragan will be back to discuss this draft. There will be a two-week review period and a public comment period (additional opportunity to review).

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

Trim asked for clarification on the packaging item that was mentioned by Barragan. Barragan replied that there is a category of food waste that is not readily compostable due to the packaging and it is not readily donatable. Trim followed up asking if it is food that has gone bad and is still in its packaging. Barragan answered yes, and said that SWD wants to be part of these conversations as things continue to evolve.

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.

At top load stations, they don't have the space to expand and take these materials for recycling.

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 per year 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 on to the floor, and we sweep it up into the chute into the trailer below the floor and take it into 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 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 are underway.

In addition to these facilities, there are other places like Cedar Grove, that accept yard waste. This will be included to let customers know of other options.

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

Trim asked what stations can't take these materials. Carter answered that the Algona, Houghton and Renton Transfer Stations can't take these materials. Trim followed up asking if Renton will be the last one since the other two stations are being rebuilt. Carter responded yes.

Lam had two questions - she wanted to know what happens to the mattresses and yard waste when they're at full-service stations and where yard waste goes after it is picked up in Sammamish. Carter replied that at a full-service station, there is a yard waste area for yard waste to be placed. There, the yard waste gets processed and put into trailers that are only for yard waste and it is then taken to Cedar Grove for processing. The same thing happens for mattresses. There is a designated area for mattresses, and we put them in a trailer or roll off box that is taken to a vendor that processes the material.

Debris Management Plan – Support Letter

Ockerlander led this.

After the last meeting, there was an internal discussion on whether to send a letter to the Executive on the debris management plan. We will be looking for approval in August or September for the letter. We will be seeking feedback from the committee soon. The current draft plan is out for review with comments due July 16. There are some technical assistance workshops in the fall.

MSWAC wanted more recommendations to help climate change and we will be including that.

Trim wanted to add a sentence that speaks on all the efforts that can be made for materials to be reused or recycled.

Ockerlander welcomed any other edits to be sent to her.

Long-term Disposal Discussion Update

Liu gave this update.

We had our 3rd subgroup meeting which revealed weaknesses in the study methodology. A lot of questions were raised around making mass burn feasible in Washington State. We had concerns and heard similar concerns from the subgroup

members. 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 expense 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 Transformation 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

Lam asked how the consultant could not address these concerns from the beginning. Liu responded that this was a question that we also had, and we addressed this with them earlier this week. Mclaughlin added that what they have provided us is a very high-level summary and we can quickly move through it and raise these questions. According to Tetra Tech, most of our concerns are part of the broader, more in-depth, draft report. They assured us that they are looking at including these various factors and it is not ready yet. McLaughlin stated that he left the meeting with Tetra Tech feeling that they could answer and address our concerns.

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. Please note that we are changing the name from workshop to open house as it is open to everyone. At the end of August, we will also 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 and advisory members. The comments will be submitted to the consultants at the end of September 2024. We expect the final report in late October.

Weiker wanted to know if there was a date for the open house. Liu answered that there is not a date yet, but we will be working with Ockerlander to get things set up. Weiker added that we might need a second one since August is tough for attendance.

Trim stated that she has a meeting on her calendar that SWD said we were going to do and asked for an updated meeting invite as soon as possible. Liu said she believed that the meeting Trim has was the original workshop #2. The date for the

meeting will ultimately depend on when the consultant can get us the information so that we are having a meeting with updated information.

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 are too much to walk through in a briefing and make 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 MTCO ₂ e	Y MTCO ₂ e
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. As this process moves forward and we have more finalized information, we will ask for a vote from advisory committees on the criteria to move forward with.

Atwood commented that like what Pat said, this is one of the biggest decisions that will ever be made in our lifetime. Given that, she was reluctant to shorten the list of criteria and wanted to know the purpose of shortening the list. Liu answered that part of it is clarification with communication. The other is that we have a finite amount of time with each city/partner and going through the full list will take a long time. Another part of it is that some of these criteria don't have a lot of difference between them like mass burn and waste export by rail. If there is not a lot of difference, we can take it out. There are some criteria that have a lot of difference and those are the ones that are worth highlighting.

Atwood followed up asking if SWD wants to figure out which criteria will be highlighted after discussion with constituents, but the committee won't know which criteria have the difference until their analysis. Liu answered that is correct, and we won't ask for advisory inputs until the analysis has come through. Atwood clarified that the big criteria wouldn't be eliminated. Liu said that they would not and only some of the smaller sub-criteria. Atwood assumed that the big and complete versions would be provided to whoever them and that SWD will present on more focused topics. Liu responded that in our conversations with partners, we will be focusing on a select few but the full list will be in the final report. Nothing will be pulled out. Atwood said that what people care most about will depend on who SWD is talking to. Many people will be assured to know that this full list has been looked at.

Future Planning

Weiker asked the committee if there are any fields that they want to do. She asked if people are interested in any field trips to help make an informed recommendation.

Member Comment

Trim commented that many bills are getting teed up for the upcoming session – like the WRAP Act, mattress recycling, EV battery recycling, refrigerant EPR, a new C&D idea and organics bill. Some things have been taken out of the last organics bill. If you are interested in being part of the organics stakeholder meeting, Trim can get you on the list. The group will be negotiating language, which is different than last year's meetings.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:54 a.m.