Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group (ITSG)

Approved November 28, 2007

King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:
Tom Spille – City of Bellevue
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way
John MacGillivray – City of Kirkland
Stacey Breskin-Auer – City of Redmond

County Staff:
Jennifer Broadus, SWD
Jeff Gaisford, SWD
Jane Gateley, SWD
Kinley Deller, SWD
Josh Marx, SWD
Mike Reed, KCC
Diane Yates, SWD

I. Review Agenda and Minutes

Everyone present introduced themselves.

ITSG member Rob Van Orsow volunteered to give the ITSG update at the January Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) meeting. There will not be an ITSG update at the joint Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and MSWMAC December meeting.

At the bottom of page 3 of the October ITSG notes, Van Orsow clarified his question regarding product stewardship to read: *"How much of the 15 percent product stewardship recyclables are from beverage containers versus other product stewardship initiatives. Gaisford said that he only has the figure of 15 percent which was from the presentation."*

The draft October meeting notes were approved as amended by consensus.

II. SWD Updates

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates reported that the Growth Management and Natural Resources (GMNR) committee approved the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan (Plan) at its meeting on November 27th. The amendment changing the name of the Plan to the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan was also approved. Language requiring the division to consider options for extending the life of the Cedar Hills Landfill was included in the adopting legislation. The third party review by Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc. was appended to the Plan. The Plan is on the consent agenda for the December 10th King County Council meeting.

The 2008 budget was passed by council on November 19th and included a number of provisos for the division. None of those provisos involved conversion technologies.

III. Construction/Demolition WPR Presentation

Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented data on Construction & Demolition (C&D) and Waste Prevention and Recycling (WPR). This can be viewed at:
http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/WPRCDITSG11282007.ppt

ITSG member Tom Spille asked where the recycling tonnage data came from. Gaisford said that it is from the Department of Ecology (DOE) and reflects all King County tonnage, including Milton with the exception of the City of Seattle.

The 2006 Construction and Demolition Disposal Characterization pie chart percentages represent tonnage by weight, not volume. ITSG member Stacy Breskin-Auer said that since asphalt and concrete are heavier in comparison to plastic, this needs to be taken into account when using weight for the percentages.

For the 2006 Estimated C&D Diversion pie chart, ITSG member Rob Van Orsow asked where landclearing falls in the percentages. Gaisford answered that the landclearing tonnage is not in the data. There is an additional 180,000 tons of landclearing debris, and 250,000 tons top soil. Landclearing is separate from C&D for the purpose of this presentation, because it has its own system to handle these materials and the county does not have to manage it. Spille suggested that some additional slides be added to the presentation covering landclearing since it is being reported separate from C&D.

Spille suggested that for the "Flow of King County-Generated C&D Materials" handout the dotted lines be in different colors for visual ease.

Van Orsow asked why concrete is listed in the "End Markets" section of the handout, but not all asphalt products. Gaisford said that this is a good question, and the division had a hard time deciding what should be included in the handout. Van Orsow also suggested showing the tonnage numbers next to the materials.

Breskin-Auer asked how the recycling incentive funds collected from the haulers for meeting the recycling goals are being allocated. Gaisford said that in 2006 $1.1 million was collected through the $4.25/ton surcharge at the private transfer stations. The surcharge is the source of funds to pay the haulers based on the recycling and diversion levels they achieve. In 2006, $210,000 was paid back to the haulers based on their recycling and diversion levels. The county is holding that money and waiting for the haulers to increase their recycling. Van Orsow asked if those funds are carried over from year to year. Gaisford replied that they are.

Van Orsow asked if the deadline for the Green Building grants have been extended. Gaisford said that it has. More grant funds will be awarded this year than last year.

Breskin-Auer asked if there were King County transfer stations that had the capacity to recycle C&D. Gaisford said that there are very few transfer stations that can recycle this material at this time. The Enumclaw Transfer Station can handle wood recycling and maybe scrap metal.

Breskin-Auer said that a small self-hauler such as a landscaping company does not have a place to recycle C&D. Gaisford said that the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station will have a renewable/reusable materials contractor on site, at scheduled times, that will pull C&D recyclables offline before they go into the transfer station.

Breskin-Auer asked if small businesses that self-haul can take their loads to a private commingled processing center. Gaisford said they can, but the private processers may not be as conveniently located as the division's transfer stations. Breskin-Auer said that the bigger construction companies have room to sort their C&D loads on their jobsites, but they might not have the time. Time is important to construction companies and unless it is easy for them to do so, those materials will not be recycled. Gaisford said that this is a good point, and maybe a fee structure can be implemented to incentivize sorting. Breskin-Auer said that the fee would have to be a significant one.

Breskin-Auer said that information would need to be provided to home owners who are doing remodeling projects as well to ensure that contractors do not pass on the cost of disposal to customers.

Regarding the regulatory diversion option of C&D deposits through land use permits, Van Orsow asked how such an option would be implemented. Gaisford said that it is an option for the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan). This would have to be implemented by individual cities and the county. Van Orsow said that there would need to be requirements in place that program revenues are used for solid waste programs.

Council Staff Mike Reed asked if the division had a feel for how the construction community would respond to this option. Gaisford said that there would be some level of resistance, but in California they have implemented this option successfully and the communities have become comfortable with it. Reed asked if there might be less resistance to deposits then mandatory jobsite recycling. Gaisford said that it would depend on the generator. Big companies might not have a problem with onsite recycling, but small residential remodelers might not have the space available.

Gaisford said that it is important to keep concrete and asphalt tonnage on the radar screen. If the asphalt and concrete were not recycled it would need to come through the disposal system and it is a significant amount of tonnage.

ITSG received a copy of the 2006 King County/Seattle Construction Recycling Directory. The directory will be updated in 2008. This is one of the most downloaded documents on Solid Waste Division's website.

IV. Commercial WPR Presentation

Gaisford gave a presentation on Commercial Waste Prevention and Recycling. That presentation can be viewed at:
http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CommercialITSG11282007.ppt

Reed asked if restaurants were the main generators of food waste. Gaisford said that certain businesses, such as restaurants, grocery stores and food distributors, have a significant amount of food waste. Useable food is being generated by grocery stores. Reed asked if the food that is being recycled exceeds their use-by date. Gaisford said grocery retailers are sophisticated in that they work with food banks or compost facilities to ensure the food is either used or is composted. Reed asked why food is such a large part of disposed tonnage. SWD Staffperson Josh Marx said that food is mostly water,

and is very heavy. Most of the 26 percent disposed is from restaurants and other food service industries.

Van Orsow said that since most businesses are located within cities, more recycling would occur if all the cities had embedded recycling rates. Van Orsow asked if the division has per capita data for cities that already have embedded rates. Gaisford said that he only had an overall commercial rate; per capita data by city is not reported to the division. Breskin-Auer said that even the cities themselves have sketchy data from businesses since they are not required to report that data to them. Van Orsow suggested that Dr. Jeff Morris' study can tie in the cities' data into the model that he is producing. Van Orsow said this might be a good tool to demonstrate the advantages of an embedded rate.

ITSG discussed recycling programs, and that it is easy to start recycling programs, but harder to maximize them. Generally people can recycle two to three times more then they already do. Gaisford said that many businesses have recycling opportunities but do not realize it.

Reed said that you have to keep in mind that commercial sectors have many systems in place. They might work on refining those systems, but practices that divert from their systems might be seen as an irritant. Recycling programs may be viewed negatively. Businesses need to know how recycling affects their bottom line in terms of cost, time, and energy. Individual people might be motivated to recycle, but businesses as a whole might be less motivated. Gaisford said that garbage disposal may not be a business priority for some companies.

Reed asked if the commercial tonnage data includes the public sector as well as businesses. Gaisford said that it does.

Van Orsow asked Breskin-Auer about the City of Redmond's pilot programs. Breskin-Auer said that they did not implement a ban on food in the garbage, but they did active outreach education through the city's inspection program. Van Orsow asked if this helped motivate businesses to recycle more. Breskin-Auer said that they do not have hard data at this time.

Van Orsow questioned if the data from the DOE is correct. He suggested that someone should double check the figures for accuracy and more realistic numbers. Gaisford said that the figures the division gets from the DOE is King County data with the addition of Milton, minus the City of Seattle. Gaisford said that those numbers can be double checked.

Van Orsow asked if the 31,500 tons of metal that was disposed in 2006 include car bodies. Gaisford said that it does not include car bodies.

Reed asked when the WPR packages for increasing diversion for all sectors will be presented to the advisory groups. Gaisford said that the packages will be an agenda item in March 2008, after goals have been discussed. The packages that are brought back to the groups will reflect the goals.

Spille asked about the timing of a discussion on criteria for measuring materials. Gaisford said that will happen in the goals discussion. Spille said that how materials should be measured is a big issue. Bellevue wants to see attainable goals set in the next planning period. Gaisford said that if a 55 percent goal for plastics recycling were proposed, the question then becomes should it be a countywide or city level goal. Spille noted that this is a good question, but thought that since it is part of a countywide plan it should be a countywide goal.

Spille said that Bellevue has conducted four different waste characterization studies. Van Orsow said that Waste Management has also promised to do more with the waste characterization.

Next Step:
The next ITSG meeting is scheduled for January 3, 2008.