

**KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**August 11, 2006**

**11:45 – 2:15 p.m.**

**King Street Center, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Center**

**Approved Minutes**

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Doug Jacobson	City of Bothell	Public Works Director
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Dan Bath	City of Burien	Capital Projects Manager/Engineer
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Elaine Borjeson	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Staff
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Don Brocha	City of Woodinville	Councilmember
Mick Monken	City of Woodinville	Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

**Theresa Jennings, Solid Waste Division Director**

**Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager**

**Brad Bell, Landfill Supervisor**

**Mark Buscher, Lead Planner**

**Tom Karston, Finance and Rates Analyst**

**Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison**

**Jane Gateley, Technical Writer**

**Gemma Alexander, Staff**

**Robert Dutton, Staff**

**Bill Reed, Staff**

**Josh Marx, Staff**

King County Council Staff

**Merri Ann Osborne**

City Staff

**Amy Ensminger, City of Woodinville**

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05. Everyone present  
3 introduced themselves.

4  
5 **Approve July Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

6 *The minutes were approved as submitted by consensus.*

7  
8 Chair Garber said that MSWMAC's normally scheduled November meeting would fall  
9 on the Veteran's Day holiday, and that alternative dates of November 3rd, 13th or 20th  
10 had previously been suggested. Of eleven responses, ten preferred November 3rd.

11  
12 *MSWMAC approved rescheduling its November meeting to November 3<sup>rd</sup> at its*  
13 *regularly scheduled time and location.*

14  
15 **ITSG Update**

16 ITSG and MSWMAC member Alison Bennett reported that ITSG spent some time at its  
17 last meeting discussing effective meeting strategies to improve the group's productivity.  
18 ITSG also discussed the timing related to approval of the Waste Export System Plan and  
19 how it relates to completion of the third party review. ITSG members decided to submit  
20 their comments to the plan by email. The document formerly known as the Business Plan  
21 was reviewed and renamed to reflect the fact that a true business plan will not be  
22 prepared until after the Waste Export System Plan has been approved. ITSG previewed  
23 the Rate Study and Recycling Goals presentations.

24  
25 MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini commented that she would like a briefing on the  
26 progress of the ILA/Governance meetings as well.

27  
28 Chair Garber agreed that a briefing would be useful and suggested that MSWMAC plan  
29 for one at the next meeting. Cities will caucus for that discussion.

30  
31 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked if it was possible to receive copies of the Solid  
32 Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) minutes.

33

34 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said those minutes are posted on the  
35 division's website ([http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/public\\_documents.asp](http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/public_documents.asp)). She  
36 will also email them to MSWMAC members in the future.

37

### 38 **SWAC Update**

39 Armanini reported that after some internal housekeeping about its subcommittees, SWAC  
40 had a presentation by council staff Mike Huddleston on the background and process of  
41 the third party review. SWAC approved its list of questions for the third party review,  
42 which is basically the same as MSWMAC's list with two exceptions:

- 43 1. SWAC added the word "technologies" after Waste to Energy to emphasize that  
44 the question regards more than just incineration.
- 45 2. SWAC added a sustainability section, recognizing that "sustainability" is a vague  
46 term, with the question, "Are there models or methods for the transfer of solid  
47 waste from the point of generation to final disposal that minimize fossil fuel  
48 consumption and air pollution?"

49 Garber clarified that although they are very similar, SWAC's questions for the third party  
50 review are submitted separately from MSWMAC's, and are not an amendment of the  
51 questions MSWMAC prepared.

52

53 Armanini said that Assistant Division Director Geraldine Cole presented the division's  
54 recommendations for the Waste Export System Plan and the contents of the Business  
55 Plan as required by Ordinance 14971. There was no discussion of these. SWAC will  
56 review and discuss the documents at its next meeting.

57

### 58 **SWD Update**

59 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that the division has hired a  
60 new Lead Planner. She introduced Mark Buscher, who has worked with the division  
61 before, saying that he is one of the best planners she has ever worked with. Buscher has  
62 worked on several Comp Plans. He will be developing a schedule for the Comp Plan  
63 process in time for next month's meeting.

64

65 Jennings said that Woodinville submitted one additional comment on the Environmental  
66 Impact Statement (EIS). The final EIS will be available at next month's meeting.

67

68 **Response to Ordinance 14971, Section 5B**

69 Jennings said Ordinance 14971 identified nine specific issues that should be addressed in  
70 a document it called a business plan. However, these issues do not constitute a typical  
71 business plan. Further, the contents of a traditional business plan would be dependent on  
72 the approval of the Waste Export System Plan. The division has drafted the document  
73 under review today as a direct response to the Ordinance, and intends to develop a regular  
74 business plan four months after approval of the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan.

75

76 Regarding approval of the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, Garber said that the  
77 September 28 deadline for submitting the plan to council is firm, but MSWMAC will not  
78 be able to see the results of the third party review before that date. She suggested that at  
79 next month's meeting, the motion to approve the plan should include language stating  
80 that the approval is pending the outcome of the third party review.

81

82 *MSWMAC approved this course of action by consensus.*

83

84 Garber called for comments on the plan, saying that MSWMAC will have only one more  
85 meeting in which to discuss it.

86

87 Vice Chair Joan McGilton asked if comments had been received from all of the groups  
88 identified on the cover page.

89

90 Jennings said that all comments that have been received to date have been included in  
91 this draft of the plan. MSWMAC and SWAC are the only groups that have yet to  
92 comment on the plan. She added that the division will attempt to incorporate any further  
93 comments received by August 25<sup>th</sup> into the draft of the plan to be discussed at the  
94 September 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The division will make it clear what changes have been made as  
95 a result of comments, using the appropriate method for the number and extent of  
96 comments received.

97 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka said her council would like to make comments after  
98 receiving a briefing from the division, but that will not be possible before August 25<sup>th</sup>.

99

100 Armanini said SWAC will be giving comments at its September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, which is  
101 open to the public. She suggested that would be the last opportunity to comment.

102

103 Theresa Jennings asked that written comments be submitted via e-mail or regular mail by  
104 August 25<sup>th</sup>. Comments should be submitted to Jane Gateley, the division's technical  
105 writer at jane.gateley@metrokc.gov.

106

### 107 **Business Plan**

108 Jennings said that based on input from ITSG, the business plan which was presented to  
109 MSWMAC last month has been renamed "Response to Ordinance 14971, Section 5B."

110

111 Garber called for comments on the document. Hearing none, Garber said that September 8 will  
112 be members' last opportunity to comment.

113

### 114 **Rate Study**

115 Finance and Rates Analyst Tom Karston gave a presentation on the rate study, available  
116 at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/RateStudyAugMSWMAC.ppt>

117

118 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza asked about the forty-five day reserves requirement.

119 Karston replied that it is the money (approximately nine million dollars) kept on hand to  
120 maintain operations for forty-five days in the case of an emergency. Jennings added that  
121 it is a financial policy that is evaluated annually.

122

123 Armanini asked why the division couldn't fund emergencies through interfund loans  
124 from the landfill reserve fund. She said that if the elimination of the reserve fund would  
125 impact the rate, it should be considered. Jennings said that would be an option, but the  
126 money would have to be paid back.

127

128 In response to a question, Karston said the division has been paying into the landfill  
129 reserve fund since the mid 1980's, but that the amount is variable based on how much

130 time remains before the anticipated closure of Cedar Hills Landfill, and how much is  
131 needed in reserve. There are thirteen funds, which cover new area construction, landfill  
132 closure, and post-closure maintenance.

133

134 In response to another question, Karston said that the rate is predicted to increase above  
135 the rate of inflation in 2017 because of Cedar Hills closure and the shift to export, when  
136 the division will have less control over costs.

137

138 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked why not raise the rate earlier to keep it below the  
139 rate of inflation. Karston said that a six-year rate of \$98.50 would lessen the bump at  
140 2017, but would not make any difference over the long run.

141

142 Jennings commented that closure is still more than ten years away. She said the division  
143 is confident about the first three year term of this forecast. There is still time to consider  
144 different policies for subsequent periods.

145

146 Armanini said that the \$95 rate for 2008 is the prime concern for MSWMAC today.

147

148 In response to a question, Jennings gave examples of special wastes, including such items  
149 as: contaminated soil, beached whales, eighteen player pianos and items containing  
150 asbestos. Special waste requires additional staff to manage.

151

152 In response to another question, Jennings said the regional direct fee increase resulted in  
153 a decrease in regional direct tonnage.

154

155 MSWMAC member Joan McGilton asked how rate changes relate to the cities' contracts.

156

157 Armanini said that most contracts include terms on cost of service.

158

159 MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte commented that it is important to be sure the assumed  
160 average can weight used in the model is correct.

161

162 **Recycling Goals**

163 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford gave a presentation on  
164 recycling goals, available at: <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/WRRgoalsMSWMAC.ppt>

165 In response to a question, Gaisford said the disposal numbers in the presentation come  
166 from Cedar Hills disposal data and waste characterization studies. Recycling numbers  
167 come from the Department of Ecology, and are matched with the waste characterization  
168 studies, then compared against the information provided to the division by the haulers.  
169 The per capita goal came from the year 2000 disposal rates.

170  
171 In response to another question, Gaisford said that commercial recycling is almost  
172 entirely influenced by cost. Although businesses usually pay a fee for recycling, the fee  
173 is lower than disposal costs.

174  
175 Division staff said that self-haulers are approximately 75% residential and 25%  
176 commercial customers.

177  
178 Pelozza asked if recycled asphalt could defray the cost of paving. Gaisford replied that it  
179 already does so and will continue to do so.

180  
181 McGilton asked about overseas markets. Gaisford said that a lot of King County's  
182 recyclables go to overseas markets, and the division's study looks at the impact of that.

183  
184 Gaisford said Seattle's mandatory recycling program is increasing recycling, especially at  
185 multifamily residences. He said the division will bring someone from the City of Seattle  
186 in the next few months to discuss the city's programs.

187  
188 Asked about the cost of enforcement, Gaisford said Seattle has 2-3 officers who primarily  
189 focus on multifamily and business recycling. The haulers tag cans that contain too many  
190 recyclables. Overall, enforcement is light. The City has had good compliance, largely  
191 due to the long lead time for implementation and lots of education.

193 MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby thanked Gaisford, saying the presentation was helpful  
194 and informative. He asked if the waste characterization studies showed whether  
195 recycling programs are having an effect.

196

197 Gaisford said that the waste characterization studies were begun before recycling  
198 programs were implemented, and the proportion of materials in the waste stream has  
199 shifted over time in response to recycling programs.

200

201 Grigsby asked about paper in the waste stream. Gaisford said that paper still makes up  
202 25% of the waste stream, and the division is getting ready for a campaign to get more of  
203 paper out of the garbage. Convenience is key to encouraging recycling, so that will be a  
204 focus of the campaign.

205

206 In response to a question, Gaisford said that recycling did increase when the haulers  
207 switched to single-stream recycling. He said that in addition to the convenience of single  
208 stream recycling, capacity (sufficient bin size) and frequency of collection have  
209 contributed to higher recycling rates.

210

211 **Adjourn**

212 The meeting was adjourned at 1: 50 p.m.

213

214 Submitted by:

215 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff