

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 8, 2006

11:45 – 2:00 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th 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
Rich Wagner	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Debbie Anspaugh	City of Bothell	Public Works Admin Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	City Representative
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
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
Valerie Jarvi	City of Woodinville	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Solid Waste Division Director

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Jane Gateley, Staff

Gemma Alexander, Staff

Josh Marx, Staff

Sandra Matteson, Staff

Tom Karston, Staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston

Guests

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 October Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

6 *The November minutes were approved by consensus.*

7
8 **SWD Update**

9 Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that the 2007 budget was approved by
10 council, but that the rate proposal was not taken up. The budget approval included three
11 provisos. For years the division has recommended that hauling recyclables from transfer
12 stations to processors should be done in-house to save money. The first proviso requires
13 the division to perform a policy analysis of the issue of bringing work historically
14 performed by the private sector into the public sector. The report is due March 31, 2007.

15
16 The second proviso requires the division to explore the use of wood waste to generate
17 steam to heat county buildings. The division believes that this is an issue more
18 appropriately handled by Facilities and is working to move the proviso to that agency.

19
20 The final proviso requires analysis of conversion technologies, and delineates a number
21 of specific elements that should be included. The division had already begun working
22 with a consultant on this analysis. The additional elements from the proviso, which
23 include applying Kyoto standards to disposal options and looking at waste to energy
24 applications outside of the U.S., will be added to the consultant's draft scope of work,
25 which will be reviewed at MSWMAC's January meeting. Jennings said the analysis is
26 expected to cost about \$350,000. [The estimate has since been adjusted to \$400,000.]

27
28 MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini commented that in addition to studying design,
29 engineering and construction costs of new facilities, siting costs should be included.

30 Garber agreed, commenting that siting costs for waste to energy can be huge because site
31 specific meteorology studies must be done to determine stack height, which relates to
32 aesthetic impacts, among other things. She said she hopes the cities are thinking about

33 what kind of patience they have for the pursuit of that technology when there are other
34 choices available.

35

36 Jennings said that the division will follow the usual advisory committee process for
37 report development, and MSWMAC and SWAC will be able to review and comment on
38 the draft before it is sent to council.

39

40 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked about the Health Department's response to food
41 waste recycling. Jennings said that it has been approved as a pilot project with specific
42 requirements, and that notification has been sent by the Health Department by e-mail.

43

44 **SWAC Update**

45 Armanini reported that SWAC discussed the land swap deal that may include Harbor
46 Island, and what kind of input SWAC may have on the subject.

47

48 SWAC also discussed formally adding unincorporated area representation through a
49 designated Unincorporated Area Council (UAC) position. The group decided to gauge
50 UAC interest as a first step, and moved to invite UACs to nominate members to SWAC.
51 They will decide how to proceed based on the response from UACs.

52

53 SWAC reviewed the Waste Prevention and Recycling milestone report outline and
54 discussed the balance between carrot and stick approaches, to which the division was
55 responsive. SWAC noted that the impacts of recycling can be changed as a function of
56 who is responsible for recycling - for example electronic waste, where product design
57 may be improved by placing responsibility for recycling on manufacturers.

58

59 Armanini said that SWAC is an open public meeting, and invited MSWMAC members to
60 attend the next meeting on Friday, December 15.

61

62 **ITSG Update**

63 MSWMAC member Linda Knight reported that ITSG has met twice in November,
64 primarily to work on the governance report. Good progress has been made, and ITSG

65 hopes to bring the report to MSWMAC in January, with time to review before the
66 meeting. Knight thanked the division for allowing ITSG to use technical writer Jane
67 Gateley to write up the report.

68

69 In response to a question, council staff Mike Huddleston said that cancellation of an
70 ITSG meeting due to the snowstorm caused a further delay beyond the anticipated one
71 month. He said he has spoken with the council to alert them to the delay, and will draft a
72 formal letter requesting a new deadline.

73

74 **Third Party Review**

75 Huddleston reported that procurement has been completed. Responses were received
76 from five firms, each with a different approach. One qualified firm was selected. The
77 council staff team has drafted a memo to the council chair recommending approval of the
78 firm and its proposed approach. Three concerns during the procurement process were:

- 79 • The budgeted \$50,000 was not sufficient for the work requested.
- 80 • The 90 day turn-around time was not sufficient.
- 81 • Firms did not want to disqualify themselves from future work on the King County
82 solid waste system by bidding on this small project.

83

84 As a result of the first concern, the budget was increased to the full amount of \$129,000.
85 Huddleston said that the third concern resulted in a team that has a strong East Coast
86 focus. This means the consultants are used to working in an environment that is much
87 more industrialized, with solid waste systems where the waste to energy industry is much
88 more established, land use regulations are very different from King County, and there is
89 virtually no self-haul service. The effort to ensure independence resulted in a team that is
90 unfamiliar with local conditions.

91

92 Huddleston said that team membership is negotiable per the RFP, and asked MSWMAC
93 members what they thought about adding a local economist and a local non-King County
94 utility manager to the team to balance the regional perspective.

95

96 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway said that her city council had a difficult time
97 understanding that the importance of the transfer system was independent of the disposal
98 method. She said she is concerned that hard-won understanding could be derailed if
99 process reviewers are themselves unfamiliar with local circumstances.

100

101 Garber said she can't imagine using a team that does not include someone with local
102 experience. She said she is disappointed that in the effort to avoid local agendas we have
103 ended up with a team that has its own preconceptions. Garber added that she likes the
104 idea of adding an independent, but local, solid waste director to the team because she
105 shares Greenway's concern. Garber commented that distributed transfer stations help to
106 keep collection fees low. Due to the tall stack, waste to energy facilities are typically
107 more industrial looking than transfer stations, and in King County would likely have to
108 be sited farther from population centers. If waste to energy is paired with fewer transfer
109 stations, it could substantially increase collection fees for residents of some, if not all,
110 cities.

111

112 *MSWMAC agreed by consensus to support addition of local expertise to the third party*
113 *review team.*

114

115 **Waste Prevention and Recycling Milestone Report**

116 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford said this is a milestone
117 report, intended to address key policy questions for the Comp Plan, but it is not meant to
118 cover everything that will be in the Comp Plan chapter on recycling. He said both ITSG
119 and SWAC have reviewed the outline, and their comments have been incorporated.

120

121 Armanini said that she is concerned about the inclusion of bans in the matrix. Her
122 concern is that what works in Seattle may not be as well received in the suburban county,
123 where the culture is different.

124

125 Garber commented that the Comp Plan process is intended to answer that question, and
126 all options should be considered.

127

128 Greenway said that in Kirkland the culture has evolved in response to recycling
129 programs. She said she is amazed by the level of enthusiasm for recycling in her city and
130 believes that existing programs serve as education to create the mindset that recycling is a
131 necessary behavior. She said the carrot approach that has been pursued so far has worked
132 up to the point where public acceptance of required recycling is possible.

133

134 When asked if she thinks that bans would influence the recalcitrant recycler, Greenway
135 replied that she does. She said the conclusion of the evolution of recycling programs is
136 mandatory recycling. She added that not only is it possible to institute bans, but there is a
137 point where they become necessary.

138

139 Knight said that education is a necessary function of recycling programs, but does not
140 believe it is always the most effective or affordable way to change behavior. She said she
141 thinks the entire region has already benefited from Seattle's ban because people
142 throughout the county see the press and think it applies to them. She added that for
143 certain waste streams and population segments, she believes bans are essential, and looks
144 forward to seeing the results of the division's analysis of the question.

145

146 MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder said he is interested to see the conclusions on cost of
147 enforcement relative to bans' effectiveness. He said he feels that there will be a point of
148 diminishing returns.

149

150 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett said she shares Armanini's concern about how some
151 cities will receive a regulatory approach. She said data on the effectiveness of that
152 approach is necessary before it can be supported.

153

154 Armanini asked whether bans would belong in the Comp Plan or in individual cities'
155 contracts. Gaisford replied that when ITSG discussed that question, they noted the
156 progression in the Comp Plan from mandated curbside collection to offering separate
157 yard waste collection and then finally banning yard waste from garbage. However, other
158 significant decisions have been made individually by the cities. A continuing discussion
159 is needed to determine where the line should be drawn between collective action and

160 individual choice. He added that the intention for this milestone report is to scope the
161 options. No choices will be made until the Comp Plan.

162

163 Huddleston commented that a city-by-city piecemeal approach is inefficient. He said he
164 would suggest that if that paradigm is preferred, the county should not have any role in
165 recycling at all. The alternative to this would be for the entire region to rally around a
166 concrete goal, like adding one year to the life of Cedar Hills, and uniformly support that
167 goal through targeting specific materials for increased recycling. He said he sees a
168 parallel between recycling and seat belt laws. Both began with education, but education
169 alone is inefficient, so enforcement must be added as a second step. Huddleston said we
170 must discuss why recycling is useful. Once there is agreement on the reason for
171 recycling, the most efficient methods will be easier to determine.

172

173 Greenway commented that while some communities have sophisticated recycling
174 programs, others don't have mandatory garbage recycling. With such a wide variety of
175 users, it will be hard to create programs that fit the entire system.

176

177 Gaisford discussed the matrix handout and said it is not exhaustive, but is intended as a
178 starting point for discussion of which strategies deserve further analysis. He asked
179 MSWMAC members for input on any other strategies that should be included in the list.
180 In answer to a question, he said the analysis will include both environmental benefits as
181 well as negative impacts such as emissions from collection trucks. He noted that there
182 are also separate categories for start-up costs and ongoing costs.

183

184 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler commented he thinks this is the most critical part of
185 the analysis. Although not easy to do, it is imperative to clearly identify the goals and
186 then measure the elements that are most significant to gauge success.

187

188 Knight said that although bans are always discussed with a negative spin, they are in fact
189 an active step governments can take to move toward a goal. In so far as they are an
190 effective tool, bans are positive.

191

192 Garber commented that the overarching criterion is that which approaches
193 “sustainability,” although the term remains somewhat vaguely defined.

194

195 Gaisford said members could continue to send their comments to the division until the
196 January meeting.

197

198 **Landfill Operations**

199 Engineering Services manager Kevin Kiernan gave a power point presentation on Cedar
200 Hills Landfill operations. That presentation is available at:

201 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CedarHillsLandfill.ppt>

202

203 In response to a question, Kiernan said three of the landfill gas flares will be moved to the
204 landfill gas conversion facility to serve as backup for downtime. He said the division
205 expects to sell pipeline quality gas, because there is a pipeline near the landfill and
206 electricity prices are too low for electricity generated from landfill gas to be competitive.
207 Information about the future of the landfill gas program will be available in January.

208

209 Huddleston commented that low electricity prices are a region-wide phenomenon that
210 any system generating electricity from waste will have to deal with.

211

212 Jennings said the division hopes that the new contract will provide the flexibility to
213 respond to changing conditions in the energy market.

214

215 In response to a question, Kiernan said that seagulls require an ongoing effort at the
216 landfill, although they are not as problematic as in the past. Many strategies have been
217 used, and all work to some degree, but none eliminate the problem entirely. Currently the
218 division has a contract with the USDA to kill some of the birds. This combined with
219 other strategies such as bird wires and noisemakers keep the birds under control.

220

221 Armanini asked about the impacts of alternative daily cover. Kiernan said it allows for
222 easier collection of landfill gas, and saves time that used to be spent scraping dirt from
223 the working face each morning.

224

225 Kiernan said the buffer, combined with the capped areas of the landfill, provides habitat
226 for a number of species, including: deer, coyote, lynx, eagles, and reportedly, bear. There
227 is a mowing program to avoid the encroachment of trees onto the landfill's capped areas.

228

229 Kiernan said that when considering alternatives for future landfill development, it is
230 important to remember the homes to the north that look directly down on the landfill.

231

232 In response to a question, Kiernan said the big difference between Cedar Hills and
233 landfills in Eastern Washington is the amount of water that must be managed. The
234 division spends over two million dollars each year to manage leachate. Although
235 landfills in Eastern Washington must follow the same regulations, climatic differences
236 require very different management efforts. Today, no one would be likely to site a
237 landfill in a wet climate like Western Washington's.

238

239 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka asked if it would be possible to get a close look at
240 each of the transfer stations like the ones provided for Cedar Hills in this presentation.
241 Kiernan said that there are only staff photos available, but offered to look into using
242 department resources to produce more professional and comprehensive images of the
243 transfer stations. Kiernan encouraged anyone who has not already done so to arrange a
244 tour to see the landfill in person.

245

246 **Adjourn**

247 In response to a question, Garber said that it may be necessary to schedule an early start
248 for future meetings based on the agenda. Garber suggested that a Comp Plan schedule
249 update be included at the next meeting.

250

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

252

253 Submitted by:

254 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff