

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

**June 8, 2007**

**11:45 – 2:45 p.m.**

**King Street Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Center**

**Approved**

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
<b>Rich Wagner</b>	<b>City of Auburn</b>	<b>Councilmember</b>
<b>Sharon Hlavka</b>	<b>City of Auburn</b>	<b>Solid Waste Supervisor</b>
<b>Susan Fife-Ferris</b>	<b>City of Bellevue</b>	<b>Conservation and Outreach Program Mgr.</b>
<b>Joan McGilton</b>	<b>City of Burien</b>	<b>Mayor</b>
<b>Don Henning</b>	<b>City of Covington</b>	<b>Councilmember</b>
<b>Rob Van Orsow</b>	<b>City of Federal Way</b>	<b>Solid Waste and Recycling Coordinator</b>
<b>Jessica Greenway</b>	<b>City of Kirkland</b>	<b>Councilmember</b>
<b>Jim Lauinger</b>	<b>City of Kirkland</b>	<b>Mayor</b>
<b>Erin Leonhart</b>	<b>City of Kirkland</b>	<b>Public Works Maintenance Supervisor</b>
<b>Carolyn Armanini</b>	<b>City of Lake Forest Park</b>	<b>Staff</b>
<b>Jean Garber</b>	<b>City of Newcastle</b>	<b>Mayor</b>
<b>Jon Spangler</b>	<b>City of Redmond</b>	<b>Natural Resources Division Manager</b>
<b>Linda Knight</b>	<b>City of Renton</b>	<b>Solid Waste Coordinator</b>
<b>Dale Schroeder</b>	<b>City of SeaTac</b>	<b>Public Works Director</b>
<b>Rika Cecil</b>	<b>City of Shoreline</b>	<b>Environmental Programs Coordinator</b>
<b>Frank Iriarte</b>	<b>City of Tukwila</b>	<b>Deputy Public Works Director</b>

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

**Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager**

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

**Bob Tocarciuc, Planning Supervisor**

**Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison**

**Thea Severn, Assistant Operations Manager**

**Tom Karston, Finance and Rate Analyst**

**Josh Marx, SWD Staff**

**Bill Reed, SWD Staff**

**Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff**

**Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff**

King County Council Staff

**Mike Reed**

Guests

**Joyce Nichols, City of Bellevue**

**Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association**

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 May Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

6 MSWMAC Vice-Chair Jessica Greenway thanked Gemma Alexander for doing an  
7 outstanding job on the minutes. MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini agreed and noted  
8 how interesting it is to read the different perspectives of MSWMAC and the Solid Waste  
9 Advisory Committee (SWAC).

10  
11 *The May minutes were approved by consensus.*

12  
13 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/ITSG/Master Schedule**

14 Garber announced that there would not be a SWAC update because SWAC has not met  
15 since the last MSWMAC meeting.

16  
17 Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan announced that the in-house hauling of  
18 recyclables legislation was approved by the Growth Management Natural Resources  
19 (GMNR) Committee on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, and was referred to the Operating Budget Committee.

20  
21 The Landfill Gas to Energy contract will be transmitted to council in June. Armanini  
22 inquired about revenue estimates. Kiernan replied that estimates are currently a million  
23 dollars a year in revenue which is three times more than in the original contract. Kiernan  
24 also noted that King County keeps the credits for emissions and half of the tax credits in  
25 the new contract. Garber asked what process would be used at Cedar Hills Landfill to  
26 clean up the gas. Kiernan stated that it would be a multi-step process on skid mounted  
27 equipment. It will involve compression, cooling and filtration.

28  
29 The Bow Lake Transfer Station Master Facilities Plan has been approved by council.  
30 The division can move forward with design. Design and construction will take  
31 approximately three years.

33 The rate proposal will be heard on June 13<sup>th</sup> by the Operating Budget Committee.  
34  
35 Kiernan discussed the U.S. Supreme Court's recent flow control decision. The Court  
36 decided that local government has the authority to direct where its waste is disposed.  
37 Garber asked if the construction/demolition/land clearing (CDL) waste contracts are  
38 subject to this decision. Kiernan stated that there was no impact on the CDL contracts.  
39 They were awarded through a competitive bidding process and companies within and  
40 outside the state of Washington had the opportunity to bid. Kiernan stated that solid  
41 waste management requires a large capital investment. Certainty of the waste stream  
42 makes it easier to make those investments. The summary of the decision is available at:  
43 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/USCourt4-13.pdf>  
44  
45 Fife-Ferris asked that Kiernan explain the impacts of the division hauling recyclables.  
46 Kiernan stated that the division's analysis indicated the work could be done by the  
47 division at a lower cost.  
48  
49 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow updated the committee on the last  
50 Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) meeting. Van Orsow reported that there  
51 was some discussion about Councilmember Lambert's letter. ITSG also reviewed the  
52 recycling diversion options presentation that is going to be presented today.  
53  
54 Greenway announced that Kirkland launched a battery recycling program. The idea for  
55 that program came out of discussions at MSWMAC. The goal for the program is 100%  
56 battery recycling.  
57  
58 Planning Supervisor Bob Tocarciuc reported on the Comprehensive Solid Waste  
59 Management Plan updated schedule. The business plan has been moved to six months  
60 after the projected approval of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan.  
61 SWAC will hear the Rural Level of Service presentation in August, while ITSG and  
62 MSWMAC will receive the information in September. Tocarciuc stated that there is  
63 flexibility in next year's schedule if some items require more than one meeting.  
64

65 In response to comments that the schedule was difficult to understand, Tocarciuc replied  
66 that he would revise the schedule to try to make it clearer.

67

68 Council Staff Mike Reed expressed concern about the timeline for developing the draft  
69 Comp Plan. Reed said there is concern about the pressure the schedule puts on transfer  
70 station design and construction schedules. Kiernan stated that most of the transfer station  
71 projects are on hold pending approval of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export  
72 System Plan.

73

74 Reed inquired if the bonds are contingent on the Comp Plan. Kiernan replied that they  
75 are dependent on the rate proposal.

76

77 Reed inquired if interlocal agreements (ILA) are waiting for the completion of the Comp  
78 Plan. Kiernan noted that that is a question for MSWMAC, but the division can bond with  
79 the existing agreements. Garber noted that shortening the Comp Plan process is not  
80 realistic because the advisory groups will want to comment on each topic.

81

82 Armanini noted that the advisory groups completed their part of the process some time  
83 ago. It is the third party review and the approval of the rates that have delayed decisions.

84

85 **Councilmember Lambert's Conversion Technologies Study Letter**

86 Kiernan stated that the Waste-to-Energy (WTE) report was available for review, but  
87 emphasized that the report is just a preliminary draft and has not completed review by the  
88 Division yet. The electronic version of the draft is available at:

89 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/DraftCTReport060807.pdf>

90

91 Kiernan stated that comments should be brought to ITSG or MSWMAC or emailed ahead  
92 of time.

93

94 MSWMAC member Joan McGilton asked if the Zero Waste decision made by the City of  
95 Seattle would impact the county's decisions on WTE. Kiernan stated the city's and

96 county's planning efforts are on a different timeline. However, the jurisdictions do share  
97 information and look for opportunities for coordination.

98

99 McGilton stated that there should be a discussion of Zero Waste in the division's Comp  
100 Plan. Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford stated that the  
101 division will be discussing Zero Waste with the cities as one potential policy choice.  
102 Many of the concepts in Seattle's Zero Waste discussions were also included in King  
103 County's considerations for waste prevention and recycling.

104

105 Garber said that Kiernan would provide responses to the issues raised in the letter that  
106 Councilmember Lambert sent to R.W. Beck consultants.

107

108 Kiernan stated that there were no cost comparisons for new landfills included in the  
109 report because current county policy states that the county will not construct a new  
110 landfill in King County. That question was beyond the scope of R.W. Beck's work.

111

112 In response to the public vs. private issue, Kiernan noted that comparisons of the cost of  
113 building and financing were included in the report; however this data is not conclusive  
114 since a WTE facility hasn't been built in the U.S. since 1995. The report used the best  
115 available data.

116

117 Kiernan noted that estimates of waste generation were based on moderate increases in the  
118 recycling rate. WTE would be compatible with a recycling rate of up to 70 percent.

119

120 Regarding the management of residual ash, Kiernan noted that compliance with state and  
121 federal regulations were part of the criteria that R.W. Beck had to use in drafting their  
122 report. Some facilities and technologies that are allowed in Germany are not in  
123 accordance with regulations here.

124

125 Kiernan stated that steam can only be moved a relatively short distance before the value  
126 is lost. A facility would need to be constructed in Seattle in order to be used by Seattle  
127 Steam. Siting in Seattle is beyond the scope of what was asked of R.W. Beck.

128

129 Kiernan stated that the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) findings in the report are  
130 different than other findings due to the nature of the energy market in the Northwest  
131 region. The region's primary source of power comes from hydropower and natural gas.  
132 The estimates used in the report were conservative ones.

133

134 On the last point, Kiernan stated that the division cannot plan for other jurisdictions'  
135 systems. We can share our ideas with them, but they have not expressed an interest in a  
136 coordinated planning effort.

137

138 **Waste Prevention/Recycling: Single and Multi Family Services Discussion:**

139 Gaisford gave a PowerPoint presentation on Single and Multi Family Diversion Tools  
140 and Options. It is available at:

141 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrc/swd/MSWMACSF060807.ppt>

142

143 Armanini asked what the planning window was for the data presented in the report.

144 Gaisford stated that it is current information.

145

146 Armanini inquired about the data for the single family curbside mix diversion scenarios.

147 Gaisford responded that the data was an estimate based on both King County numbers  
148 and data from other jurisdictions. Armanini noted that there shouldn't be decimals used  
149 on the percentages because that implies a level of accuracy that isn't there. Solid Waste  
150 Division staff Bill Reed stated that without the decimals you don't see the impact.

151

152 Greenway asked if there was any data available on how many households recycle.

153 Gaisford noted that the data gathered was from hauler reports and that they only keep  
154 track of the set out rate. Solid Waste Division staff Bill Reed stated that a county-wide  
155 average set-out rate has not been calculated. Greenway noted that information would be  
156 useful because it would let us know if the goal should be to get more people signed up for  
157 recycling or more people to recycle. Gaisford stated that according to phone survey  
158 results 90 percent of households do some level of recycling.

159

160 MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte commented that Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)  
161 capacity should be included in the infrastructure option. Iriarte stated that he had recently  
162 met with a hauler and that their capacity would not be able to meet the tonnage indicated.  
163 Gaisford concurred with this suggestion. MSWMAC member Linda Knight stated that  
164 the focus should be on things local governments can influence directly. Fife-Ferris stated  
165 that Cascadia's study indicated that the MRFs have sufficient capacity.

166  
167 Gaisford said that since the completion of the MRF study, new information indicates the  
168 MRFs do not have the capacity to handle as much material as had been expected.

169  
170 Armanini stated that the triple bottom line is that transporting waste into Pierce County's  
171 MRFs might not be to the benefit of the recycling program. Van Orsow noted Waste  
172 Management now sends South King County recyclables to nearby MRFs in South King  
173 County and Pierce County (instead of all the way to Woodinville). Also, a new MRF is  
174 coming on-line in Fredrickson, near Puyallup.

175  
176 Discussion followed about the inconsistency between jurisdictions' recycling programs.  
177 For example, some jurisdictions permit shredded paper in recycling containers; others do  
178 not. In response to a question about shredded paper, Gaisford said there is variation  
179 among the jurisdictions in the way that it should be handled. Fife-Ferris commented that  
180 this raises the question of consistency among the cities. MSWMAC member Don  
181 Henning stated that it may be valuable for cities to discuss consistent collection standards  
182 with their haulers.

183  
184 Knight stated that there is potential to recover organic materials and that the issue should  
185 be looked at in the Comp Plan. Armanini said that before everyone gets seduced by the  
186 14.6% that the disposal ban option projects that they should keep in mind that this is a  
187 new program and we're still gathering data. Gaisford said that these numbers reflect the  
188 range of options. There is room for education and a ban would not be appropriate since  
189 people haven't figured out how to recycle food waste yet.

190

191 MSWMAC member Erin Leonhart said that the Department of Public Health is  
192 concerned about food waste recycling, and that must be addressed.

193

194 Armanini asked in reference to the multi family curbside mix diversion scenarios if there  
195 was an analysis done in places where they have recycling containers located side by side  
196 with garbage containers. Gaisford said that based on case studies; there were other issues  
197 that were a factor, not just container placement.

198

199 In response to the data presented on the multi family wood, carpet, and textiles diversion  
200 scenarios Fife-Ferris stated that textile options were added to multi family service in the  
201 City of Bellevue, with landlords having the option to set-up this service and there was no  
202 response.

203

204 Van Orsow stated that rates are a motivator for single family homes. Property managers  
205 are charging residents for service, which may provide an opportunity for cities to  
206 motivate behavior change.

207

208 When presented with the single and multi family waste prevention options data, Fife-  
209 Ferris said that education through the schools to educate kids to only bring what they  
210 need would reduce food scraps.

211

212 Armanini said that junk mail bankrolls the postal service and any mandates or persuasion  
213 used would be complicated.

214

215 Van Orsow asked if the data presented for plastic bags distinguishes between handled  
216 bags and garbage bags. Reed replied that they do not. Armanini stated that there was a  
217 recent news story done on a plastic bag ban, and that article was very biased.

218

219 Fife-Ferris asked if the Glass Diversion Scenarios looked at dual collection. Gaisford  
220 said that it would add significant cost to the infrastructure. Solid Waste Division Staff  
221 Josh Marx said that glass has a higher market value if it is collected separately.

222

223 Armanini asked when a bottle bill was last tried in Washington State. Gaisford estimated  
224 it to be around 1984. He added Washington Citizens for Resource Conservation recently  
225 sent out a Request For Proposal (RFP) for a container recycling proposal that was not a  
226 bottle bill.

227

228 Fife-Ferris stated that in the City of Bellevue multi family units are treated as commercial  
229 customers. The Comp Plan needs to address multi family units combined with  
230 commercial units, as growth happens. Gaisford said that although the approach might be  
231 better to treat them as commercial units, in reality they are mixed-use buildings.

232

233 Armanini inquired about the use of consistent container size. Gaisford stated that there  
234 are different container sizes around the County, and recycling rates do vary with the size  
235 of container.

236

237 Van Orsow stated that the single family data has small percentages in clothing fiber and  
238 commented that Goodwill might be a factor in that. Knight suggested there should be a  
239 presentation done by Value Village or Goodwill on how that industry is taking care of  
240 recycling. McGilton said that in Africa clothing goes to an open market system and that  
241 you can see American tee shirt labels showing up there.

242

243 Van Orsow suggested that it would be helpful to present data on what the projections  
244 would be if all of the suggestions for the single family/multi family diversion options  
245 were implemented.

246

247 Armanini noted that the handouts should not be in color for future presentations.

248

249 **MSWMAC/ITSG Work Plan Discussion**

250 Garber said she attended a meeting to discuss adding language to the ITSG legislation  
251 requiring milestone reports as part of the Comp Plan update process. Garber said she  
252 believes that milestone reports would slow the update process and that less formal  
253 briefing reports would be a more efficient use of time. Council staff Mike Huddleston is  
254 drafting language for the amendment, which should be available for MSWMAC's review

255 and comment at the July meeting. The legislation will include reports on WTE, Cedar  
256 Hills capacity, recycling, long haul and intermodal, transfer station construction  
257 scheduling and governance.

258

259 Greenway asked who these reports would go to. Garber replied that they are intended for  
260 the RPC and the King County Council.

261

262 Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison, said that motions for adoption will  
263 accompany each briefing or report, but the action will be to approve the approach taken  
264 on the analysis. Recommendations cannot be approved before environmental review is  
265 completed on the draft Comp Plan.

266

267 Greenway said that there might be a way to make these reports useful to the MSWMAC  
268 group and other bodies that they represent. Armanini noted that was already built into the  
269 process. Garber said that we're going to be doing briefing reports anyway and that a  
270 legislative mandate for summary reports seems to be an accountability issue.

271

272 Yates said that adding reports will impact the Comp Plan timeline.

273

274

275 **Adjourn**

276 The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

277

278 Submitted by:

279 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff