

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 14, 2007

11:45 – 2:15 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Susan Fife-Ferris	City of Bellevue	Conservation & Outreach Program Manager
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
David Baker	City of Kenmore	Deputy Mayor
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Staff
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Brad Bell, Transfer/Transport Operations Manager

Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Terri Hansen, Interim Assistant Division Director

Shirley Jurgensen, Interim Engineering Manager

Tom Karston, SWD Staff

Kevin Kiernan, Interim Division Director

Sandra Matteson, SWD Staff

Josh Marx, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Interim Planning Supervisor

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

King County Council Staff

Mike Reed

Michael Huddleston

Guests

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

David Steen, City of Des Moines

Jerallyn Roetemeyer, City of Redmond

1 **Call to Order**

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

4
5 Garber announced that MSWMAC member Don Henning had passed away Friday,
6 September 7th, from kidney disease. A card was circulated for signature and his
7 memorial service is being held in Kent on September 17th. Intergovernmental Relations
8 Liaison Diane Yates provided information about the service. Garber said that Henning
9 always had good input for the committee and was dedicated to his city. His presence will
10 be sadly missed.

11
12 **Approve July Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

13 **MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza moved to approve the July minutes.**

14
15 MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris asked a question regarding Page 5 Line 115. She
16 asked about the committee's process for reviewing and taking action on the report.
17 Garber replied that the discussion today is to decide on MSWMAC's official comments.
18 Yates said that the proviso for the third party review invites the committee's comments.

19
20 Vice-Chair Jessica Greenway commented that the excellent tradition of minute taking
21 continues with new Solid Waste Division staff person Jennifer Broadus.

22
23 *July minutes were unanimously approved.*

24
25 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/ITSG/Master Schedule:**

26 **SWD:**

27 Interim Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan said that the division is instituting a
28 new policy of serving water in pitchers with glasses instead of providing bottled water.
29 The intent of this shift is to save energy and money. Kiernan stated that it is always
30 better to reduce before recycling.

31

32 Kiernan announced that Thea Severn will be the new Interim Lead Planner for the Solid
33 Waste Division.

34

35 The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) cancelled their September 12th meeting due to
36 Jennifer Dunn's memorial service. Their next meeting is scheduled for September 26th.

37

38 The Public Issues Committee (PIC) of the Suburban Cities Association (SCA) voted to
39 approve the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan. PIC had a short
40 presentation on the Conversion Technology Study.

41

42 The Factoria supplemental budget request for property acquisition has been delayed at the
43 budget committee due to some procedural questions about property appraisals and
44 purchase prices.

45

46 The division has submitted proposed amendments to King County Solid Waste Code,
47 Title 10. The changes are, primarily, administrative, and include deleting dates of
48 deliverables that have already been submitted, such as the due dates for the milestone
49 reports. The division is also seeking the authority to set fees for handling and processing
50 of recyclable materials collected at transfer facilities for which no other fee exists.

51

52 MSWMAC member Erin Leonhart asked if there was any possibility of changes on food
53 waste recycling requirements in the code changes. Kiernan said the definitions might be
54 changed, but he does not anticipate changes on public health's issues in the solid waste
55 code.

56

57 King County Council staff Mike Reed noted that the Parks Division also has fee-setting
58 authority.

59

60 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow asked if the changes to Title 10 will be made
61 available for review. The changes are available for viewing online through Legistarweb.

62 That link can be found at:

63 <http://mkcclegisearch.metrokc.gov/legistarweb/home.aspx>

64

65 Reed said that the council has hired Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc. (GBB) to
66 conduct a third party review of the division's proposal to bring hauling of recyclables
67 from the transfer stations in-house instead of contracting the work out. The review
68 should be complete in approximately two months.

69

70 Armanini asked about council's intention to continue requiring costly third party reviews
71 on all of the division's proposals. Reed replied that for substantial change in policy the
72 council feels it deserves to have some new eyes look at it. Reed continued that for
73 modest proposals a review would not be necessary. Reed said that the council has a lot of
74 different perspectives that they have to consider before making a substantive decision.

75

76 Armanini noted that the money will keep adding up for these reviews because of issues
77 between the legislative and executive branches. Reed said that cost of the third party
78 review of the in-house recyclables hauling proposal is being born by the council.

79

80 SWAC:

81 Armanini said that SWAC reaffirmed its support of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste
82 Export System Plan. Armanini clarified that this was support for the plan, and not for the
83 third party review. The vote was unanimous with two abstentions.

84

85 SWAC had a lively discussion about the R.W. Beck report. Armanini said that she would
86 not go into details on that discussion so as not to influence the discussion at MSWMAC,
87 but she wanted it noted that SWAC membership represents a diversity of interests.

88 SWAC is starting to draft its comments on the report.

89

90 Armanini said that SWAC was copied on a September 6th letter from Councilmember
91 Lambert to R.W. Beck outlining 17 concerns with Beck's Conversion Technologies
92 Report. Armanini said that since SWAC is a public meeting, the letter is a public record,
93 so she would like to make it available to MSWMAC. Councilmember Lambert's letter
94 can be found at:

95 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/LambertWTEletterSept6.pdf>

96

97 Armanini asked if the division was going to respond to the letter. Kiernan answered that
98 a response is being drafted.

99

100 ITSG:

101 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka gave the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group
102 (ITSG) update. ITSG met on September 5th, with four cities in attendance. They
103 received a presentation from the division on the Rural Level of Service, and Self-Haul
104 Level of Service. The presentations brought up questions about cost analysis, and
105 bringing garbage into transfer stations.

106

107 The discussion that took place on recycling included the new Shoreline transfer station
108 and its pilot recycling programs. ITSG discussed future plans for accepting additional
109 recyclables at the stations and whether services should be consistent countywide.

110

111 ITSG is interested in looking at the recycling rates of other communities in an effort to
112 determine if recycling rates are higher with curbside collection services or with transfer
113 station services.

114

115 Schedule:

116 Garber announced that there are no changes in the master schedule. Pelosa asked that the
117 master schedule be available at each MSWMAC meeting whether or not the schedule had
118 changes. Kiernan said the division would have copies available at each meeting.

119

120 **Rate Increase: Public Notification Plan**

121 Kiernan said that the division's rate increase will be effective January 1, 2008. Letters
122 have been sent out to all the cities, to charge customers, haulers, and unincorporated area
123 councils. The division will also provide the information on its website, and by placing
124 signs at the facilities.

125

126 Kiernan asked that MSWMAC help the division by posting the rates notice on their
127 cities' websites.

128

129 MSWMAC member Linda Knight asked if the haulers just pay the tonnage fee at the
130 transfer stations since the state tax and Local Hazardous Waste Management (LHWM)
131 fee is added to customers' bills. Kiernan responded that the division does not charge the
132 haulers the state tax or LHWMP fee at the stations.

133

134 Van Orsow asked if the division was able to help cities determine how to allocate the
135 increase across its different rates. Kiernan said that in the unincorporated areas and in
136 cities that do not contract for collection services, the rate increase would be handled by
137 the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Committee (UTC). The division could
138 work with cities that contract for collection services and set their own rates.

139

140 MSWMAC member Joan McGilton asked how the rate increase will affect residents.
141 Kiernan answered that the average impact is calculated to be an additional 73 cents for a
142 residential one can customer. She said she hoped the haulers would be as responsible as
143 the division in informing its customers.

144

145 Garber noted that division's brochure was very well done and informative.

146

147 **Conversion Technologies Study Discussion**

148 Garber said that she had two personal thoughts to put before the committee. These
149 documents are just her suggestions. These documents can be found at:

150 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/GarberCommentWRSImatrix.pdf>

151 and

152 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/GarberWTEvsWXport.pdf>

153

154 Garber said that in regards to Waste Export vs. Waste Conversion technologies, that
155 ordinance 14971 has been fulfilled and there are no advantages to not sticking to waste
156 export. Three potential recommendations are given at the end of her document. The
157 matrix is intended to provoke discussion.

158

159 Garber asked Council staff Mike Huddleston what council will do with the Conversion
160 Technology Study and when he expects council will take action.

161

162 Huddleston said that the majority of the council shares the concerns that MSWMAC has
163 expressed about the single vendor involvement in the process. However, council has
164 other issues, including economic development. They are interested in increasing rail
165 capability. There are concerns that waste export isn't the highest and best use for rail
166 capacity.

167

168 Huddleston said it is important to look at different technologies and that the number of
169 technologies have been whittled down to a handful including export and landfilling.
170 Price differentials and siting are issues to continue to look at as well as health issues.

171

172 Huddleston also said he appreciates the emphasis placed on extending the capacity of
173 Cedar Hills Landfill.

174

175 Huddleston said he agreed with Garber's recommendations up to number three, *'that no*
176 *further resources be expended on the study of conversion technologies at this time.'*

177 Huddleston stated that he is concerned that this will influence the division's Solid Waste
178 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) process and sides will become entrenched between
179 waste export and waste conversion.

180

181 Huddleston continues that the King County Council is open-minded; there is some
182 skepticism about waste export but there is more skepticism about waste to energy.
183 Concerns are related to siting and costs.

184

185 Garber said siting is one issue. She said the nature of the contracts between the county
186 and the cities for solid waste services are such that cities would have to sign onto waste to
187 energy without contract reopener provisions. Cities would have to lock themselves into
188 one vendor and one technology. She said she is also concerned about sustainability – a
189 waste to energy facility has a 40 year life span and then the facility would require a major

190 reconstruction or a new plant would have to be built. We are not in same situation as
191 Europe. We have arid areas in eastern Washington, where landfilling is appropriate.

192
193 Armanini said that SWAC came up with significant point, which is that the life of Cedar
194 Hills is further out than was originally thought. Armanini referred to the R.W. Beck
195 study, which states that there are emerging technologies that show promise. Since the life
196 of Cedar Hills could be extended, the region has the luxury of retaining flexibility and
197 doesn't need to make decisions in this Comp Plan update. She suggested that the
198 wording, '*and to retain as much flexibility as possible for as long as possible,*' be added
199 to Garber's second recommendation, which states, '*That every avenue to extend the life*
200 *of the Cedar Hills Landfill be explored, including early waste export, to keep our rates as*
201 *low as possible for as long as possible.*'

202
203 Greenway said Garber did a great job of laying out just the facts in comparing waste
204 export and waste to energy. She said the first three resonate with her – cost, greenhouse
205 gas emissions and recycling goals. She said she wants to make sure we have this
206 discussion based on facts. Some seem enamored of the concept of conversion. Some of
207 what enamors people becomes less desirable when you just look at the facts and not the
208 romance of it.

209
210 Greenway said that Armanini makes a good point about flexibility. She asked about the
211 infrastructure required to implement early waste export and if flexibility is lost with that
212 path.

213
214 Kiernan said that partial early waste export would be handled by a contractor. The
215 division would need the capability to take boxes off trucks and put on trains. Seattle has
216 the capacity for partner waste identified in their contract. Waste Connections has
217 intermodal and landfill capacity. King County would have to enter into a contract but
218 wouldn't need to make any capital investment. Greenway said that it is good to know
219 that flexibility is maintained.

220

221 Huddleston said another issue is the requirements for a transfer system between the
222 various options. Is the number of stations, location of stations appropriate? He said the
223 last question is what kind of recycling should take place at stations. If you don't have a
224 transfer system, then you would have to pay to transport uncompacted waste. You either
225 pay for the infrastructure or pay a higher rate for someone else to have infrastructure.
226 Also, are the costs appropriate? The Third Party Review questioned the division's capital
227 costs.

228

229 Kiernan said that in early 90s, when the division looked at the economics of hauling
230 compacted waste from the transfer stations to Cedar Hills, it penciled out. You reduce
231 truck trips when you can carry 28 tons instead of 18 tons per truck. It's consistent
232 regardless of where the waste goes.

233

234 McGilton said she was bothered by the technical information that is presented; that it
235 won't work in Seattle/King County area. If we're going to site a facility to handle all
236 garbage, it will have to be one big plant or you'd need to site several small plants. Where
237 are you going to put them? When this information goes out to general public, the same
238 thing that happened before will happen again. We're too tuned into the public process
239 here in King County for this to work. Also we don't want to lose all the work that's been
240 done on recycling.

241

242 Huddleston said he doesn't want to stir up the public and have them equate a transfer
243 station with a waste to energy facility.

244

245 Huddleston went on to discuss the difference in cost between waste export and waste to
246 energy. He said an effort could be made to work with the state to eliminate the sales tax
247 on a facility, which would make the costs for a waste to energy facility more consistent
248 with waste export. Huddleston said it's important to have a deliberative process.

249

250 Huddleston said he doesn't share Armanini's optimism about the capacity of Cedar Hills.

251

252 Kiernan said that there are two factors in looking at the life of Cedar Hills. One is
253 volume that can be developed and five years is a good estimate for that. But we can also
254 look at the amount of waste coming in. We have already gained nine years with
255 recycling programs and there is more to be gained there. The second strategy we can
256 look at is diverting some waste from Cedar Hills to further extend its life.

257

258 Fife-Ferris asked if her understanding was correct that a significant amount of the
259 funding for the construction of the Spokane facility came from the state. Kiernan said
260 that construction costs were about \$110 to \$115 million. He said he believed the state
261 contributed about \$66 million. (Note: subsequent information indicates total grant was
262 \$52.7 million)

263

264 Fife-Ferris said she thought that was an important point to note in the report. She went on
265 to say that siting is a deal killer and that she is concerned about the amount of time and
266 energy both division staff and city staff have already spent on this issue.

267

268 Huddleston said that the reason the state provided funding for the Spokane facility was
269 because of contamination of their sole source aquifer. Additionally, because of the
270 aquifer, it is not possible for them to site a landfill.

271

272 Garber said she understands that Damon Taam has his own consulting firm and is
273 working with WRSI on the City Los Angeles' waste to energy project. She said if that is
274 true, she is concerned about his bias. Fife-Ferris agreed that if there's a conflict of
275 interest, it needs to be disclosed.

276

277 Garber discussed the August 23rd presentation of a movie filmed on Councilmember
278 Lambert's recent trip to Germany and shown in council chambers and on King County
279 TV. She mentioned that the vendor was sitting on the dais at the presentation.

280

281 Pelozza asked if this should be moved forward with a motion. Huddleston suggested that
282 a letter would be a better alternative than a voted motion. Huddleston said the issue of

283 flexibility could be addressed in the letter. Garber said she is less concerned with the cost
284 differential and more concerned with the loss of flexibility.

285

286 Garber said the issue of extending the interlocal agreements between the county and the
287 cities should also be addressed in the letter.

288

289 Armanini asked the division what it thought the risks are of each potential disposal
290 option.

291

292 Kiernan said each choice brings its own set of risks. He addressed each option:

293 Cedar Hills Landfill:

- 294 • Permitting in Area 8 – Area 8 would not require a change in the land use permit. It
295 would require other permits.
- 296 • Litigation – The division has purchased long term liability insurance on Cedar Hills
297 through 2012 and is looking into extending the insurance beyond 2012.
- 298 • Long term environmental risk – The division has the post closure maintenance fund
299 and a double liner system.

300 Waste Export:

- 301 • Some of the same risks as Cedar Hills since you are taking waste to someone else's
302 landfill.
- 303 • Infrastructure – Getting from here to there since there are periodic disruptions in the
304 rail line.
- 305 • Cost – If rail line capacity is limited, there are costs increase that could potentially
306 arise at the time of contract renewal.
- 307 • Guaranteed tonnage – We need to guarantee tonnage over the long term to get the
308 best rate.

309 Conversion Technologies:

- 310 • Siting – Cost and time in a siting process would be considerable. It has been tried
311 before with a lot of pain and suffering, and with no guarantee of success.
- 312 • Litigation experience – As an example, there was a pink cloud of iodine over the
313 Spokane facility and a fire there last week.

- 314 • Infrastructure – Similar infrastructure risks as Cedar Hills with the exception of if
315 there's a large earthquake. Cedar Hills is less susceptible than a waste to energy
316 facility to seismic activity.
- 317 • Capital Cost – Capital costs of \$500 to \$700 million based on initial capital cost
318 estimate.
- 319 • Guaranteed tonnage – Ability to guarantee tonnage over long term.
- 320 • Energy markets are also a risk.

321

322 Armanini said that the issue of guaranteed tonnage seems to fly in the face of recycling
323 goals. So what is the goal...guaranteeing tonnage? She went onto say that there is going
324 to be energy recovery at Cedar Hills.

325

326 Knight said she shares the concerns of others here and that she is a little fuzzy on the
327 council process. What is their decision-making process? She said she keeps hearing we
328 have to go through this process and she's not sure what that process is. Council created
329 MSWMAC and they deserve to hear that voice in a formal way. At some point, the cities
330 may dig in their heels. The cities' position in this is very significant. Cities have the
331 interest of their ratepayers at heart.

332

333 Garber said she hears Knight saying it's not inappropriate for cities to dig in their heels.

334

335 Kiernan said that from the technical perspective, the question is, 'what do we do with our
336 garbage?' We need to make decisions about what we do after current capacity is filled.
337 If we can get to 2021 or beyond, a decision does not need to be made in the current Comp
338 Plan update.

339

340 **Peloza moved that MSWMAC send a letter to the King County Council including**
341 **Chair Garber's three recommendations, with the an added modification to maintain**
342 **flexibility. He said we need to put a stake in the ground at this time.**

343

344 Armanini asked Peloza if his intent was that Garber's entire paper be converted to letter
345 format rather than including only the three recommendations.

346

347 Pelozza said that was the intention of his motion.

348

349 Armanini asked if Garber's analysis can be shared with SWAC, since they are more
350 technical and informational. There were no objections.

351

352 MSWMAC discussed whether or not members are required to take the letter to their
353 councils for direction. Members agreed that they would each follow their city's
354 requirements in order to take action at MSWMAC.

355

356 *The committee agreed by consensus to send a letter to King County Council.*

357

358 MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby asked about the county council's next steps in this
359 process.

360

361 Huddleston said it's setting the stage for the Comp Plan.

362

363 Greenway asked what effect this letter would have on the Transfer and Waste Export
364 System Plan. Huddleston said that it should not have an effect, but there are linkages that
365 you find in politics when you have big issues. The Transfer plan needs to be done; it is
366 time sensitive and can not wait. Greenway said that statement should be added to the
367 letter.

368

369 Armanini suggested that MSWMAC send a letter similar to the one that SWAC has
370 transmitted that reaffirms the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan first, since the third
371 party review did not reveal any flaws in the plan.

372

373 **Armanini motioned that a letter be generated to the King County Council affirming**
374 **MSWMAC's support of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan**
375 **before sending a letter on the Conversion Technology Report.**

376

377 *The motion passed unanimously with Bellevue abstaining.*

378

379 Van Orsow asked how the letter was going to be sent. Garber said she will draft and sign
380 the letter which will be distributed to the committee.

381

382 **Transfer System: Rural Level of Service, Parts I & II: Presentation/Discussion**

383 Interim Lead Planner, Thea Severn gave a presentation on the Rural Level of Service.

384 This presentation can be found at this link:

385 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/MSWMACRuralLOS1and209142007.ppt>

386

387 McGilton asked about the portals on Vashon Transfer station. They are considered a
388 piece of art.

389

390 Fife-Ferris asked, in response to the Rural Area Curbside data, if there is a decrease in
391 waste to the drop boxes due to curbside subscription rates. Severn answered that is not
392 the case, but rather there are more houses, and more people ordering the service. Van
393 Orsow said that the data reflects subscribed people not self-haulers.

394

395 Knight asked if the self-haulers on Vashon Island have yard waste collection. Severn
396 answered that they do not, but composting is another option. Kiernan said that Vashon is
397 a unique place with unique needs.

398

399 Greenway said that she would like to hear all the recommendations together at the end.
400 Severn recapped the recommendations.

401

402 **Adjourn**

403 The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

404

405 Submitted by:

406 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff