

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 08, 2008

11:45 – 2:30 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Meeting 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
Sabrina Combs	City of Bothell	Special Projects Administrator
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Chris Eggen	City of Shoreline	Councilmember
Mark Relph	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

Pam Badger, Special Waste Supervisor

Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff

Kevin Kiernan, Division Director

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Josh Marx, SWD Staff

Bill Reed, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Interim Lead Planner

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Cities

John MacGillivray, City of Kirkland

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. Everyone
3 present introduced themselves.

4
5 **Nomination and Elections of 2008 Chair and Vice Chair**

6 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates called for nominations for the 2008
7 MSWMAC Chair, to be elected by majority roll call vote.

8
9 **MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza nominated Jean Garber to continue as MSWMAC
10 Chair.**

11 *By majority vote Garber will continue to Chair of MSWMAC in 2008.*

12
13 **MSWMAC member Linda Knight nominated Jessica Greenway to continue as
14 MSWMAC Vice-Chair.**

15 *By majority vote Greenway will continue as Vice- Chair of MSWMAC in 2008.*

16
17 Garber and Greenway expressed their appreciation and gratitude for the committee's
18 confidence in them.

19
20 **Approval of January Meeting Minutes**

21 **Greenway moved to approve the January minutes.**

22 *January minutes were approved by consensus.*

23
24 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/Legislative Update/Master Schedule:**

25 **SWD:**

26 Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that the opening ceremony for the new
27 Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station is scheduled for February 13th.

28
29 The 30 year old roof of the Skykomish Drop Box collapsed due to snow load on January
30 31st. The Skykomish location is unstaffed and monitored by remote video. The facility
31 was shut down before the roof collapsed. The division is working with the City of
32 Skykomish and Waste Management to provide interim services. The division is

33 redirecting self-haulers to Snohomish County. The site remains inaccessible due to
34 continuing snowfall. The roof will be replaced this summer.

35

36 MSWMAC member Susan Fife-Ferris asked if the division had insurance. Kiernan
37 replied that the division is covered, but there is a deductible. There was a disaster
38 declaration for that part of the county. The division is tracking all costs for recovery.

39

40 Pelozza asked about the structure of the Skykomish facility. Kiernan replied that it was
41 similar in design to the Cedar Falls Drop Box. He said that the roof was approximately
42 30 X 50 square feet. Skykomish receives only 700 tons of garbage per year, which is less
43 than the daily tonnage at the division's busiest transfer stations. Interim Lead Planner
44 Thea Severn said that the drop box serves the City of Skykomish, which has a very small
45 population of about 228.

46

47 Kiernan said that when King County surpluses a property, the process begins with an
48 internal notice to other county agencies alerting them that the property is available. If
49 there is no interest, then that property becomes available to affordable housing and other
50 jurisdictions. Recently, a King County Roads property known as the Covington Pit
51 became available near the City of Covington. The property is within the search area for
52 the new South County transfer facility and meets the initial siting criteria for a transfer
53 station. While the division has indicated an interest in keeping ownership of the property
54 within the county, it has not been selected for the site of a new transfer station. The
55 division will follow the siting process that was developed with MSWMAC before siting
56 any new facility. Kiernan said that if other properties become available that meet
57 requirements for a transfer station, the division will place a hold on them as well to
58 maximize the number of options available when the siting process formally begins.

59

60 Pelozza asked if this property could replace the Algona Transfer Station. Kiernan said that
61 is a possibility, although the property is outside of the urban growth boundary.

62

63 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow asked if the Covington Pit property was on a rail
64 line. Kiernan replied that it is.

65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

Garber said that the City of Covington has named new representatives to MSWMAC.

Kiernan said that the division will keep MSWMAC informed of any new developments.

SWAC:

MSWMAC member Joan McGilton’s requested that Yates explain the composition of SWAC for the new MSWMAC members. Yates said that SWAC is established under state law. The committee is balanced geographically and includes those who receive solid waste services, as well as representation from public interest groups, a marketing expert, labor, recycling businesses, a manufacturer located in King County, solid waste collection companies and local elected officials. They are advisory to the Solid Waste Division and King County Council. SWAC currently has 19 members. Members are appointed by the Executive and then confirmed by council. SWAC meets on the third Friday of each month.

McGilton said that SWAC has reached consensus that the division should monitor conversion technologies while moving forward with waste export. They discussed when it would be appropriate to express this consensus to council.

SWAC discussed several issues related to the initial presentation of waste prevention and recycling goals development:

- SWAC was troubled by the lack of standard language in jurisdictions.
- Numeric goals do not always provide a direct comparison
- There was some discussion of the incremental costs of achieving higher recycling rates
- SWAC member Joe Casalini who represents Allied/Rabanco stated that the upward trend for waste generation is a growth-driven regional trend.
- There was some discussion about the construction and demolition (C&D) waste stream.
- SWAC wanted to see more efforts targeting multi-family generators.

97 Kiernan said that he had recently met with western Washington solid waste managers,
98 and everyone is struggling with measurement standards and definitions of recycling
99 terms. McGilton said that cities also have this issue when communicating with other
100 cities.

101

102 Other Updates:

103 Yates noted that the March meeting will not be in the eighth floor conference room. The
104 March MSWMAC meeting will be on the seventh floor in the 7044/7045 conference
105 rooms.

106

107 Yates asked cities to please remember to notify the division in advance of their recycling
108 events. The Waste Reduction/Recycling grants require that cities notify the division of
109 the schedule for their events. The division's customer service staff receives calls from
110 city residents asking about these events, which also generates additional traffic at the
111 transfer stations. So, it is helpful if the customer service staff and transfer station staff
112 know about these events. Division staffperson Morgan John administers the grants and
113 he is the point of contact for this information.

114

115 The division has developed an intranet website for MSWMAC and the Interjurisdictional
116 Technical Staff Group (ITSG). The website has all the agendas, minutes, and reports
117 posted for MSWMAC's convenience. The link for this website is

118 <http://www.metrokc.gov/dnrp/swd/about/MSWMAC-ITSG-resources.asp>

119

120 Legislation Update:

121 Yates distributed a legislation matrix containing all the federal, state, and King County
122 legislation involving solid waste. Included in the matrix is the history of each bill, the
123 bill number, and a link to the associated website. In the future, new information will be
124 highlighted in red.

125

126 Garber said that this is an excellent tool and thanked Yates for all her hard work on
127 producing the matrix.

128

129 Master Schedule:

130 Severn said that in March a draft of the Business Plan required by Ordinance 14971 will
131 be brought to MSWMAC to review. The King County Council will receive the plan in
132 April.

133

134 **Topics for Briefings/Reports to Council and Anticipated Direction from County**

135 **Council: Discussion**

136 Kiernan said that division and council staff met to discuss pending topics for council
137 briefings. The dates are tentative pending the council's schedule.

138

139 The Waste Prevention and Recycling (WPR) presentations that MSWMAC has received
140 will be consolidated into one briefing for the council in May.

141

142 Council will be briefed on the Cedar Hills Landfill site development plan in August. This
143 will cover the range of alternatives for extending the lifespan of the landfill. A decision
144 on alternatives can not be made until Environmental Review has been completed.

145

146 There will be a briefing on reevaluating the rate that is charged for yard waste and other
147 organic debris. The rate was originally calculated based on a small amount of tonnage.

148 As the division accepts more of these materials at the new Shoreline Recycling and
149 Transfer Station, economies of scale may permit a lower rate. The division does not
150 anticipate that this to be controversial.

151

152 Another topic to be scheduled for briefing is disaster debris management. A fee waiver is
153 currently the primary tool used for dealing with disaster debris situations similar to those
154 that occurred this December. The waivers are usually set for a time period directly
155 following the disaster. Some people take longer to recover from disasters than others,
156 and the division wants to accommodate them without having weeks of fee waivers. The
157 division has looked to Snohomish County for a possible solution. Snohomish County
158 residents who require a voucher must call for assistance. Vouchers are provided by either
159 city building inspectors, the local fire district or other agencies after an evaluation of the

160 damage. The division is considering this alternative and would work with the cities on
161 this issue.

162

163 Partial early export will be discussed with council as well. This briefing has not yet been
164 scheduled, as the division's internal analysis has not been completed.

165

166 The conversion technologies report was introduced to council in October. The Regional
167 Policy Committee (RPC) received an introductory briefing by council staff and was told
168 that they will receive a more detailed briefing at a later time. The division has extended
169 R.W. Beck's consulting contract to keep them available for that briefing. If a report is
170 not acted on by the end of the year in which it was introduced, it must be reintroduced the
171 following year.

172

173 Pelozza asked that the conversion technologies report be put on the Master Schedule.
174 Severn replied that the report was on the schedule, but after the work was completed and
175 transmitted to Council it was taken off. Yates said that it is on legislative matrix which
176 includes work products the division has submitted to council. Kiernan said that the
177 division would return the conversion technologies report to the master schedule.

178

179 **ITSG Role and Work Plan: Continue Discussion**

180 Garber referred to a handout in which she had summarized the consensus of
181 conversations with several MSWMAC members on ITSG's role.

182

183 Garber said that it would be useful to send all cities MSWMAC materials even if they do
184 not show up to the regular meetings. She said that she feels it should be up to ITSG if
185 they appoint a chair or not.

186

187 Gaisford asked about ITSG's work plan for their February meeting. Garber said that
188 MSWMAC needs to develop that direction for ITSG during this meeting.

189

190 Garber distributed a draft ITSG Work Plan. She said some of the ITSG meeting dates are
191 firm dates that come from the Master Schedule. Garber noted that in the draft work plan,

192 she combined host city mitigation and financial policies into one meeting. She said the
193 “Information Needed” column was an attempt to be more specific about what is needed
194 from ITSG than just identifying the topic for discussion. Garber added that two meetings
195 do not have topics assigned, since the division expects to be drafting the Comp Plan at
196 that time. She said that those meetings provide an opportunity to discuss governance
197 issues.

198
199 Garber stated that MSWMAC had already decided to form a special governance
200 committee to meet separately from ITSG.

201
202 Garber asked who initiates the discussions of the decision process to negotiate the ILA,
203 as required by the budget proviso. Kiernan said that the budget proviso directed the
204 division to begin discussions, which it has done by introducing the topic to MSWMAC.
205 The outcome of the discussions depends on what topics come up. The Governance
206 Report identifies some of the issues that need further development. Kiernan said that he
207 expects cities will want to meet separately from the division until they have developed
208 the issues more fully, and then the two parties will meet to have discussions or
209 negotiations.

210
211 Fife-Ferris said that it is worth putting out an early notice now that a governance group is
212 forming so that cities can plan their staff time.

213
214 MSWMAC member Erin Leonhart said that having a separate governance committee is a
215 good idea, but said she is reluctant to divide ITSG into subcommittees because the extra
216 meetings would be burdensome to staff from cities that have only one person assigned to
217 solid waste. Garber said that she doesn’t want to fracture ITSG. She said that as topics
218 come up people with different interests might be more likely to participate in addition to
219 those who attend regularly.

220
221 Knight said that she has not participated in ITSG for some time, but she likes the
222 approach of giving ITSG specific questions to address. Knight said that ITSG can get off
223 topic because they are interested in the details. Knight suggested that MSWMAC should

224 plan to check in with ITSG to make sure the system is working. Knight concluded that
225 she was not sure that ITSG's participation would increase since city staff are typically
226 overscheduled. Knight said that every city operates differently and that lack of
227 participation indicates a level of trust with King County.

228

229 Hlavka suggested that a letter to mayors of cities would help increase participation.
230 MSWMAC discussed several key points to include in a letter to go to the chief city
231 executives. These points include:

- 232 • identify specific needs for input,
- 233 • request assignment of staff to participate,
- 234 • identify benefits of participation and drawbacks of inaction,
- 235 • communicate a sense of urgency,
- 236 • clarify that the draft Comp Plan is a package that must be approved or rejected
237 wholesale, so now is the time to have input on specific issues,
- 238 • the outcome of this process will have a financial impact on city residents, and
- 239 • acknowledge cities that do participate.

240

241 Fife-Ferris asked that the draft ITSG work plan be sent to members electronically.

242 Garber said that it would be emailed, and asked for members to reply with their input
243 prior to the next ITSG meeting.

244

245 Greenway said that it sounds like there are two ILA concerns; the possibility of extending
246 the term of the ILAs so that the county can get longer term financing, and the
247 development of governance issues to be resolved by opening the existing ILAs for
248 renegotiation. Fife-Ferris said that this is a reflection of the cities' position.

249

250 Kiernan said that the Governance Report raises some potential issues, for example
251 dispute resolution, which could be resolved through a formal ILA process. The ILAs
252 expire in 2028, which could affect financing. Kiernan said that council staff Mike
253 Huddleston had suggested 30 year bonds to reduce the cost of financing. This would
254 require longer ILA agreements.

255

256 Knight said that the issues are intertwined. The term of the contract and dispute
257 resolution are both just items that need to be negotiated.

258

259 McGilton said that she is unclear about the recommendation in the Governance Report to
260 designate MSWMAC as the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum (SWIF). Garber said the RPC
261 has not responded to the governance report yet. She said that MSWMAC member Nina
262 Rivkin is planning to broach the topic at the next RPC meeting. Yates said that once
263 RPC takes a position, the governance report will still have to go to council for review.
264 Garber said that if there are any changes to the SWIF, legislation would have to be
265 drafted and developed, which MSWMAC would presumably review.

266

267 In response to a question, Fife-Ferris said that the text of all of the ILAs is the same,
268 although each city signs individually. Garber said she expects that any changes to the
269 ILAs would be signed by all the cities. Garber said that the first step to making any ILA
270 changes would be for the governance committee to develop suggested changes for
271 presentation to MSWMAC.

272

273 Severn said that she would put the committee formation on the SWD Timeline under
274 Governance/ILAs.

275

276 McGilton said that she has some logistical concerns. Solid waste staff and the policy
277 people understand the issues, but they are not a complete representation of cities that will
278 be reviewing the Comp Plan. She doesn't want to see the Comp Plan process stalled.
279 Garber said that even if cities do not participate on MSWMAC or ITSG, they are all sent
280 agendas and minutes, and part of the Comp Plan process includes public involvement.
281 Severn said the public involvement process of the Comp Plan starts in May. All cities
282 will be offered a general overview, and presentations can be tailored to their interests.

283

284 Kiernan said that the division and cities have relations on many levels, in which the ILAs
285 and the Comp Plan are two fixed points. The draft Comp Plan is a complete package that
286 must be approved or rejected in its entirety. The division is trying to solicit input and

287 share information early in the development of the Comp Plan so that cities have an
288 opportunity to comment on specific issues.

289

290 Garber said that the Public Issues Committee (PIC) of the Suburban Cities Association
291 (SCA) receives regular updates about SWAC and MSWMAC. Garber said when she
292 gives updates to the SCA, she always encourages cities to participate directly in
293 MSWMAC. She added that now, as important decisions are being made in the Comp
294 Plan process, more cities may appoint representatives.

295

296 **Illegal Dumping and Special Wastes (Sharps) Handouts: Review**

297 Severn directed members' attention to the handouts on illegal dumping and sharps
298 disposal. She said these handouts give background information on the issues together
299 with the current policies and actions taken, and the division's preliminary
300 recommendations for the Comp Plan. Severn asked for comments.

301

302 In response to a question about having meeting materials provided in advance, Garber
303 said that it is important that everyone read the materials and be prepared to discuss topics
304 at the meetings.

305

306 Severn said that there was substantial work done for the last Comp Plan dealing with
307 illegal dumping. The current recommendation is to continue with those efforts, with the
308 priority placed on enforcement. The data on illegal dumping are not centrally located so
309 it is difficult to assess the entire scope of the issue. A tracking system needs to be
310 implemented to determine the effectiveness of efforts.

311

312 Greenway asked how enforcement would be implemented. Severn said that a working
313 group has made specific recommendations for enforcement that would be drafted into
314 new code. Special Waste Supervisor Pam Badger added that a work group consisting of
315 city, county, state and federal staff found that illegal dumping enforcement programs
316 faced similar issues across the board. They recommended strengthening codes in some
317 cases and expanding enforcement authority in others to help streamline bureaucracy.
318 Those recommendations were transmitted to the Executive, who approved them. The

319 next step will be to write legislation enacting the recommendations. Greenway said that
320 she would be interested in seeing more details about the changes. Badger replied that she
321 will send the report from the workgroup to MSWMAC.

322

323 McGilton asked if cities will be expected to change their codes as well. Kiernan said it
324 depends on who is doing the enforcement, for example, the Health Department has
325 jurisdiction across the county and in the cities, while changes to land use code would
326 apply only to the county. Kiernan added that if illegal dumping becomes a felony, police
327 will still be busy responding to other emergencies. However, if the changes are made to
328 land use codes, rather than criminal code, a code inspector can write a ticket for illegal
329 dumping.

330

331 MSWMAC member Chris Eggen asked if the division had an idea of the effectiveness of
332 the illegal dumping efforts. Severn said that complaint tracking has only recently been
333 centralized. Many agencies and individual property owners are involved in responding to
334 illegal dumping, and there currently is not a way to capture all of their costs. Illegal
335 dumping sites are still being found, and there is no way to know how old newly
336 discovered sites are.

337

338 Kiernan said that the hotline allows the division to direct people to the responsible agency
339 while still collecting data in one place. The growth in the number of calls received might
340 be a reflection of greater awareness of the hotline rather than an increase in illegal
341 dumping.

342

343 Severn said that the division recommends a change in the acceptance policy for sharps.
344 Severn said that the recommendation is to no longer accept sharps in the MSW
345 (municipal solid waste) stream, either at the curbside or transfer stations. This is
346 consistent with the practice of the City of Seattle, Snohomish County and Waste
347 Management, and with the recommendations of the Environmental Protection Agency
348 (EPA) and the Center for Disease Control.

349

350 Fife-Ferris asked about alternative disposal options and enforcement to uphold this ban.
351 Severn said that a brochure is being developed that includes a growing list of disposal
352 sites. Severn said Group Health and most pharmacies take back sharps for free from their
353 patients and customers. She added that there are several mail back programs as well,
354 although they are more expensive. In most cases, people can return their sharps to the
355 same places where they got them.

356
357 Fife-Ferris said that Waste Management has an affiliate partner that accepts sharps; they
358 have a financial interest in a ban. She said that it unless disposal is very convenient a ban
359 will be useless.

360
361 Fife-Ferris asked about customers who are getting their sharps from the internet. She
362 said she'd like to see this issue explored more before implementing a ban on sharps
363 disposal. MSWMAC member Mark Relph said he had similar concerns to Fife-Ferris,
364 and would like to see the results of the sharps collection pilot program at the new
365 Shoreline transfer station.

366
367 Knight said that she does not share those concerns, if King County can indicate a range of
368 take back programs. She said the ban on household hazardous waste (HHW) has been
369 successful despite limited disposal options. Knight said that as individuals we have the
370 responsibility to take care of waste we produce, and sharps are not different from any
371 other material in that sense.

372
373 Eggen said that in the Washington State Uniform Medical Program all sharps are sent by
374 mail order. He said he'd prefer a safe container that can be put into the garbage, or some
375 other option to dispose of sharps safely. Eggen said he agrees that individuals have a
376 responsibility to dispose of the materials properly, but unless it is convenient to do so, the
377 problem will continue.

378
379 Badger said that there is not a container that can withstand the level of compaction that
380 solid waste receives.

381

382

383 **WPR: Goals Development II: Presentation and Discussion**

384 Gaisford gave a presentation on Waste Prevention and Recycling Goals Development. It
385 can be viewed at:

386 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Goals2MSWMAC02082008.ppt>

387

388 Greenway asked if the potential for increase in recycling and waste reduction lies in
389 improving participation in existing programs or in increasing the number of recyclable
390 materials. Gaisford answered that both have the potential to improve.

391

392 Fife-Ferris asked what impact Ecology's definitions of beneficial use would have on local
393 jurisdictions. Kiernan said that it is not clear; Ecology and the Washington State Utilities
394 and Transportation Commission (WUTC) are both state level agencies, but are looking at
395 the question of beneficial use separately.

396

397 In response to a question, Gaisford said that the 2015 C&D goal of 50 percent includes
398 50 percent of all C&D waste except asphalt and concrete. He said it is not known
399 precisely how much of the C&D that is currently disposed is recyclable, but the C&D
400 goal is an aggressive one.

401

402 Garber asked members to direct any further questions or comments to Yates, along with
403 any ideas or thoughts for the ITSG workplan before their February meeting.

404

405 **Adjourn**

406 The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

407

408 Submitted by:

409 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff