

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 13, 2008

10:45 – 1:20 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

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
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
Gina Hungerford	City of Kent	Conservation Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Chief Policy Advisor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Chris Eggen	City of Shoreline	Councilmember
Kirsten Weinmeister	City of Snoqualmie	Recycling Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Zach Schmitz	City of Woodinville	Management Analyst

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

Ann Berrysmith, Finance and Administration Manager

Kevin Kiernan, Division Director

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Shirley Jurgensen, Interim Engineering Services Manager

Josh Marx, SWD Staff

Bill Reed, SWD Staff

Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Cities

Barre Seibert, Councilmember, City of Clyde Hill

Stacy Breskin-Auer, City of Redmond

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

Guests

Sharon Hlavka, Green Solutions

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber of Newcastle called the meeting to order at 10:50 a.m.
3 Everyone present introduced themselves.

4
5 **Approval of May Meeting Minutes**

6 **Joan McGilton of Burien moved to approve the May minutes.**

7 *The May minutes were approved unanimously*

8 .
9 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/Other Updates**

10 **SWD:**

11 Division Director Kevin Kiernan reported that the division began accepting additional
12 materials for recycling at Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station at the beginning of
13 June. These materials include TVs, DVD/VCRs and fluorescent lights. A handout is
14 available with complete information.

15
16 The Regional Policy Committee met on June 11 with two solid waste items on its agenda.
17 The first was the Ordinance 14971 Business Plan, which was approved and forwarded to
18 the council. The second item was a presentation on Waste Prevention and Recycling,
19 which was postponed.

20
21 The division tested a new machine for its effectiveness in shredding mattresses. The test
22 was not very successful, as the machine had a very low throughput and wires in the
23 mattresses caught in the mechanism. The division will continue to look for alternative
24 methods for dealing with mattresses. Bill Pelozza of Auburn said this is important.

25
26 Beginning June 16, King Street Center will begin collecting compostable materials. At
27 future meetings, MSWMAC members will be able to separate compostables as well as
28 recycling from their lunch garbage.

29
30 The landfill gas to energy project is proceeding on schedule. The SEPA environmental
31 review process has been completed. The contractor is now pursuing the necessary
32 permits to begin work.

33

34 Thea Severn, who has been serving as the Interim Lead Planner, has been hired for the
35 permanent position of Planning and Communications Manager.

36

37 Severn said the only change to the master schedule this month was the addition of
38 governance discussions to begin this summer.

39

40 **SWAC:**

41 McGilton reported that SWAC discussed the Waste Prevention and Recycling (WPR)
42 goals, especially the question of whether or not the goals were too aggressive.

43 (NOTE: SWAC passed a motion to approve the direction outlined in the draft
44 recommendations for the Comp Plan waste prevention and recycling goals.)

45

46 **Other Updates:**

47 Garber said there is no update from ITSG since they did not meet in May.

48

49 Carolyn Armanini of Lake Forest Park has resigned from MSWMAC, but will remain
50 active as the Chair of SWAC. Lake Forest Park Councilmember Don Fiene will replace
51 Armanini on MSWMAC.

52

53 A governance committee has been formed, and an initial meeting scheduled in July.

54 Members include Linda Knight of Renton, Erin Leonhart of Kirkland, Scott McCall of
55 Shoreline, Joyce Nichols of Bellevue, Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way, and Justina Tate
56 of Woodinville.

57

58 **WPR Goals**

59 Garber said the goal of the discussion is to pass a motion that will allow the division to go
60 forward with development of a preliminary draft chapter for MSMWAC's review, and
61 urged members to stick to the schedule. She said that much of the discussion so far, and
62 the comments received, have been more detailed than the policy level discussion that will
63 be included in the Comp Plan.

64

65 Recycling and Engineering Services Manager Jeff Gaisford added that the detailed
66 discussion of strategies have lacked the context that the Comp Plan will provide, but was
67 necessary to understand how it is possible to achieve the proposed goals.

68

69 Severn said there has been a lot of concern about bans, and not every city is positioned to
70 ban materials from disposal. The division wants cities to focus on the areas where they
71 can be most successful. The Comp Plan is a policy document that sets a framework. It
72 does not prescribe programmatic details. It has been useful to discuss those details to
73 gain an understanding of how goals might be achieved, but that level of detail is not a
74 part of the actual plan document.

75

76 MSWMAC Vice Chair Jessica Greenway of Kirkland asked what a ban would mean for
77 the cities, and who is responsible for implementation. Gaisford replied that
78 implementation has varied somewhat for each of the existing bans. Using the yard waste
79 ban as an example, he said that once all cities had curbside service in place, the county
80 did region-wide education about the ban and haulers were responsible for enforcing it.
81 Waste characterization studies show that this approach was effective. For any ban,
82 infrastructure must come first, and then education is the key to success. Greenway said
83 in that case, a ban is the end result of a plan of action.

84

85 In response to a question, Gaisford said the division does intend to provide options to
86 avoid bans.

87

88 Nina Rivkin of Redmond said it is critical to keep in mind that there are numerous steps
89 involved that precede implementing a ban. She suggested that the Comp Plan should
90 focus on those steps and the tools that are available to cities rather than on the bans.

91

92 Chris Eggen of Shoreline asked whether bans would require renegotiation of hauler
93 contracts and asked what the cost to customers would be. Severn replied that haulers
94 already look for banned materials such as hazardous waste, yard waste and computers,
95 and suggested that additional materials could be included in those inspections.

96

97 Knight said if materials bans are in code, city contracts can specify compliance with
98 code, and need not be renegotiated when additional materials are banned from disposal.
99 When appliances were banned from disposal at transfer stations, Renton did not have to
100 make any changes to its collection contract. Haulers are informed of changes in code and
101 are prepared to comply with county code.

102

103 Kiernan said the recommended bans, in most cases, are only after 2016, and only if goals
104 are not met through other strategies. Bans are being considered only as a means to an
105 end. If the end can be achieved without banning materials from disposal, there is no need
106 for a ban. He added that once there is agreement about the recommendations, they will
107 be subjected to cost analysis as part of the Comp Plan process.

108

109 Garber said the division is moving toward a more flexible approach to allow cities to
110 tailor programs to meet their individual needs. They are considering alternatives to bans
111 that cities can use if infrastructure obstacles are not overcome.

112

113 Rivkin said the Comp Plan should include discussion of the infrastructure obstacles, such
114 as building codes, and address methods the cities may use to overcome them.

115

116 Pelozza asked for a definition of the word ban. Severn said that a materials ban prohibits
117 disposal of that material in the garbage, but does allow for incidental quantities of the
118 material in mixed waste.

119

120 Greenway said that she had previously been focused on the question of enforcement, but
121 now realizes that for the cities, the big commitment is infrastructure, particularly for
122 multifamily and commercial customers.

123

124 Knight said bans are one tool among many to reach goals. She added that although
125 people tend to focus on the negative connotations of the word “ban,” it is important to
126 remember that bans also provide an opportunity for the business community to expand.
127 When appliances were banned from disposal, it stimulated the recycling industry.

128

129 **Peloza moved that MSWMAC ask the Solid Waste Division to prepare a**
130 **preliminary draft of the WPR Comp Plan section for review by MSWMAC. The**
131 **section should reflect policy issues raised by MSWMAC members on the draft WPR**
132 **goals and recommendations, including but not limited to (1) ensuring that WPR**
133 **goals are measurable and achievable during the planning period; (2) the need to**
134 **collect appropriate data to guide WPR efforts; and (3) flexibility for cities to tailor**
135 **programs to meet WPR goals, including alternatives to bans countywide.**

136

137 **Peloza moved that the original motion be amended to include a due date for the**
138 **draft, such as January, 2009.**

139

140 **Eggen moved that the amendment be amended to October, 2008, in order to be**
141 **consistent with the schedule.**

142

143 Garber noted that because the division is dependent upon input from MSWMAC,
144 deadlines increase pressure on MSWMAC to limit its discussion so that the division can
145 meet its deadlines.

146

147 Severn said the division expects to have a draft chapter available by October.

148

149 Rivkin said she supports the motion, as it gives the division the direction it needs and
150 embedded in the motion are requirements to address achievable goals, data collection,
151 and flexibility for cities, all of which were concerns repeatedly raised by the cities.

152

153 ***The motion passed unanimously with the amended date of October, 2008 inserted after***
154 ***the word “section.”***

155

156 **MSWMAC Meeting Start Time**

157 Greenway said that the new start time is very difficult for her. She said she has spoken
158 with Peloza, and may have developed a compromise. The goal of the change was to
159 avoid Friday afternoon traffic. An 11:15 start time would accomplish that while allowing
160 Greenway to arrive on time.

161

162 Knight said she was not present for the initial discussion, and respects the desire to avoid
163 the traffic, but a later start time would be more convenient for her as well. She attends
164 another regional meeting earlier in the day that conflicts with the new MSWMAC start
165 time. She would still have to leave the first meeting early to get to MSWMAC at 11:15,
166 but that would be an improvement over 10:45.

167

168 McGilton suggested that when meeting agendas require additional time, the meetings
169 could be started earlier, rather than ending later.

170

171 Garber asked if a meeting time of 11:15-2:00, with a 10:45 start time as required by the
172 agenda would be acceptable. The suggestion was approved by consensus.

173

174 **Cedar Hills Capacity**

175 Severn and Interim Engineering Services Manager Shirley Jurgensen gave a presentation
176 on Cedar Hills Landfill capacity, available at:

177 http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CH_Capacity_&_Disposal_Criteria_ppt_MS
178 [WMAC_061308.pdf](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/CH_Capacity_&_Disposal_Criteria_ppt_MS)

179

180 In response to a question, Jurgensen said that most of the residential areas are almost as
181 old as the landfill, but one development was built in the 1980's.

182

183 In response to another question, Severn said that there are no current issues with the
184 neighboring community. On June 11, only six neighbors attended the annual community
185 meeting hosted by the division. Jurgensen added that one resident, a previous litigant
186 against the division, commented that she was not concerned about extending the life of
187 the landfill as long as the buffer remains in place.

188

189 Eggen asked if the plan will affect the closure date of Cedar Hills. Severn said that it
190 will. Closure dates beyond 2016 are possible with several development options. Specific
191 closure dates will vary for each option. The consultant will also be looking at potential
192 uses post-closure to make sure that development options will be compatible.

193

194 Pelozo asked about the soil stockpile. Jurgensen said the soil is used for daily and final
195 cover and bottom liner construction. Money is saved by avoiding the importation of soil.
196 Severn added that the division is looking at stockpile options. A consultant has been
197 hired to update the site development plan. The consultant will develop alternatives. A
198 preliminary list is expected to be identified by August. That list will be narrowed and
199 selected alternatives will undergo environmental review, which takes about six months.
200 Public involvement is part of the process. The final site development plan may be
201 available this time next year. It will need to be adopted by council.

202

203 Pelozo asked about the recommendations from the third party review of the Transfer
204 Plan. Severn said the site development plan will analyze those recommendations.
205 However, based on previous work done by the division, it is unlikely that those
206 recommendations will be implemented. Reducing the buffer to the statutory minimum
207 would likely result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts, and construction of walls
208 would require cutting into the buffer.

209

210 Kiernan invited members to tour the landfill. He said the division is very proud of the
211 site, and that it will be valuable when making decisions to have seen it. Garber added
212 that it is a testament to the quality of the management of the landfill that neighbors who
213 previously opposed it now have no issues.

214

215 **Criteria for Disposal Options**

216 Continuing the PowerPoint presentation referenced above, Severn presented initial
217 criteria for evaluating disposal options.

218

219 Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue asked how necessary it is for the Comp Plan to look at this
220 issue, since Cedar Hills will not close within the period of this Comp Plan. Kiernan
221 replied that the Department of Ecology requires the Comp Plan to look at the next six
222 years in detail, with a general twenty year view. Within the next twenty years it is almost
223 certain that Cedar Hills will close. Although it is too early to select a disposal option
224 now, it is prudent to have criteria ready so that it will be possible to evaluate options as

225 they become available. This is becoming increasingly true as new technologies develop
226 to deal with specific components of the waste stream. Ideas such as using yard waste to
227 generate biofuel or convert plastic to oil may be evaluated in advance of Cedar Hills
228 closure if they become available.

229

230 In response to a question, Severn said that the criteria would be developed in greater
231 detail before being applied to any disposal option. The Comp Plan would only include
232 the type of high level discussion presented today.

233

234 Kiernan pointed out that the county has historically been conservative in its approach.
235 Unless the division receives a policy direction otherwise, there is no plan to change that
236 approach. While other jurisdictions may experiment and run pilot projects, the division is
237 proposing criterion requiring technologies to be proven to work.

238

239 **Financial Policies**

240 Severn introduced Finance and Administration Manager Ann Berrysmith, and presented
241 draft financial policies available at:

242 http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Financial_Policies_1_ppt_MSWMAC_06130
243 [8.pdf](#)

244

245 Kiernan said the division uses multiple funds in its financial structure. Most of these are
246 provided for in King County code, but descriptions of the funds will also be reflected in
247 the Comp Plan. The division is also subject to federal financial requirements; these are
248 evident in certain fund descriptions such as the post-closure maintenance fund.

249

250 Pelozza asked if the landfill gas to energy project will defray costs. Kiernan said it would;
251 the contract guarantees the division at least one million dollars per year.

252

253 Nichols asked if the policy to maintain a forty-five day operating surplus is required.

254 Kiernan said it is a long standing practice of the division, but is not required by law.

255

256 In response to a question, Kiernan said the basic garbage fee is based on the systemwide
257 cost of providing garbage service, and is the same at all transfer stations, regardless of the
258 level of recycling service provided or the cost to operate the specific facility. However,
259 he said there is a policy question of whether the fee for recycling should be based on the
260 cost of providing the service or should incentivize recycling.

261

262 Severn said that if the policies presented today appear to be moving in the right direction,
263 the division will return with more detail next month.

264

265 Garber said the new governance committee should address this topic, and suggested it be
266 included in their first report to MSWMAC in August, which will be received in caucus.
267 She asked MSWMAC members to discuss financial policies with their cities and to send
268 comments or policy suggestions to Yates.

269

270 **Direction to ITSG**

271 MSWMAC did not have any direction for ITSG. Yates said she would notify ITSG
272 members that there will not be an ITSG meeting in June.

273

274 **Public Comment**

275 Former MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka of Auburn introduced herself and thanked
276 MSWMAC for the opportunity to participate as a member of the public.

277

278 **Adjourn**

279 The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

280

281 Submitted by:

282 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff