



forecast by the division's economist was accurate within 400 tons. In response to a member's comment, Assistant Division Director Kevin Kiernan noted that the division is looking at strategies to resolve the conflict between the financial benefit of increased tonnage and the environmental goal of reduced tonnage.

The division's 2013 Green Holidays campaign received a lot of media attention, with more than 15 articles, TV, and radio segments. Most of these are linked on the [division's web site](#). Tom Watson, the EcoConsumer, also answered recycling questions on KUOW on January 2.

#### SWAC

SWAC did not meet in December.

#### Other

MSWMAC member Ken Miller asked about recent news involving Harbor Island. Kiernan responded that there are several tenants on that property, and security has been an issue. In the short-term, the division has improved fencing to close access points and provided 24-hour security. In the long-term, it would be desirable to find a single tenant to take over the entire property, including responsibility for security.

#### **2014 Work Plan: Discussion and Action**

Division Director Pat McLaughlin presented information link MSWMAC's activities in [2013](#) and thoughts on goals for 2014.

In 2014, the division wants to provide more clarity about its goals and expectations for the committee and provide materials far enough in advance to allow members to come prepared to the meetings. The division is concerned about irregular attendance at meetings interfering with the committee's ability to meet challenging timelines. Intergovernmental Liaison Diane Yates presented the draft work plan.

Members expressed agreement with the call for renewed commitment to the committee, and discussed actions that might help new members get up to speed more quickly.

The committee reviewed the draft work plan. Members commented that financial policies, the potential for amending the new ILAs, a rate study, and South County RTS siting/environmental review were not in the work plan. Kiernan pointed out that potential ILA amendments are in the work plan in track changes; he said that the division will have 2013 year-end numbers in February. The division will be able to perform a rate analysis then.

Miller suggested adding the green fence issue and viability of recycling markets to the work plan as a discussion item.

MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin recommended deferring action on potential amendments to the new ILA until June or July to allow more time for discussion. Kiernan stated that the division must meet the deadline set by County Council.

The committee discussed the amount of time members need to review materials before each meeting. Several members commented that one week was insufficient. There was also concern that too much lead time could result in the committee discussing out-of-date materials at their meetings. There was general consensus that MSWMAC should model its schedule after the Sound Cities Association's "two-touch" system, but should maintain flexibility to act on shorter notice as necessary.

*Rivkin moved that MSWMAC delay adoption of the work plan to February, when the division would present a revised work plan including additional items supplied by members of the committee.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

MSWMAC Vice Chair Bill Pelozo requested that members submit additional work plan items to Diane Yates by January 17 to enable the division to distribute the revised work plan in advance of the February meeting.

### **Construction and Demolition Debris Management Options**

After a presentation on the topic in December, the January meeting notice included the following resolution in support of Option 4 for construction & demolition (C&D) disposal drafted by the chair for discussion and action:

*Whereas; The King County Solid Waste Division (SWD) has outlined four options for Construction and Demolition (C&D) Disposal after expiration in September 2014 of contracts with Republic and Waste Management International for operation of C&D Disposal facilities, and*

*Whereas; The four options outlined are (1) No Action, (2) Add C&D Disposal to the SWD System, (3) Issue a new RFP and Renegotiate Contracts for C&D Disposal, and (4) Designate Qualified Facilities, and*

*Whereas; Option 4 is a proven approach used by many regional governments, and*

*Whereas; Option 4 is an approach similar to Seattle's, so its use by the SWD would result in a process for C&D Disposal easily understood by contractors countywide, and*

*Whereas; Agreements which are required for designation could cover Recycling, Fees, Environmental Liability, and other items, thereby allowing the SWD to incentivize processes that lead to achieving King County Disposal System goals, and*

*Whereas; Once a sufficient number of C&D Disposal Facilities are designated, the SWD could implement bans on disposal of recyclable C&D materials, or implement other strategies, to increase recycling of C&D material.*

*Whereas; Designation can include reporting/documentation requirements that enhance monitoring of recycling and disposal,*

*Therefore; The Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) supports selection of Option 4 for C&D Disposal.*

There was a question about whether there are sufficient facilities to handle the tonnage. Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford responded that the division believes current facilities are sufficient, but noted that if additional capacity is needed, there is time for implementation.

Option 4 does not change any of the responsibilities defined in the interlocal agreements.

*Spangler moved to delete the third and sixth “whereas” clauses:*

*The amendment passed unanimously.*

*The amended motion in support of Option 4 for C&D disposal passed unanimously.*

### **Transfer Plan Review**

MSWMAC agreed to extend the meeting for 20 minutes to allow sufficient time for discussion of the topic.

Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn gave a [presentation](#) on the review of the Transfer Plan.

Comments and answers to questions included:

- Renton has some capacity to accommodate increased tonnage, while Shoreline could accommodate substantially increased tonnage.
- It may be possible to “mix and match” elements of Options 1 and 2 for Alternative E.
- The cost of relocating household hazardous waste service was included in the analysis.
- It is important to remember that we are planning for regional growth.
- All of the alternatives in the Transfer Plan Review reflect the division’s commitment to achieve 70 percent recycling. However, capacity for growth will be beneficial in case achieving that goal proves more challenging than expected.
- This review has confirmed that Factoria RTS is a critical component of any plan to serve the northeast county satisfactorily.
- This review has shown that there are multiple options for serving the northeast county, some of which include: construction of a Northeast RTS, redirecting commercial traffic to designated facilities, and limiting self-haul at Factoria RTS.

- Alternatives to building a Northeast RTS involve policy changes or service impacts. The region must examine its tolerance level for these impacts.
- The current procurement schedule for Factoria RTS calls for “best and final offers” this month. If construction is to proceed as planned, the division should go to Council with a contract in April.
- Options 1 & 2 would allow the current procurement for Factoria to continue. Option 3 would stop the current procurement.
- Due to the tonnage drop in 2007, the 2021 opening date for a new Northeast RTS called for in the Transfer Plan is no longer critical for the system to provide sufficient tonnage capacity. There is time to continue analysis of options that meet the needs of the region.
- There is an approved Transfer System Plan in place, and it is still valid until an amendment is passed.
- The division does not support Option 3 for Alternative E (redesign Factoria).

The comment period on the draft Transfer Plan Review Report is open until February 3. The division encourages everyone to submit comments as soon as possible to allow time for their incorporation into the final report.

Discussion will continue next month. If a member would like to submit a resolution for action on the topic, please submit it to Diane Yates in advance.

### **Interlocal Agreements**

This process will continue through at least May. Today the process and timeline is the focus of discussion. This process does not change the work of the financial policies committee. The division believes we can meet the timeline. Although the division must meet the deadline set by Council, MSWMAC has some flexibility in deciding when or whether to weigh in. MSWMAC will proceed with the proposed timeline.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.