

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee

August 8, 2014 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:35 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Members	
Diana Quinn	<i>Algona</i>
Bill Pelosa	<i>Auburn</i>
Alison Bennett	<i>Bellevue</i>
Susan Fife Ferris	<i>Bellevue</i>
Stephanie Schwenger	<i>Bellevue</i>
Sabrina Combs	<i>Bothell</i>
Brian Roberts	<i>Burien</i>
Barre Seibert	<i>Clyde Hill</i>
Chris Searcy	<i>Enumclaw</i>
Rob Van Orsow	<i>Federal Way</i>
David Baker	<i>Kenmore</i>
Gina Hungerford	<i>Kent</i>
John MacGillivray	<i>Kirkland</i>
Mary Jane Goss	<i>Lake Forest Park</i>
Diana Pistoll	<i>Maple Valley</i>
Carol Simpson	<i>Newcastle</i>
Stacia Jenkins	<i>Normandy Park</i>
Jon Spangler	<i>Redmond</i>
Linda Knight	<i>Renton</i>
Tom Gut	<i>SeaTac</i>
Rika Cecil	<i>Shoreline</i>
Chris Eggen	<i>Shoreline</i>
Frank Iriarte	<i>Tukwila</i>

King County Staff
Linda Bremer, SWD Staff
Mendy Droke, Local Hazardous Waste Management Program
Jeff Gaisford, SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Manager
Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD Staff
Kevin Kiernan, Solid Waste Division Assistant Director
Laila McClinton, SWD Staff
Pat McLaughlin, SWD Division Director
Mike Reed, King County Council Staff
Thea Severn, SWD Planning & Communications Manager
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison
Guests
David Della, Waste Management
Kevin Kelly, Recology CleanScapes

Minutes & Agenda Review

The June MSWMAC minutes and the minutes of the joint MSWMAC/SWAC meeting in July were approved as written.

Updates

SWD

On July 18, four members of SWAC and fourteen members of MSWMAC together with Deanna Dawson, the Executive Director of Sound Cities Association, toured the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and the adjacent Cedar Grove Composting facility. The division distributed a [fact sheet](#) about the landfill at the event. Commenting about the tour, a member suggested that additional information be added to the [web site](#) to highlight technology at the landfill, treatment ponds and other ways the facility is protecting the environment. Kiernan noted that the division is happy to provide tours of the facility and that information about tours is available [online](#).

The Cedar Hills fact sheet included the new projected date when the landfill is expected to reach capacity. The primary reason for the newly calculated date of 2030 is projected tonnage which is significantly influenced by the assumption that recycling will increase by one percent per year until it reaches 70%. The revised date also reflects changes in tonnage from the great recession, new methods of compaction and other operational changes at the landfill, and revised settlement projections. The revised date is based on the current site development plan.

In 2013 the division received approximately \$1M for sale of landfill gas to BioEnergy Washington (BEW). For that same time period the division received \$1.2M from Puget Sound Energy for its portion of the value of carbon credits associated with the sale of power from the BEW plant.

The division borrowed \$17M (at 3.15%) that will finance construction of the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station over the next year. In addition, \$10M of outstanding bonds from 2007 was refinanced which will lower future annual debt service by \$70K per year through 2020 and by \$84K per year from 2021 to 2024.

Material recovery at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station continued to grow in June. Metal and wood recovery both surpassed the goal. Overall, the monthly goal of 235 tons was exceeded by 16 tons. The division plans to extend the pilot to other stations.

The division is beginning the construction process at the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station. The City of Bellevue is assisting with communications with the public which will include door-to-door contact with facility neighbors.

The division began its second year of partnership with community educators, the facilitadores de Reciclaje (facilitators or educators of recycling), and local Hispanic media with a tour of the Cedar Hills landfill. The group will tour the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station in late August.

SWAC

Because of the joint meeting in July, there is no SWAC report this month.

Case for Change

The committee received a [presentation](#) about the need for change in the division. Members appeared generally in favor of the concepts. Comments included:

- Making a change of this type will require that the division look at funding and rate models.
- It's exciting to see the direction presented. Of particular interest is reframing the public concept that recycling is free of cost.
- These changes may have policy implications such as the idea of mandatory collection and/or bans.

- It will be important to define “zero waste of resources” and other efforts that may impact costs.
- Alternatives to exporting should be evaluated and should include greenhouse gas implications; particularly related to the costs of collecting and transporting waste.
- Resource recovery decisions must include financial implications. However, those implications must also include the opportunity costs in terms of landfill capacity of disposing rather than recovering the resources.

Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study

MSWMAC continued their ongoing discussion of the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study (SSWMS.) Members were reminded that they received the [Executive Summary](#) of the SSWMS in June. Comments included:

- The Sound Cities Association asked that the study address alternate disposal actions including waste to energy/incineration. Division staff responded that while the study did not take a position on any particular method, it did recommend an action to gain more information about various alternative disposal methods. The SSWMS suggests the County move forward with Requests for Expression of Interest (RFEI) to see what types of alternative disposal options/technologies are available. Then, it recommends that the division continue the work with Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for parts of the waste stream. This would leave the option open to any type of technology.
- Proposals for alternative technologies would most likely require a guaranteed feedstock.
- Technologies would be evaluated to see if they fit with recycling, resource recovery and other goals.
- The RFEI/RFP process may result in differing disposal technologies for various parts of the waste stream.
- Consultants working on the SSWMS expect that the RFEI/RFP process would take from twelve to eighteen months. Funds have been added to the division’s budget request to support the RFEI/RFP work.
- It’s not clear how or where separation would occur. For example, some anaerobic digestion options target commercial food generators so in those cases, separation would happen at the source.
- Consider revising how success is measured in terms of recycling. The 70 percent recycling goal does not consider waste that is avoided or capture waste that is recycled through options that are outside the solid waste system. Instead, consider focusing on material remaining in the waste stream after recycling.
- Regarding multi-family recycling, the focus should be upstream as much as possible.
- Consider what can be done to influence building codes to encourage recycling at multi-family developments.
- Members will attempt to get an evaluation of the SSWMS on the Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee agenda.
- Action from advisory committees on the SSWMS would be useful to the division to see if there is a consensus on the direction proposed by the study.

- The following motion was moved and seconded. “Move that MSWMAC support the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study.”
- It was suggested that the group take action on a motion at the next meeting. Another member suggested that action could be taken during the current meeting. After a show of hands showing the preference of members in attendance, the Chair said action would take place at the next meeting.
- Members that think MSWMAC action on SSWMS is appropriate may email a proposed motion to Severn and Yates, copying Eggen and Pelozo not later than August 22.

Product Stewardship

The committee received the third of three presentations about product stewardship scheduled for June, July and August. The third [presentation](#) is about paint stewardship.

The intent of paint stewardship is to move the responsibility for collection and disposal of left over paint to the industry that manufactures and sells the product. Legislation to require all producers to participate in a stewardship program has been passed in eight states. Attempted legislation in Washington in 2014 made significant progress but was not ultimately successful.

Legislation proposing paint product stewardship will be introduced again in 2015. Cities are invited to support this legislation. Yates will send electronics copies of the [draft letter](#) and [resolution](#) in support of paint product stewardship legislation to MSWMAC at the members' request. Comments included:

- Paint containers are also recycled.
- The price of collecting and recycling paint is included in the purchase cost to the consumer and does not appear as a separate item on the receipt.
- Consider encouraging communities to use recycled paint as part of their efforts against graffiti.
- Currently, there is a single paint stewardship/recycling program in the country and it is associated with the American Coatings Association.
- Oil based paint is collected at the Wastemobile and household hazardous waste facilities.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.