

King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee

January 15, 2010 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room
Next SWAC meeting – February 12, 2010 - 10:30-1:30

Meeting Minutes

Members
David Baker
William A. Beck
Joe Casalini
Sean Kronberg
Joan McGilton
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann
Ray Schlien
Bill Ziegler

Others
Ed Davis, Seattle King County Health Department
Lauren Cole, SWD Staff
Tom Creegan, SWD Staff
Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager
Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff
Jim Jordan, Parametrix
Kevin Kiernan, Division Director
Bill Lasby, Seattle King County Health Department
Dwight Miller, Parametrix
Victor Okereke, Engineering Services Manager
Peggy Papsdorf, Suburban Cities Association
Grace Reamer, King County Council Staff
Thea Severn, Planning and Communications Manager
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison

Approve October and November Meeting Minutes

The group changed the October minutes to reflect that the September minutes passed “by general consent.”

A motion to approve the revised minutes for the October SWAC meeting, the November SWAC meeting, and the Joint SWAC/MSWMAC meeting passed by general consent.

Updates: SWD/SWAC Membership

Tonnage for 2009 came in at the forecasted amount of 860,000 tons. That is a 15 percent decrease from peak tonnage in 2007. Previous actions to reduce expenditures allowed the division to end the year financially healthy.

Transfer station hours changes went into effect January 2nd. The implementation was uneventful.

SWD has transmitted a rate reduction for yard waste/organics to the Executive. The reduction from \$82.50 to 57.50 per ton is possible because of economies of scale and reduced hauling costs at Shoreline where the majority of yard waste/organics is received. The progress of this action will be captured in the legislative update distributed at each SWAC meeting.

The DNRP Director has left and Executive Constantine will appoint her replacement. In the meantime, Bob Burns is the Interim Director. He has been involved with DNRP for some time and is familiar with the work of the division.

The state legislative 60-day session begins January 11th. The SWD 2010 State Legislative Request Form was available to attendees. Materials about county legislation completed in 2009

and planned for 2010 were also available. Updated materials will be available at SWAC meetings.

Work on the Factoria Facilities Master Plan (FMP) has begun. Work to site NE Lake Washington and South County recycling and transfer stations is expected to begin in the fall.

SWD may purchase property being surplus by King County Roads Division to preserve the option of siting a transfer station at that location. The property, called “the Covington Pit” appears to meet the minimum criteria for a recycling and transfer station. If, after the siting process has been completed, the location is not the preferred site SWD could surplus the property.

The liability insurance policy for Cedar Hills was scheduled to expire next year. Instead of allowing that to occur, division was able to purchase a 5-year extension of the \$50 million policy for only \$70,000 per year. This relatively low cost is evidence of the insurer’s confidence in the landfill.

The waste-to-energy plant is accepting 80% of the landfill gas from Cedar Hills and has operated continuously for six weeks. The plant is still commissioning and is aggressively working on noise control issues.

The Houghton roof replacement work is expected to begin in July. SWD has requested approval from the King County Council to limit self-haul service during construction.

Max Pope has resigned from SWAC due to health issues. SWD and SWAC sent him recognition of his twelve years of valued service.

Casalini, Stenberg, and Kronberg have been reappointed for another three year term. Tim Crosby and Hilary King have been appointed to SWAC subject to approval by the King County Council. There are currently two open positions. One is for a manufacturer located in King County. The other is for an interested citizen.

Cedar Hills Project Program Plan: Briefing

The Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan authorized SWD to explore opportunities to take advantage of available landfill capacity and to extend the life of Cedar Hills. To accomplish this, SWD has identified five alternatives, conducted an environmental review, and received public comment.

SWD is recommending Alternative 2 to the Executive; primarily because it retains flexibility while providing the security of an additional 5-6 years of landfill capacity.

The cost to design, construct, and operate Alternative 2 would be approximately \$70 million. When compared to the costs of the “no action” alternative, Alternative 2 is expected to save ratepayers between \$55 million and \$90 million.

Alternative 2:

- ***preserves the flexibility to implement further development.*** If it becomes reasonable to pursue further development in the future, Alternatives 3-5 could be considered. The only additional planning cost would be for environmental review.
- ***provides the ability to respond to changing conditions, technology and data.*** The further into the future data is projected, the greater the risk of error. Conversion technologies also continue to improve. When possible, it is prudent to delay to encourage better decisions and preserve the option of implementing new technology.
- ***does not require relocation of buildings.*** Maintenance and other support activities may be built into new recycling and transfer stations as space and funding permits. Until those decisions are made, determining the cost/benefit of relocating buildings at Cedar Hills as would be needed in Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 is problematic.
- ***can be accomplished under the existing land use permit.*** The area of alternative 2 is included in the existing special use permit.
- ***does not pose any significant adverse environmental impacts*** compared with the no action alternative. This finding is consistent throughout Alternatives 1-5.

McGilton reported that a MSWMAC member said he would prefer an alternative that extends the life of the landfill for a longer time. He prefers the increased certainty. Additionally, MSWMAC members asked that the impact of the alternative on the per can rate be reported as well as overall costs.

SWD expects to submit the Project Program Plan (PPP) recommending Alternative 2 to the Executive and the King County Council in the first quarter of 2010 in conjunction with the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cedar Hills Site Development Plan. If Alternative 2 and the Final EIS are approved, SWD can begin the permitting, design, and construction work required to ensure the new disposal cell is ready for use when needed.

Kiernan said projections about when a disposal area will be filled are based on many factors. One factor is the amount of tonnage disposed which is projected to be flat for a couple of years and then to begin a slow growth. The expected increase in recycling rate may mitigate part of that growth. Another factor is the potential impact of early diversion. When the comp plan has been approved, SWD will issue a request for proposal to review that option.

In response to a question Kiernan said SWD is working to comply with the reporting requirements in the new EPA regulations related to Greenhouse Gases.

Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station: Project Update

The work at Bow Lake is broken into two contracts. The first contract – site preparation - began April 2009 and is expected to conclude in April 2010.

The second contract – building the new station – is in the procurement process and is expected to begin in July. It will be awarded using negotiated procurement which allows SWD to consider elements in addition to cost when awarding the contract.

Constructing the new station will occur while the current station continues to operate. The new building is planned to be open to customers in the 4th quarter of 2011 and the balance of the work at the site is planned to be completed by the 4th quarter of the following year.

The Bow Lake site adjoins I-5 at 180th street. There is a 150 foot elevation change across the site which overlooks the Duwamish valley. An additional 10 acre parcel north of the site was acquired from the Washington State Department of Transportation to provide the space to construct the new station while the existing facility maintained operations.

The location was a municipal landfill from the 1940s to the 1960s. Excavation revealed burn fill and refuse in addition to various soils. Materials not suitable for construction were moved to Cedar Hills where the majority will be used as daily cover and will not adversely impact landfill capacity.

The facility design includes a waste sorting area adjacent to the tipping floor. This area will allow SWD employees to recover recyclable materials from the waste stream. Approximately 10% of the waste stream at Bow Lake could be diverted from disposal in this way.

McGilton reported that a MSWMAC member suggested that SWD look for design options that don't require customers to re-weigh in order to avoid disposal fees for recycled materials. Kiernan said that few customers have taken advantage of the opportunity to re-weigh at Shoreline where a system similar to the one planned for Bow Lake is already in operation. Customers appear satisfied with Shoreline's system.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available at

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/extranet/dnpr/swd/Bow%20Lake%20RTS%20-%20Construction%20Update-JAN%202010.pdf>.

Mercury Lighting Bill: Briefing

Energy-efficient compact fluorescent lights and fluorescent tubes save energy and save money. As a result, use of fluorescent lights is increasing. However, fluorescent lamps contain highly toxic mercury and should be recycled.

Currently, only about 2% of mercury lights used in Washington's households are recycled. Residential recycling options vary greatly across the state. Local governments and utilities lack adequate funds to provide recycling of fluorescent lights. Sustainable funding could be obtained from producers and would result in only a 2-5% increase in the retail price of the lamps.

Legislators recognized the need for product stewardship of fluorescent lights. In 2009, they wrote a bill that passed out of three house committees but didn't get a floor vote. SWD has been working with the Waste Refuse and Recycling Association (WRRRA) and Waste Management on the 2010 version of the bill. The best version of the bill to view is 2SHB 1469. See the bill at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?year=2009&bill=1469>

Additionally, the Washington State Department of Ecology was tasked with developing recommendations for mercury lighting recycling. Based on their analysis and input from stake holders, Ecology has recommended a cost internalization financing model and a flexible

performance-based collection system. You can find their recommendation at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0907076.html>

The 2010 legislative session is quite short and will most likely be focused on the budget. None the less, SWD will continue to work for a product stewardship for fluorescent lamps.

2010 Adopted Budget and Provisos: Briefing

For the most part, SWD's 2010 adopted budget matches their budget request. Four budget provisos apply to SWDs budget.

- Summarize appropriate methods of disposal for toxic contaminated flood debris in the 2009 summary on storm debris management. This is completed.
- Evaluate and report costs and benefits of providing limited access hours after 4 p.m. to the Factoria Transfer station. This has been drafted.
- Report on implementation of the Utilities Audit report with which the SWD agrees. Due by August 1st.
- Report on the efficacy of the methane gas collection and sale operations at Cedar Hills. Report will be prepared after data is available from the 1st and 2nd quarters.

Proviso responses will be tracked on the SWD's 2010 county legislative schedule.

Open Forum

There was no public comment.