

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
September 19, 2014 - 9:30 a.m. to 12:10 a.m.  
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Center**

Meeting Minutes

<b><u>Members Present</u></b>	<b><u>King County Staff</u></b>	<b><u>Others</u></b>
April Atwood	Linda Bremer	Doreen Booth
David Baker	Jeff Gaisford	Jamie Clegg
Jerry Bartlett	Kathy Hashagen	Gib Dammann
Bill Beck	Beth Humphreys	Scott DuBoff
Elly Bunzendahl	Kevin Kiernan	Ioana Lewis
Joe Casalini	Ross Marzolf	Bill Nelson
Bob Dixon	Laila McClinton	Barbara Ristau
Jean Garber	Thea Severn	
Steve Gerritson	Diane Yates	
Stacia Jenkins		
Kim Kaminski		
Sean Kronberg		
Keith Livingston		
Jose Lugo		
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann		
Stephen Strader		
Thomas Wray		
Bill Ziegler		

**Member Recognition**

Retiring SWAC members David Baker (2006 – 2014), Bob Dixon (2008 – 2014) and Bill Beck (1997 – 2014) were thanked for their long service on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. Changes to term limit requirements have resulted in their departure, although members may remain on the committee for a period of time until new members have been appointed as long as they have complied with all training requirements.

**Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Yates facilitated the election process. Nominations for the position of Chair included Garber and Strader. Garber was elected with a vote of 12 to six.

Nominations for the position of Vice Chair included Casalini and Jenkins. Casalini was elected by a vote of eleven to seven.

**Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

The August minutes were approved as written.

## Updates

### SWD

Members were reminded that completion of the training for Open Public Meetings Act, the Public Records, and King County Code of Ethics is required in order to be considered for reappointment. Send copies of the certificates from those trainings to Yates in order to continue being a member in good standing. SWAC recruitment has begun. Recruitment materials have been transcreated into Spanish.

Recently, SWAC meetings have been extended to allow time for important agenda items. It is likely that extended meetings will continue through much of 2015 because of anticipated meeting content. The division prefers extending the meetings to ensure members are included in these important topics. However, it does have schedule implications. If extending is not the preference of the group please let Yates know.

A ground-breaking ceremony for the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station on Aug. 14 was attended by SWD staff, the design team, the construction management team, and the project contractor. Currently, construction submittals are being reviewed, limited site work has been approved, and construction trailers are in place. Outreach to neighboring businesses has begun with the construction manager going door-to-door to hand out project newsletters. Project activities planned for the next few weeks include deconstruction of two warehouses, installation and activation of dewatering wells, removal of some mature trees, and grading for the new transfer building.

The division's GreenTools program has developed a suite of trainings to help King County staff understand and meet new Green Building requirements. Trainings begin September 17 with a big-picture look at the updates, the Sustainable Infrastructure Scorecards, and annual reporting. Subsequent trainings will build on this initial session.

The Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station received another award. The award is from the Engineering News Record Northwest in the Energy/Industrial – Green Project category. Bow Lake is also one of three finalists for the Best Overall Project in the Northwest.

In the second quarter of 2014, SWD-funded cleanup crews removed over sixteen tons of litter and illegally dumped garbage from public lands and waterways throughout King County. SWD partners with the Washington State Department of Ecology to fund and carry out these cleanups. The division also works with Friends of the Trail and the Department of Corrections on this cleanup work.

Division staff and a PCC Natural Market chef made a third appearance on the KING-5 New Day show about the [Food: Too Good To Waste Program](#). Community outreach continues through September at farmers markets. Public response has been positive, with many visitors saying that the outreach is a great use of county funds. The division is partnering with Bartell Drugs, Biobag, and the City of Seattle to provide discounted compostable bags and kitchen food scrap containers. Forty families are about halfway through their participation in the [Food Waste Challenge](#) which is also part of the campaign.

Group Health Cooperative which has been voluntarily providing medicine take-back has notified the County that they will cease that service. Their decision is based to some degree on the difficulties associated with controlled substances. Since then the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) released their final rule on take-back of controlled substances. It includes a critical provision allowing authorized pharmacies to take back controlled substances with other drugs in drop boxes or mail back programs.

#### Transfer Plan Review Part 2

SWAC Chair Garber provided a summary of the August Transfer Review Plan Part 2 committee Meeting. The committee will further explore the alternatives recommended in the Transfer Plan Review Final Report. We will not make motions or take actions, but rather provide feedback to the division, with reports back to SWAC and MSWMAC.

Council Motion 14145 requires that the division consult with stakeholders during the Part 2 Review. In addition to committee meetings, a workshop will be held on November 17 from 10:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. at the Mercer Island Community Center to involve a broader group.

The committee discussed adding regional equity to the list of guiding principles. Whether listed or not, the King County code states, “To the extent practicable, solid waste facilities shall be located in a manner that equalizes their distribution around the county, so that no single area of the county will be required to absorb an undue share of the impacts from these facilities.”

The division reviewed the three alternatives recommended in the Transfer Plan Review Final Report – the Base Plan, which includes a new NE Recycling and Transfer Station and Alternatives E1 and E2, which do not. Specific strategies will be discussed for serving the NE service area if a new NE transfer station is not build and their pros and cons compared with those of building a new NE facility. The effect of longer travel distances on collection costs will be part of the analysis.

The division selected 2023 and 2031 as forecast years. 2023 is projected to be the highest tonnage year and 2031 the lowest because Bellevue will have left the system and the division is projected to meet its 70 percent recycling goal. The review will also include a sensitivity analysis to look at what happens if there is only 60 percent recycling.

Alternatives E1 and E2 both assume the Renton Transfer Station will stay open but Renton has told the County it wants that station to close by 2018. So the Council amended its motion to require that the Part 2 review also look at a variation of alternatives E1 and E2 that doesn’t include the Renton Transfer Station.

The division made a presentation on Transfer Station Capacity and Demand. Transactional capacity is more significant than tonnage capacity in forecasting overall station capacity. The committee discussed strategies for reducing the effect of self-haul traffic on transactional capacity, including methods of reducing queues and demand management strategies.

And finally, the results of the Part 2 Review will inform an update to the Transfer Station chapter of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The division expects to complete

a draft report of the Part 2 Review by the end of January 2015. SWAC and MSWMAC will review the draft report before the division submits it to the County by March 2015.

#### MSWMAC

SWAC and MSWMAC Liaison Stacia Jenkins gave the MSWMAC update. MSWMAC had a similar agenda to SWACs. MSWMAC passed a resolution in support of the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study recommendations.

#### **SWAC Open Forum Discussion**

Livingston moved and Casalini seconded the following motion.

“I move that Open Forum be changed to Public Comment and limited to Public Comment.”

Discussion included:

- Members have an opportunity to speak during updates. They may also make technical presentations which can be included in the agenda with the approval of the group. In addition, articles and other materials can be distributed via Yates.
- Remember that though information can be shared via email, discussion must occur during a meeting rather than electronically in order to comply with the Open Public Meetings Act.
- A member stated strong objection to limiting the subject matter that can be discussed in Open Forum. The Chair has the ability to cut off discussion if they deem fit.
- If Open Forum is changed to Public Comment consider adding “other” to the agenda to allow members to bring forward ideas.
- Consider adding something to the updates section where members can do limited “touch base” information sharing and bring forward ideas.
- The group reviews and approves the SWAC work program annually. Agendas are drafted based on that work plan. Other work is driven by ordinance requirements. The Chair and Vice Chair discuss and sometimes change the agenda before it is distributed in advance of the meeting.
- Topics can be added to agendas by making a motion during a meeting.
- Public Comment is required in SWAC bylaws. Members started to make comments during that period so it was changed to Open Forum.

The motion failed. (3 in favor, 14 opposed, 2 abstentions)

Schmidt-Pathmann moved and Gerritson seconded the following motion.

“I move that SWAC allow five minutes on each agenda for solid waste related topics not on the current agenda to be presented to the committee.” Discussion included:

- It is unclear what is gained by this motion. It seems that this is already covered by Open Forum.
- It’s really about a quality exchange of ideas but the group should be careful about how Open Forum is used.
- Revising the minutes of a prior meeting to include detailed information is not the best choice. Instead ensure the detailed information is provided to the note taker in advance of the statement so it can be included in the notes.

The motion failed. (4 in favor, 15 opposed)

### **Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study**

Members Bartlett, Casalini, Lugo, Schmidt-Pathmann, Kaminski, and Bunzendahl disclosed a possible conflict of interest and recused themselves from discussion of this topic. They were reminded that in addition to making this statement they need to send an email to that effect to Yates and McLaughlin.

Refer to the [memo](#) sent to SWAC September 10 and distributed at the meeting. The division has completed work on the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study and is ready to move on to scoping three follow-up projects.

1. A feasibility assessment of anaerobic digestion at division facilities which would evaluate available technologies, appropriate facility size and location feedstock potential product markets, and cost.
2. A process to solicit proposals that would explore the private industry's interest and ideas for managing a portion of the waste stream using alternative technologies.
3. An assessment of a possible new fee structure which would consider what services would be funded by the new fee, how the fee would be structure, how the fee would be collected, and how tip fees would be affected.

Comments included:

- The Suburban Cities Association (SCA) is very interested in a study of waste to energy. The division expects a proposal for waste to energy will be received. It would be reviewed as part of exploring options related to proposals from private industry.
- The request for expressions of interest (RFEI) will likely be permissive regarding how much of the waste stream would be diverted and if/how waste would be separated. However, it is likely that the system's waste reduction and recycling goals would be included in the RFEI. The RFEI will inform a request for proposals.
- Advisory groups will have an opportunity to provide input on evaluation criteria.
- The organics that would be addressed using anaerobic digestion represents about 30 percent of the landfilled waste stream and is a targeted material for diversion. The technology is fairly proven and is scaleable. The division believes that enough information is available to move forward with this option rather than waiting for the RFEI/RFP process. Members noted that the evaluation criteria should apply to anaerobic digestion as well as the other proposals.
- The assessment of a possible new fee structure is expected to include all division fees.

Baker moved and Strader seconded the following motion.

“SWAC supports King County Solid Waste Division’s Sustainable Solid Waste Study as a list of potential options for achieving King County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan waste reduction, recycling and solid waste goals. As a regional partner in the solid waste system, SWAC recommends that the feasibility of any option be analyzed in greater depth, including potential impacts on rates. Furthermore, SWAC recommends that the Solid Waste Division provide opportunities for stakeholder input on further consideration or development of any option, and seek SWAC review and advice in the scoping of any option, development of specific proposals, and implementation of specific proposals.”

The motion passed with 12 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

### **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan Update**

The committee received a [presentation](#) about the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (comp plan.) The presentation included information about RCW 70.95.080 that requires the plan to be prepared. It also covered required plan content and the fact that it is a system plan, rather than a County plan - Cities are included.

The comp plan will be organized similarly to the current draft. Additionally, the intent is that chapter 5 of the comp plan will replace the Transfer Plan which is currently under review. Plan language about disposal alternatives will be permissive to allow for the options previously discussed in the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study.

Comments included:

- Consider changing language that would allow haulers to dispose of materials collected as recyclables if the market for the materials is no longer viable. (re: green fence.)
- The division is required to review the current comp plan every five years to determine if an update is needed.
- Planning for the division includes many interrelated topics. The comp plan provides overall, high level guidance and it will be structured permissively to allow the division to respond to changes. It is not necessary to wait until the more detailed work is completed.
- The most significant change from the currently adopted comp plan is to allow for alternative disposal options. The plan was adopted in 2001 and directs the division to export waste when Cedar Hills reaches capacity.

### **Open Forum**

During introductions, Bill Nelson mentioned the services provided by Sight Connections formerly called Community Services for the Blind. The organization provides curbside collection of gently used clothing and household goods. Ioana Lewis provided the following contact information: 703-887-8138

A member made information about the [Ecobuilding 2014 Transformation Through Transparency conference](#) available to SWAC members.