

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
December 19, 2014 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:45 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>
David Baker	Anna Fleming	Doreen Booth
Jerry Bartlett	Beth Humphreys	Gib Dammann
Joe Casalini	Morgan John	King County Councilmember Lambert
Jean Garber	Kevin Kiernan	Ross Marzolf
Stacia Jenkins	Pat McLaughlin	Suellen Mele
Kim Kaminski	Laila McClinton	Barbara Ristau
Keith Livingston	Thea Severn	
Jose Lugo	Kathy Wright	
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann	Diane Yates	
Bill Ziegler		

**Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda**

The November SWAC minutes were approved as written.

**Updates**

SWD

In 2015, the Solid Waste Division will be redefining its business model to focus on waste prevention, resource recovery and waste disposal. The new structure will allow the division to ensure rate stability, system flexibility, and operational excellence, as well as to gain efficiencies and improve coordination by bringing together complementary functions. Contract management and project management will be centralized. At a member's request, a high-level division organizational chart will be shared with the committee at the January meeting.

On Nov. 25<sup>th</sup>, the first edition of the quarterly solid waste newsletter for cities was emailed to MSWMAC members, as well as to all city mayors, city managers/administrators, public works directors and recycling coordinators. It is also available [online](#). MSWMAC members are encouraged to share their ideas for future newsletter topics with Diane Yates by the end of January. The next edition will be emailed at the end of February.

There are four provisos on the 2015/2016 budget:

1. Restricts \$50,000 from being expended or encumbered until transmittal of a plan to stabilize post-closure landfills. The plan is due Jan. 31, 2016.
2. Restricts \$1.7 million and 9.0 FTEs until transmittal of a report on the resource recovery program. The report is due June 30, 2015.

3. Requires \$150,000 to be expended for study of increasing diversion of waste from multifamily generators. No due date has been set for this study.
4. Restricts \$5 million from being expended or encumbered until transmittal of a report on a review of the ILA. It is a requirement to ask cities for recommended revisions to the amended and restated ILA. MSWMAC members should review the ILA and share suggested amendments with the division at the January meeting. The report is due Aug. 1, 2015.

The division now has a presence on Instagram. Follow us @kingcountyswd.

## MSWMAC

SWAC liaison Jenkins reported that SWAC provided input on the Finance chapter at the December meeting. The committee also passed its bylaws with no substantial changes. In addition, SWAC discussed the need to include more information about cities' solid waste programs in the Comp Plan. A "Roadmap to 70 Percent Recycling Rate" was added as a standing agenda item and a related subcommittee was formed.

## Other

Chair Garber stated that the Transfer Plan Review analysis is still underway. Because the analysis is not far enough along to merit being presented, the meeting originally scheduled for Dec. 19 has been cancelled.

## **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**

Severn presented the revised redline version of Chapter 7: Finance. Comments from the first review at the November SWAC meeting were taken into account. Comments from the December MSWMAC meeting have not yet been included. Comments included:

- A table of contents for the chapter was included for reference during the review process, but will not be included in the final Comp Plan.
- While most financial policy statements are in the imperative mood, consider reviewing all verbs to ensure the meaning is clear and there is minimal room for interpretation.
- Severn noted that FIN-14 uses "may" intentionally.
- The "rainy day" reserve and rate stabilization reserve are a part of the operating fund.
- SWAC and MSWMAC will be briefed on significant differences between the original ILA and the Amended and Restated ILA. These differences are also noted in the Planning chapter.
- The concept of a possible environmental reserve fund resulted from discussing how to handle potential liabilities shared by cities and King County related to the Cedar Hills Regional landfill.
- Per MSWMAC discussion, the "Funding for Cities" box may be revised to accurately reflect the diverse ways cities fund their solid waste programs. This may inform discussions on how to most effectively use county resources to meet county goals.

- In the introductory paragraph, consider not only mentioning that “the system experienced reductions in garbage tonnage” but also increased recycling rates, which has an effect on revenue as well.
- Per MSWMAC discussion, the division will consider removing “currently” from the Comp Plan as much as possible given that the plan has an extended life and “currently” does not indicate a clear timeframe.
- Consider adding detail about what the two special waste fees cover.
- The C&D disposal surcharge fee is set to cover the cost of administering the program rather than to encourage or discourage C&D disposal.
- A member cautioned against banning disposal of materials that have recycling markets prematurely as markets that were considered “stable” have collapsed in the past. More discussion will be included in the Waste Prevention and Recycling chapter.
- In the “Amended and Restated ILAs and ‘Latecomer’ Provisions” section:
  - Consider changing “... the five cities that have not signed will be responsible for planning and managing solid waste generated within their city limits” to “... the five cities that have not signed will be responsible for planning, managing, *and financing* solid waste generated within their city limits. *This includes producing a Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, as required by state law.*”
  - Consider rewording “many questions remain...” to “King County is exploring different options...”
- In the “Closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill” section, consider reevaluating the assumption that the cost of waste export is lower than other disposal options.
- Consider including a clarifying statement that tonnage forecasts are based on the assumption that the county will achieve a 70 percent recycling rate by 2030.
- In the “New Revenue Sources” section:
  - Consider connecting the new sources of revenue with current revenue sources listed earlier in the chapter.
  - Consider noting that \$1 to \$1.4 million is an annual figure.

The comments provided will be considered for inclusion in the Draft Comp Plan, which is anticipated to be complete in September 2015.

### **Roadmap to 70 Percent Recycling Rate: Discussion**

Division director Pat D. McLaughlin shared a chart demonstrating that despite concentrated efforts by the division, cities and private partners, King County’s progress in moving toward the 70 percent recycling rate by 2030 has stalled over the last three years and remains at 52 percent. McLaughlin pointed out that the commercial sector has made the most significant progress over the last eight years and has the highest rate, but has not progressed in the last three years. Single-family households showed some improvement over the last eight years, but again, have not made progress recently. Multi-family household recycling rates have made small increases, but remain well below commercial and single-family household recycling rates.

McLaughlin suggested adding the 70 percent roadmap as a standing agenda item at SWAC meetings. All members were in favor of adding the item.

A committee composed of MSWMAC and SWAC members will be formed to create a plan for developing a tool box of policies and programs that will help cities increase recycling rates and reduce waste generation. The committee will bring the plan back to MSWMAC and SWAC for further consideration. Yates will email all members asking if anyone would like to join.

Comments included:

- States and countries measure recycling in various ways, therefore recycling rates are difficult to compare. For example, Washington State does not include C&D recycling and vehicle recycling among other things.
- To consider King County's progress within a national or global context, it may be valuable to note how King County's recycling rate would vary if alternative measures were used.
- A member requested more information on the most effective King County recycling programs.
- As multi-family housing continues to grow quickly, planning and setting requirements for recycling in multi-family residences is increasingly important.
- The tonnage forecast is calculated based on factors set by the Puget Sound Regional Council. These include population, household size and employment.
- Consider viewing the King County tonnage forecast in a map format to consider regional differences in growth.
- Consider tracking when each city's contract with their garbage hauler will be up for renewal so that SWAC can offer advice on potential improvements.

### **Waste-to-Energy Technologies: Presentation**

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was unanimously approved.

Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann made a [presentation](#) on waste-to-energy technologies.

### **Open Forum**

King County Councilmember Lambert suggested that, when making its tonnage forecasts, the division consider that the county only spends 65 percent of what it budgets.

Councilmember Lambert noted that defining "recycling" is very important and that a commodity should only be counted as "recycled" if it has a market and is sent to that market within a certain timeframe. She also noted the importance of having space for recycling in multifamily housing.

A member added that it is important to not only have space for recycling containers, but also to have space for haulers to access containers.