

Joint MSWMAC/SWAC Advisory Committee Meeting

February 17, 2017 - 11:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

MSWMAC Members	
David Hill	Algona
Bill Pelosa	Auburn
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Sabrina Combs	Bothell
Tris Samberg	Bothell
Austin Bell	Burien
Miya Andrews	Burien
Brian Roberts	Burien
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Jenna McInnins	Kirkland
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
Diana Pistoll	Maple Valley
Carol Simpson	Newcastle
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	Redmond
Linda Knight	Renton
Beth Goldberg	Sammamish
Uki Dele	Shoreline
Kellye Mazzoli	Woodinville

King County Staff
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
Jennifer Devlin, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Matt Hobson, SWD staff
Ross Marzolf, KC Council staff
Yolanda Pou, Public Health - Seattle King County
Mike Reed, KC Council staff
Terra Rose, KC Council staff
Eben Sutton, SWD staff
Kim van Ekstrom, SWD staff
Diane Yates, SWD staff
Guests
Quinn Apuzzo - Recology
Joe Casalini – Republic Services
Emily Newcomer – Waste Management
Laura Moser – Waste Management
Ian Sutton – Parametrix

SWAC Members	
April Atwood	Mason Giem
David Baker	Kim Kaminski
Elly Buzendahl – excused	Kevin Kelly - excused
Gib Dammann - excused	Keith Livingston - absent
Karen Dawson	Ken Marshall
Jean Garber - Chair	Barbara Ristau
	Stephen Strader

Minutes:

No minutes were reviewed at this meeting. MSWMAC and SWAC will review and approve minutes from their January meetings at the next meeting that is not a joint meeting.

Comp Plan Visioning Exercise

In respect of time, Chair Penny Sweet moved the updates to the end of the meeting. After introductions SWD staff, Matt Hobson, introduced the Visioning Exercise. The purpose of the exercise was to get reactions on what has been discussed to date and to hear the committee members’ thoughts on the direction for the coming years for the King County solid waste system.

The committee then divided into four groups to discuss the following topics:

- People and their waste
- Recycling goals and strategies
- The long-term path for waste disposal
- The future of the transfer system
- Financing the solid waste system

Non-members attending the meeting were invited to listen to the conversations.

Farewell to Diane Yates

After the Visioning Exercise, the committees took time to honor the service of Diane Yates, who is retiring at the end of the February after 16+ years of service with SWD.

Comp Plan Discussion

During lunch, SWD staff Jeff Gaisford presented an [overview](#) of the information to be included in the Waste Prevention and Recycling (WPR) Chapter of the draft 2019 Comp Plan. The reason for the Recycling Chapter is to affirm the division’s commitment to environmental stewardship, resource conservation, landfill preservation, regional job creation, and climate change mitigation. The purpose of the chapter is to describe the division’s regional goals, provide an update on WPR efforts, outline opportunities for resource conservation, recycling and product stewardship opportunities. The chapter also details methods to track the division’s progress and ways to improve data and reporting.

It is noted that WPR policies may require changes to minimum collection service levels and to what are considered acceptable recyclable materials. The division currently has an overall goal to achieve zero waste of resources by eliminating the disposal of materials with economic value by 2030.

The first policy in support of this goal is, “Set achievable goals for reducing waste generation and disposal and increasing recycling and reuse.” Currently 70 percent of what is thrown away as trash could be recycled.



Discussion Questions:

1. Should the goal to achieve zero waste of resources have a time-frame (e.g., 2030) or be an aspirational goal?
2. Should the Comp Plan have intermediate, time-based recycling goals?
3. Is there interest in setting recycling goals for individual jurisdictions?

Joe Casalini of Republic Services expressed support for the 70 percent goal while Karen Dawson of Cedar Grove shared her concern that the division focuses too much on diverting recyclable waste from the landfill without thinking through the end-use; nothing is recycled until it is made useful again. Alison Bennett commented that since the current overall recycling rate is 50 percent, then 70 does not seem hard to achieve, but given the considerably lower multi-family recycling rate it may be impossible. Perhaps the division ought to consider assigning a different goal per each sector? Diana Pistoll noted that since 2020 is only 35 months away, 70 percent is a great aspirational goal but unlikely to be achieved. Gaisford noted that the 70 percent by 2020 goal was established in 2008.

Beth Goldberg wondered if the 70 percent figure associated with thrown-away recyclable materials is correct as she recalled that just two years ago that figure was 78 percent. Gaisford responded that the last waste characterization study determined there is less food waste and paper being thrown in the trash. Bill Pelozza suggested that cities partner with King County in order to change city codes because multi-family housing units do not have enough space to accommodate waste and recycling bins. Mayor David Hill shared that as a self-hauler himself, he takes his recycled materials to a private recycling facility, and therefore the 8 percent self-haul recycling rate is inaccurate as many other self-haulers likely recycle materials in the same manner. Gaisford agreed with Mayor Hill, noting that the non-residential recycling rate of 67 percent as reported by the State Department of Ecology would include the recycling rate of the private recycler receiving Mayor Hill's materials.

Chair Jean Garber said developers should build space for recycling inside and outside of multi-family housing. She also noted that aspirational goals may be discouraging since they do not measure progress. Pistoll said that Maple Valley hosts many recycling events where the tonnage of waste diverted is not included in diversion rates that Maple Valley reports to the Department of Ecology, so she will start tracking that information. Sabrina Combs noted that no one seems to be collecting data from citizen groups like Buy Nothing and lending libraries and wondered if there was a way to track that information. Gaisford responded by pointing out that waste characterization studies change over time and may be capturing some of that information. Goldberg pointed out that garbage increases with a strong economy and that is another variable that would be worth monitoring.

Gaisford proceeded with the presentation by introducing the second WPR policy "to enhance, develop, and implement waste prevention and recycling programs that will increase waste diversion from disposal using multiple tools," for example:

- Infrastructure – changes to collection frequency, resource recovery at transfer stations
- Education & promotion – outreach programs to schools, businesses, and residents
- Incentives – Embed organics collection costs, "pay as you throw" garbage rates, grant programs
- Mandates – mandatory food separation, recycling at transfer stations, enforcement

Diverting food waste from landfills is key to reaching the Zero Waste of Resources goal.



Recycling efforts at transfer stations are making a large difference with over 25,000 tons in 2016 compared to 9,500 tons in 2013. It is expected that these rates will continue to see improvements when the division begins requiring self-haul customers at select transfer stations to separate some recyclables from garbage in 2018. (There will soon be a webinar about this subject.) Mandatory separation of construction and demolition (C&D) materials started in January 2016, with a goal of capturing 85 percent of C&D by 2025 – a topic that will be discussed by the advisory committee discussions in March 2017.

The division has identified three approaches to continue the trend:

- A. The county and cities implement the Roadmap to 70 percent immediately
- B. Jurisdictional self-determination wherein the cities set and comply with their own recycling goals
- C. Regional push forward with county leading

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you/ your agency support a policy that authorizes and/or changes infrastructure, education/outreach, incentives, and mandates to increase waste diversion?
2. During the last round of discussions on the WPR Chapter, the division heard that:
 - Cities want to have a choice about what actions to take
 - Many do not support mandates
 - Want County to lead

Ken Marshall noted that in many cities the charge for recycling is embedded in the garbage charge, but yard waste is not. Goldberg noted that people get upset about embedded charges, even when it is the right thing to do. Rather, she asserted, a regional education component is key, such as public service announcements and the county website. She added that cities do not have the resources to enforce mandates. Carol Simpson said that Newcastle does not have the budget to manage garbage having only a grant to coordinate two recycling events. Dawson said she was against embedded rates as they increase the likelihood of contamination. She wondered if it were possible to make recycling free of charge. Gaisford noted that the division sets service level standards for the unincorporated areas of King County and would need to go to council to set new policies.

John MacGillivray announced he is a firm believer in mandates and has changed his personal garbage management because of them: he lives in an former unincorporated area that is now part of the City of Renton and his garbage collection shifted to every other week and now MacGillivray is conscientious about composting his food waste instead of adding it to his

garbage can. Bennett said that the City of Bellevue has embedded rates, but she is not a fan of mandates as they would require 'garbage police.' She asked how Seattle does it, as she heard they have had to revise their approach. Gaisford said Seattle has seen some success, but that is a topic for the discussion about collection. Marshall said that Seattle tried to turn trash collectors into garbage cops, but it stopped. Now, Seattle has employees who monitor garbage but they focus on commercial, not residential.

Gaisford returned to his presentation with an overview of the next three WPR policies:

- Advocate for product stewardship and management of manufactured products and greater responsibility for manufacturers to divert these products from the waste stream.
- Work with regional partners to find the highest value end uses for recycled and composted materials and support market development.
- Strive to ensure that materials diverted from the King County waste stream for recycling, composting, and reuse are handled and processed using methods that are protective of human health and the environment.

Gaisford ended the presentation with several recommendations to optimize commingled collection:

- Reduce confusion to customers by harmonizing messaging across jurisdictions.
- Prioritize the collection of materials that generate revenue and do not contaminate other recyclable materials.
- Increase the transparency, require documentation that materials are recycled safely and at their highest value.

With general consensus on the WPR policies for this meeting and an understanding that there will be further discussion on them, Hobson said next month's topic will cover the Collection chapter of the Comp Plan. Jerallyn Roetemeyer requested that the page numbers on the presentation print out to match the slide numbers.

SWD staff Meg Moorehead stated that after last month's discussion on the Planning Policies, the division did not receive any specific requests for amendments. After checking to see if there were any recommended changes, it was agreed that Planning Policies be incorporated into the draft plan as written.

Updates

SWAC & MSWMAC Updates

There were no updates shared from the Advisory Committees this month.

Solid Waste Division (SWD) Update

Acting Assistant Division Director Eben Sutton delivered SWD's updates:

SWD opens public comment period for extending Enumclaw hours proposal

Starting on Feb. 14, SWD began a public comment period for a proposal to extend hours at the Enumclaw Recycling and Transfer Station. SWD is proposing to open the station to all

customers two additional days per week, Wednesdays and Thursdays. This proposed change means the station would be open seven days a week from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The reason for this proposal is in response to increased desire for use, and having the station open all seven days will enhance customer convenience and provide access to the numerous recycling opportunities at Enumclaw. Currently, the station is closed to the public on Wednesday and Thursday but open to the City of Enumclaw, the Muckleshoot Tribe, and commercial haulers. The \$61,000 per year added cost of operating two additional days per week was approved in the division's 2017/2018 Biennial Budget. The public comment period runs through March 20. Barring any unforeseen issues, new hours would take effect on May 1, 2017.

Siting recommendation signed for new South County facility

Last week, DNR Director Christie True concurred with SWD's siting recommendation for a new South County Recycling and Transfer Station that will replace the Algona Transfer Station. The recommendation called for the new facility to be built at 35101 West Valley Highway South in Algona. This location was identified as the preferred location in the Environmental Impact Statement issued last year. The location, which is located next to the existing Algona station, was recommended because it will allow the project to progress without further delays and is considered a technically better site, among other reasons. Potential project delivery methods are now being evaluated so the project can keep moving forward. We also are close to signing an Interlocal Agreement with the City of Algona.

Discussion following SWD Updates

Pelosa opined that the news about the south county facility was a smart way to go in terms of tax payer money and efficiencies. He also noted that mitigation through negotiation was the first of its kind.

Demand Management Update:

Moorehead announced that after meeting with Executive Constantine to discuss the scope of the Demand Management Pilot, the division made a recommendation to extend the schedule with the pilot starting later in 2018 rather than January 1st. This will allow more time for negotiations, working with host cities, environmental studies, etc. Council's budget provisos will still be adhered to as they are not affected by the schedule extension – the Implementation Plan is still due to council by March 30th and the six-month report will still be submitted to council seven-months after the pilot's start date. An updated planning schedule will be available to the Advisory Committees. The Comp Plan timeline is not affected by the recommended Demand Management schedule.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.