

MSWMAC Advisory Committee Meeting

March 10, 2017 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:20 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

<u>MSWMAC Members</u>	
Diana Quinn	Algona
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Anita DeMahy	Bothell
Brian Roberts	Burien
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Laura Techico	Des Moines
Chris Searcy – Vice Chair	Enumclaw
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Gina Hungerford	Kent
Toby Nixon	Kirkland
Jenna McInnis	Kirkland
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
Phillippa Kassover	Lake Forest Park
Diana Pistoll	Maple Valley
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	Redmond
Linda Knight	Renton
Beth Goldberg	Sammamish
Rika Cecil	Shoreline
Uki Dele	Shoreline
Scott MacColl	Shoreline
Bernie Talmas	Woodinville
Kellye Mazzoli	Woodinville

<u>King County Staff</u>
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
Krista Camenzind, KC Council staff
Jennifer Devlin, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Matt Hobson, SWD staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD staff
Yolanda Pon, Public Health - Seattle King County
Mike Reed, KC Council staff
Olivia Robinson, SWD staff
Eben Sutton, SWD staff
<u>Guests</u>
Doreen Booth, Sound Cities Association
Casey Desmond, Waste Management
Laura Moser, Waste Management
Janet Prichard, Republic Services

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Chris Searcy called for nominations for Chair. Barre Seibert of Clyde Hill nominated Penny Sweet and Toby Nixon of Kirkland seconded. No other nominations were received. Members took a voice vote. Sweet was unanimously elected as Chair.

Penny Sweet called for nominations for Vice Chair. Nixon nominated Chris Searcy and Seibert seconded. No other nominations were received. Members took a voice vote. Searcy was unanimously elected as Vice Chair.

Minutes

Minutes from the January were approved as written. The February minutes were approved as amended by request of Diana Pistoll who corrected the third paragraph on page three to read "...tonnage diverted at recycling events is not included in the Maple Valley diversion rate." and a typo consisting of an errant "to" in the last sentence of that same paragraph.

Updates

Solid Waste Division (SWD) Update

SWD exceeds 2015 recycling goals

In 2016, the division set a goal of handling 24,000 tons of recyclable materials for that year. SWD is pleased to announce it exceeded that goal by handling 25,560 tons of recyclable and compostable materials. This represents a 41 percent increase in recyclable materials brought to division facilities compared to 2015.

New CNG Vehicle

On Tuesday, Feb. 28, SWD picked up a new division vehicle that runs exclusively on compressed natural gas (CNG). The new vehicle replaces an older division car that was due to be replaced. With the Department of Natural Resources and Parks commitment of being carbon neutral and having zero emissions, SWD felt choosing a car that runs on CNG helps the division participate in this important goal. King County Fleet Administration will be paying for gas and maintenance of the vehicle.

Anaerobic Digestion

The County contracted with HDR Consulting in 2016 to evaluate the feasibility of anaerobic digestion technology to manage a portion of the solid waste stream. The consultants evaluated multiple private and public sector options and are finalizing their research and recommendations. An overview of these options as well as their economic and environmental impacts will be included in future Comp Plan discussions related to solid waste disposal.

Rate Restructure

In late 2015, the County contracted with FCS Group, a financial consulting team based in Redmond, to explore options to restructure the solid waste tipping fees assessed at the transfer stations and Cedar Hills landfill. The objective of this study was to identify strategies to improve the long-term financial stability of the County's Solid Waste Fund in response to changes in economic conditions and reduced solid waste as a result of recycling efforts. We expect to receive a final consultant report this month and plan to brief the committees on the study's options and recommendations this summer as part of the discussion of Comp Plan Financial Policies.

SWD opens public comment period for Waste Acceptance Rule changes

On March 3, the Solid Waste Division began a 45-day public comment period regarding changes to the Waste Acceptance Rule. The public comment period will close at 4:30 p.m. on April 17. The Waste Acceptance Rule was last updated in 2005, and in addition to administrative changes like updating website and phone number information, the proposed changes also include updates to what is and isn't accepted at division facilities. The key driver behind these changes is to require recycling of selected materials at stations where the division offers recycling services in support of the division's goal to achieve a 70 percent recycling rate.

SWAC Update

There was no SWAC update as their last meeting was a joint meeting with MSWMAC.

Comp Plan Discussion: Follow-up on WPR Policies

SWD staff Jeff Gaisford gave an [overview](#) of the Waste Prevention and Recycling Policies discussed during last month's meeting. After Jeff reviewed WPR Policy 2, which addresses developing and implementing WPR programs, Barre Siebert shared a proposal for the creation of an "entertaining Comp Plan diversion/recycling campaign" around the concept of encouraging rate payers to "lose a few pounds" – specifically in their trash cans.

Comments about the proposal included broad support for the concept, but doubts about the feasibility of execution and evaluation since it would likely necessitate the improbable weighing of cans at the curb. It was pointed out that much of what is disposed of is lightweight packaging which is usually voluminous so perhaps message ought to be focused on reducing the volume rather than weight of landfill garbage. Another noted that decreased garbage disposal rates are correlated with economic downturns, so any reduced weight or volume may not be contributed to intentional efforts on behalf of the consumer.

It was recommended that whatever message that goes out to the public ought to be thoroughly tested so as not to invoke unintended negative feelings; something akin to a "get to the minimum" campaign to recommend that rate payers choose to order the smallest-sized waste container that would accommodate their needs, without imposing a sense of judgement about whether they are consuming less or recycling more. It was also noted that garbage rates are correlated with the size of a household which is often variable, therefore measures should be system-wide.

Gaisford put to rest the concern that statewide recycling data is not accurate since not all residential and commercial recycling efforts are being reported to the Department of Ecology. He stated that all recycling facilities are required to file annual reports to the state so the data is captured even if SWD and the cities are unable to directly capture this information. There also was discussion on setting different goal rates for different sectors, such as multi-family residences, since there are different needs and barriers for each sector. The importance of education campaigns was reiterated, especially when many rate payers feel they are already doing all they can when in truth there is a lack of awareness about what can be done.

SWD staff Meg Moorehead raised the idea of SWD staff coordinating a review of the 2013 draft plan WPR policies and actions at an upcoming meeting of the cities' recycling coordinators, as they may have ideas to include in the comp plan. She also noted that the 70 percent recycling goal is mentioned only as a suggested action in the draft plan (not as formal policy) and recommended adding it to the Zero Waste goal. She also pointed out that interlocal agreements require an enforcement policy yet enforcement is not included in any of the draft policies. She suggested that enforcement be added to the "tool box" of actions listed in WPR2. SWD will provide amended goal and policy language to address these issues before the next WPR chapter discussion.

It was noted that the 70 percent diversion rate is only half of the issue because Bernie Talmas stated that he has heard that recycling facilities will send recovered materials to the landfill if the materials are contaminated or if there is no market for the materials. Sweet added that policies ought to be written to ensure there is a market for these materials. Gaisford noted that haulers are prohibited from taking to the landfill anything collected as recycling.

There was some discussion over whether a city or the county has the responsibility to enforce diversion. Gaisford said the county is responsible for enforcement at the transfer stations, but cities would need to work out enforcement details in their contracts with the haulers.

A question was asked about why the Zero Waste policy was included in the fall 2016 survey of MSMWAC members but isn't among the current list of WPR policies. SWD staff Matt Hobson said the Zero Waste policy was relabeled as an overarching goal. The WPR policies fit under the goal and implementation actions fit under each policy. The text of the plan explains the reasoning and context for the goals, policies and actions. This plan structure will improve alignment between goals, policies, and actions.

Overall throughout the discussion, there was broad general support for WPR policies and three types of goals: *zero waste of resources* as a long term vision, the interim goal of *70 percent waste materials diverted to recycling* as a step toward zero waste of resources, and support for a goal to *measure the amount of waste disposed*.

Comp Plan Discussion: Collection and Processing

SWD staff Beth Humphreys presented an overview of the Collection and Processing chapter of the draft comp plan. This chapter includes several components that are required by state law including the designation of recyclable materials and a process to modify the list if markets collapse.

Discussion Questions:

- Do you support including the designated recyclables as a minimum standard for collection?
- Should the list of acceptable recyclables be standardized to improve consistency in messaging to the customer?
- If yes, what factors should be considered to prioritize acceptable items?

The affirmative answers to the first two discussion questions were unanimous. Humphreys noted that the designated standards are minimum standards for curbside collection.

Discussion Question:

- Do you support the proposed minimum standards for single-family and multi-family collection services?

A 2015 study on best practices for encouraging waste diversion in the multi-family sector recommended the Four C's: Convenience, Clarity, Capacity, and Color. By deploying the Four C's it is expected the multi-family diversion rate could increase from 15 percent to 21 percent.

SWD's Green Tools program has been working with cities through the Regional Code Collaboration to change building/developer codes to create space to accommodate recycling services indoors and outdoors.

There was some discussion about the multi-family collection standards for container size. It was determined that what was meant is that there should be equal container capacity for garbage and recycling, similar to what the city of Kirkland does. In regards to prioritizing which diversion to focus on for the multi-family sector, it was suggested SWD focus on recycled materials first and phase in food waste as a priority over time.

There are significant opportunities to advance recycling in multi-family residences given a number of challenges unique to that sector. Strategies include adopting minimum collection standards, strengthening building codes, and targeted outreach.

In January 2016, King County passed an ordinance supporting a goal of recycling 85 percent of waste generated by Construction and Demolition (C&D). Since C&D processing occurs outside of the county system it is not counted toward SWD recycling rate, but there are agreements with recycling facilities to deliver monthly processing reports to SWD. SWD proposes that a policy be added to address C&D management.

Demand Management Response:

Chair Sweet called for an end of the presentation out of consideration of time. Although SWD has delayed the start of the Demand Management study, MSWMAC still needed to decide if they wanted to vote on a resolution stating their response to the Demand Management project. It was pointed out that some city representatives may not feel properly empowered to represent their cities at this stage. It was decided more time was needed to discuss potential amendments to the resolution and for representatives to work with city leadership to develop their positions. Suggested changes to the resolution can be emailed to Chair Sweet.

The next meeting will be a joint meeting with SWAC on April 21 at 11:15 in the King Street Center 8th floor conference room. MSWMAC will meet there at 10:45 to discuss the Demand Management resolution.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.