

MSWMAC Advisory Committee Meeting

May 12, 2017 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

MSWMAC Members	
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Bill Pelosa	Auburn
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Sabrina Combs	Bothell
Tris Samberg	Bothell
Austin Bell	Burien
Brian Roberts	Burien
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Chris Searcy – Vice Chair	Enumclaw
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Toby Nixon	Kirkland
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
Phillippa Kassover	Lake Forest Park
Diana Pistoll	Maple Valley
Carol Simpson	Newcastle
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	Redmond
Beth Goldberg	Sammamish
Scott MacColl	Shoreline
Paula Waters	Woodinville
Lauren Broudy	Woodinville

King County Staff
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Kathy Hashagen, SWD staff
Matt Hobson, SWD staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD staff
Yolanda Pon, Public Health - Seattle King County
Olivia Robinson, SWD staff
Terra Rose, KC Council staff
Glynda Steiner, SWD Assistant Division Director
Christie True, DNRP Director
Eben Sutton, SWD staff
Guests
Doreen Booth, Sound Cities Association
Laura Moser, Waste Management
Nav Ota, City of Bellevue

Minutes

Minutes from March and April were approved as written.

Updates

Solid Waste Division (SWD) Update

Prevention Grant allocation formula changes

The amount included in the proposed State budget for Coordinated Prevention Grants (CPG) program has decreased from \$15M in the last biennium to \$10M. CPG biennial allocations to each county include a fixed component and a per-capita component. Most counties use the allocation for county programs but in King County cities receive a share of the grant funds. The State is considering increasing the fixed component of the allocation from \$100k per county to \$150k while reducing the per-capita component. This change will benefit rural counties, and aggravate the effect of declining state appropriations on urban counties.

New Assistant Division Director begins

Glynda Steiner is the new Assistant Division Director of the Solid Waste Division. Glynda has a background in Civil Engineering and has experience in consulting and working with utilities, most recently Seattle City Light.

Meeting with Councilmember Lambert

On April 19, SWD Director Pat McLaughlin and Strategy, Communications, and Performance Manager Meg Moorehead met with King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert to discuss long-term disposal options discussed at the last MSWMAC meeting and the third party review of waste-to-energy options discussed at the last MSWMAC meeting.

SWD conducts first landfill neighbor meeting of 2017

On April 20, SWD held a landfill neighbor community meeting. Seven members from the public attended to hear updates on landfill operations, how SWD is actively pursuing continuous improvement, upcoming and completed projects at the landfill and about work at BioEnergy Washington. These meetings are held twice a year and the next meeting will be held in October.

King County management of King Street Center

Shortly, the management of the King Street Center building will be transferred from Wright Runstad to the King County Facilities Management Division (FMD). Wright Runstad has been working with FMD to ensure a smooth transition. However, some of the faces you see as you enter the building may change. Other changes, including possible differences in parking will also occur and there may be some rough patches as you attend the meeting next month. Please be patient as we learn together.

2017 Mattress Recycling Summit

The 2017 Mattress Recycling Summit will occur May 24 from 9:30 – 11:30 a.m. at the ShoWare Center in Kent. The summit will provide the opportunity for mattress recyclers, haulers, retailers and others to make connections and share insights. Previously, SWD has focused on supporting private sector mattress collectors and recyclers. However, the division plans to offer mattress collection and recycling service at four or five transfer stations beginning in 2018. In response to a question, Gaisford noted that though a pilot is occurring at transfer stations this year to allow the division to practice the logistics of mattress recycling, advertising the new service to the public will occur later.

SWAC Update

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

Comp Plan Discussion: Disposal

The results of the third party review will be ready for committee discussion in August. The discussion at this meeting is based on preliminary findings that can be reevaluated after completion of the review.

The results of the survey of MSWMAC members in November was that 95 percent support maximizing Cedar Hills' capacity. SWD asked if MSWMAC supports the following policy to be included in the Comp Plan for public review.

D2 – Maximize the capacity and lifespan of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill, subject to environmental constraints, relative costs to operate, and stakeholder interests.

Comments included:

- A member expressed support of the policy saying that extending landfill life provides more time to consider emergent technologies.
- In response to questions SWD said
 - Analysis has been based on current conditions, which assume that five cities will leave the system in 2028.
 - The division has been evaluating landfill development options for a while and expect that those options will be far enough along to share with MSWMAC in late 2017 or early 2018; before the comp plan is approved.

Attendees were reminded that disposal policy is permissive of multiple long term disposal options. MSWMAC then was asked if they support the following action to be included in the Comp Plan for public review.

Action 1 – Track and evaluate options for disposal once the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill reaches capacity and closes. Consider waste export to an out-of-county landfill, a waste-to-energy facility(ies) and other disposal or conversion technologies, to handle all or a portion of the county's waste.

Attendees had no questions and did not provide comment.

The 2016 export rates per ton (including transportation from the railhead) are \$43 and \$52 for the City of Seattle and Snohomish County respectively compared to King County's disposal rate of \$35.

Comments include:

- King County should be wary of export proposals at a low rate for a short term. Even if capacity were available, it would be difficult to go back to disposal at Cedar Hills if the favorable terms were changed in the future.

In response to questions SWD noted:

- Snohomish County has a higher disposal volume than the City of Seattle. Snohomish County extended their current contract until 2018 and is negotiating terms for the next agreement.

- It is not apparent what factors contribute to the price differences between the City of Seattle and Snohomish. Different companies provide disposal services to the jurisdictions.
- SWD will provide trend information of the disposal costs.

Working with the advisory committees, SWD identified six criteria categories, and each category has multiple sub-criteria

(<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/2013-swd-comp-plan.pdf>, Chapter 6, pages 15-16) for selecting a long term disposal option. MSWMAC was asked if they support those.

In response to questions SWD noted:

- The criteria as provided include the words that were in the draft Comp Plan in 2008, but have not yet been revised to include comments from last month.
- The criteria identify what will be considered when making the long-term disposal decision. The document does not include how those criteria will be balanced and prioritized. That will be determined when the point of decision arrives.

Attendees had no questions and did not provide comment.

Action 3 assumes that the third party review confirms the results of the division's analysis of long-term disposal options. For the sake of discussion MSWMAC was asked to make that assumption and asked if they then support the following action to be included in the Comp Plan for public review.

Action 3 – Complete site development plan, environmental review, and capital improvement plan for a new landfill cell, Area 9, at Cedar Hills Regional Landfill.

Attendees had no questions and did not provide comment.

The following comments occurred during the discussion of the Disposal Criteria and Responses to [Follow-up Questions](#).

- The City of Seattle referred SWD to their comprehensive plan which made it clear that they would not be interested in a waste-to-energy facility.
- The costs of transportation to an intermodal facility and the traffic around that facility would be a factor to consider in any disposal alternative that uses rail transportation.
- There are intermodal facilities outside the City of Seattle.

The results of the survey of MSWMAC members in November was that 100 percent supported the following policy. SWD asked if MSWMAC supports policy D1 to be included in the Comp Plan for public review.

D1 – Operate and maintain the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill to meet or exceed the highest federal, state, and local standards for protection of public health and the environment.

After reviewing the “Life of a Cell at Cedar Hills” comments included:

- The tarp-o-matic machine spreads a tarp over the open face of the landfill at the close of each day and covers an average of 120-150 square feet.

The MSWMAC member survey in November showed that 100 percent of respondents agreed with the following policy. SWD asked if MSWMAC supports the following policy to be included in the Comp Plan for public review.

D3 – Monitor and maintain closed landfills to meet or exceed the highest federal, state, and local standards for protection of public health and the environment.

Comments included:

- The Department of Ecology (Ecology) is still looking at what criteria must be met in order for a closed landfill to be considered stable. Though several closed landfills monitored by the division have passed the thirty year post-closure period identified in code, no landfill in the state has been determined to be stable. SWD is continuing to work with Ecology toward that goal.
- SWD provides reports about closed landfills to regulators. Those reports are available in electronic form and will be made available to MSWMAC members.
- Liability related to a landfill does not end once the landfill is considered stable.
- Contaminated storm water (CSW) ponds needed to be moved to the South Solid Waste Area to prepare for work on Area 8. To move those ponds required that the South Solid Waste area be mined of refuse which was disposed in Area 7. Area 8 is built over native soil. Some proposals for Area 9 include mining a previously landfilled area.

Discussion on Joint Meetings

Chair Sweet asked MSWMAC their perception of the value of joint meetings with SWAC, particularly concerning the Comp Plan.

Comments included:

- MSWMAC and SWAC have similar roles in advising the King County Council. However, SWAC has the additional responsibility to advise the Department of Ecology related to the comp plan.
- SWAC is stipulated in State Law. King County Code create MSWMAC. They were chartered differently.
- SWAC membership represents many different aspects of the solid waste system including but not limited to agriculture, haulers, recyclers, labor, unincorporated areas and citizen interests. MSWMAC represents the cities that have mutually supportive solid waste agreements with the County. The groups provide different perspectives and have different kinds of influence.
- Several members said they find joint meetings with SWAC to be valuable, particularly mentioning the differing perspectives. They said meetings for education or to share information could be joint. However, each group should have separate meetings to make decisions as their interests may be different.
- A member suggested that a different room be found to host joint meetings as the 8th floor conference room becomes crowded with that many people in attendance.

Chair Sweet said she would share MSWMAC's comments with SWAC.

Member and Public Comment

MSWMAC members congratulated the City of Kirkland, which was honored with Washington State Recycling Association award for Recycler of the Year – Public Agency.

MSWMAC members were asked to fill out a spreadsheet provided by Newcastle Councilmember Carol Simpson. The intent of gathering and analyzing the data is to support upcoming contract negotiations in Newcastle.