

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee

October 9, 2015 - 11:15 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members</u>	
Joan Nelson	<i>Auburn</i>
Allison Bennett	<i>Bellevue</i>
Susan Fife-Ferris	<i>Bellevue</i>
Joyce Nichols	<i>Bellevue</i>
Sabrina Combs	<i>Bothell</i>
Barre Seibert	<i>Clyde Hill</i>
Chris Searcy	<i>Enumclaw</i>
Rob Van Orsow	<i>Federal Way</i>
John MacGillivray	<i>Kirkland</i>
Frank Zenk	<i>Lake Forest Park</i>
Diana Pistoll	<i>Maple Valley</i>
Stacia Jenkins	<i>Normandy Park</i>
Gary Schimek	<i>Redmond</i>
Linda Knight	<i>Renton</i>
Beth Goldberg	<i>Sammamish</i>
Trudy Olson	<i>SeaTac</i>
Chris Eggen, Vice Chair	<i>Shoreline</i>
Rika Cecil	<i>Shoreline</i>
Uki Dele	<i>Shoreline</i>
Frank Iriarte	<i>Tukwila</i>
Paula Waters	<i>Woodinville</i>
Thomas Hansen	<i>Woodinville</i>

<u>King County Staff</u>
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
Alejandra Calderon, SWD staff
Gerty Coville, SWD staff
Anna Fleming, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Manager
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Kevin Kiernan, SWD Assistant Director
Laila McClinton, SWD staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD Strategy, Communications & Performance Manager
Mike Reed, Council staff
Diane Yates, SWD staff
<u>Guests</u>
Doreen Booth, SCA
David Della, Waste Management

Minutes & Agenda Review

The September minutes were approved as written.

Barre Seibert made a motion to amend the agenda to include discussion of the City of Bellevue's Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Motion. Linda Knight seconded the motion. Alison Bennett explained that this motion is based on the one Mayor Goss introduced at the September meeting.

SWD Assistant Director Kevin Kiernan asked that the item be added to the agenda after discussion of the work plan for the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan) as it may inform discussion of the motion.

The item was added to the agenda after the Waste Prevention/Recycling Discussion. Members agreed to defer the cart-tagging pilot program presentation until next month if need be.

Updates

SWD

On Wednesday October 14, a community meeting with the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill neighbors will be held. Neighbors are invited to ask questions and learn about activities at the landfill. A tour of the landfill will be offered on Saturday October 17.

In an effort to learn more about trash disposal and recycling, Mongolian Parliament Member Oyungerel Tsedevdamba requested a tour of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. The parliament member was extremely appreciative of the tour and was impressed with SWD operations.

On October 5, SWD began a year-long yard and food waste pilot program at the Vashon Recycling and Transfer Station. The program is a partnership between SWD and Zero Waste Vashon, a nonprofit organization of Vashon residents. Yard and food waste will be carted to Cedar Grove Composting and SWD will track quantities and characterize types of materials collected at the station to help assess the feasibility of future processing.

Schools in King County are recycling and reducing waste, conserving energy and water, and reducing costs with assistance from the King County Green Schools Program. During the 2014-15 school year, the program assisted 182 schools in 32 cities and unincorporated King County, and 112,535 students in those schools had opportunities to learn about and engage in waste reduction, recycling, and other conservation practices. During that same time period, the program tracked recycling data from 148 schools, and of those schools 95 percent reached recycling rates of at least 40 percent, 39 percent reached recycling rates of 50 to 59 percent, and 23 percent reached recycling rates of 60 percent or more.

SWAC

MSWMAC Vice Chair Chris Eggen provided an update from the September SWAC meeting, which was largely focused on the Transfer Plan motion that was passed the previous month. A motion was made to add additional details to the August minutes to document the discussion of the motion. SWD requested that SWAC consider rescinding the motion. After round robin discussion, it was clear most members favored not rescinding the motion. In addition, there was a presentation on three possible policy directions to guide waste prevention and recycling efforts.

Comp Plan Work Plan Discussion

Strategy, Communications, and Performance Manager Meg Moorehead presented a [proposal for MSWMAC's Comp Plan review process](#) and how the proposed schedule would line up with [SWD major planning project milestones](#). She welcomed feedback on the proposed plan.

The schedule would require devoting most agendas until May 2016 to the Comp Plan, with two meetings for each chapter. A consensus-based discussion model was proposed.

Moorehead also outlined the opportunities for city input and decision-making outside of the advisory committee.

Comments included:

- Consider shifting the schedule to allow discussion of the Waste Prevention/Recycling chapter for one more month.
- Bennett expressed her appreciation for the plan, while underlining that there are multiple ways to approach the shared goal of updating the Comp Plan. She noted that cities are interested in discussing more than just the demand management strategies outlined in the Transfer Plan. Some of this is captured in the motion language. Discussion of the motion may help inform the work plan.
- Kiernan emphasized that the division is interested in city feedback. The draft schedule shows planning for the Transfer Demand Management Pilot Project beginning in March of 2016. The division wants to be sure the pilot includes options cities are interested in.
- John MacGillivray expressed his support for the proposed review process, while noting that the schedule may be aggressive.
- Several members requested adjusting the schedule to continue discussing Transfer Plan issues rather than moving onto other Comp Plan topics at upcoming meetings. Moorehead confirmed that a different order of discussion is possible.
- Moorehead explained that the Planning and Finance chapters were considered complete, but that the Finance chapter is back on the schedule because there may be a need to revisit it.
- In terms of why a new process is needed, SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford explained that sending out a draft chapter and asking for revisions meant that members provided edits before discussing the bigger picture policy direction.
- Linda Knight noted that the cut-off for information used in the Comp Plan comes before the implementation of the Transfer Demand Management Pilot Project. She asked how MSWMAC is meant to make decisions on how to move forward with the Transfer Plan. Kiernan noted that under state law, the county is required to prepare a Comp Plan. The Comp Plan has a six-year capital plan and 20-year forecast for what may be needed after that. He noted that the idea of a Transfer Plan did not exist before 2004 and that it does not exist in code. The division is advocating that a separate Transfer Plan no longer exist after 2016. Instead of having a second plan in addition to the Comp Plan, the results of the Transfer Plan can be used to inform the Comp Plan. The Transfer Plan recommendation is to pursue demand management strategies to see if they can address system needs without building a Northeast station, while retaining a station as an option if the strategies do not sufficiently address service needs.
- Tom Hansen expressed his support for the proposed work plan and for committing resources to get the Comp Plan adopted, which will provide much-needed direction. He noted that there are many opportunities for providing input and that taking action before there is a Comp Plan would be premature.

- Eggen noted that comprehensive plans are generally not prescriptive statements or code but statements of policy. He pointed out that the Comp Plan could make a policy statement about the transfer system without prescribing a process for achieving the desired outcome. Moorehead agreed that the detailed scope for the pilot project typically would not be included in the Comp Plan.
- Stacia Jenkins reiterated her concern that some cities will be more impacted by the strategies than others. She asked if the Comp Plan would contain conditions that have to be met in order to make a decision on the transfer station system. Moorehead explained that typically Comp Plan policies have been higher level, but if there was agreement on the criteria for decision-making, that could also be included in the Comp Plan.
- Joyce Nichols expressed her concern about presenting the proposed demand management strategies to her city council, and noted she would be unable to say she played a role in developing the recommendations. She recommended that the county work with city staff to revisit the demand management strategies. She advised tackling this sooner rather than later so that the advisory committees are better able to address other issues in the Comp Plan.
- On behalf of the division, department and the County Executive, Kiernan committed to working with interested cities to develop a work plan for the Transfer Demand Management Pilot Project.
- A subcommittee will be formed to discuss the scope of the Transfer Demand Management Pilot Project as well as issues raised in city comment letters that were not been adequately addressed during the Transfer Plan review. The cities of Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond, and Woodinville volunteered to work on the subcommittee.
- Kiernan confirmed that the division would meet with the subcommittee as soon as possible, but would likely not have results to present at the November MSWMAC meeting.

Comp Plan: Waste Prevention/Recycling: Continue Discussion

SWD Recycling & Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented [70% Recycling: A Case for Change](#). He gave an overview of three possible policy directions to guide waste prevention and recycling efforts.

Discussion included:

- Jenkins noted that given the number of steps required and the reality of election cycles, option A would be very challenging to implement. She added that solid waste is not a very high priority for most city councils.
- Several members noted that while city councilmembers may support waste prevention goals, many believe the county should be leading the way in unincorporated King County.
- Division staff is available to speak with city councils. Presentations can be tailored to the particular interests of the cities.
- Sabrina Combs expressed a concern that illegal dumping may result from enforcing mandates and bans as well as from people having to drive longer distances if a

Northeast transfer station is not built. She is also concerned that cities with small staff will be overwhelmed if there is backlash to unpopular programs or policies.

- MacGillivray noted that money is often the most effective motivator for people.
- Eggen recalled that in his experience, policies can start off with very limited public support and end up becoming standard operating procedures that citizens expect. He noted that nothing would ever change if people waited for the support of every councilmember in the region. Nonetheless, option A would be very difficult to implement immediately and may endanger the adoption of the updated Comp Plan. Eggen suggested that a combination of options B and C may allow sufficient support from city councils to be gathered.
- Diane Pistoll underlined the need to consider impacts on low-income or fixed-income people and stated that she is opposed to both mandates and punitive action. She emphasized the need to involve the rural customer base in these discussions.
- Eggen asked about the financial benefits to ratepayers of increasing recycling. Gaisford noted that the top of page 3 touches on this: “the most commonly disposed materials could have been easily recycled and have an estimated annual combined economic, environmental, and health value of \$92 million, given current market prices.”
- Beth Goldberg noted the need to better define what the \$92 million dollar figure actually means for the ratepayer. For example, what sort of effect will mandatory compost collection have on a typical single-family monthly bill down the road? Financial data is important to present to city councils.
- Several members emphasized the need for more engagement efforts and campaigns to increase public understanding of the benefits of recycling. This would include financial incentives. In turn, policy makers need to hear from public.
- Eggen noted that there are a variety of motivations for increasing recycling: financial, environmental, and political. A document that outlines the advantages of increased recycling would be helpful.
- Knight noted that avoided costs can be very difficult to convey to the public. In addition, she urged prudence when talking about savings. Not all customers would realize a cost savings by moving forward with the strategies outlined because every city’s rates are predicated on a number of items.
- Uki Dele noted her preference for options B and C.
- Susan Fife-Ferris stated the plan should contain multiple options that have proven results as well as shared goals. She noted her concern about the negative repercussions for cities if goals are not met and the potential impact on jurisdictions with little or no staff.
- Goldberg noted that the Sammamish City Council recently discussed whether or not to make yard and food waste a required element in its next contract and decided to leave it as an optional service. She noted tackling yard and food waste may be a bigger challenge than expected.
- Some members expressed concerns about tying grants to specific recycling goals, arguing it would limit innovation, while others expressed support for targeted grants, citing that this strategy has been effective in the past. Others suggested a combination of targeted grants and general grants.

- Jenkins noted that option C is the most feasible. She added that forming a group of cities working together to share best practices and data – similar to the Regional Code Collaboration or the King County Cities Climate Collaboration – would be helpful and should be added to option C.
- Combs suggested creating a one-page reference document that includes a list of options and contact information. She added that several workgroups are currently meeting regularly to discuss topics such as recycling and organics contamination, and that they will be providing data and learnings that may provide additional insights.
- Knight expressed concern for the future of the solid waste industry and the costs that future ratepayers may be burdened with. She stated that the county should lead, but also that all cities need to make a commitment to work toward goals collectively and collaboratively. She supports a combination of options B and C.
- Whatever path is chosen, hauler involvement is important. The county could take the lead on working with haulers to develop collective goals.
- Eggen did an informal poll, asking members to raise their hands to indicate the options they favor. No one raised their hand for option A and about five people raised their hands for options B and C.

Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report Motion: Discussion

- Bennett stated that if the county is serious about working with cities and addressing their concerns, a vote on the motion is not necessary today, although she would like to see MSMWAC take action before the end of the year. Cities submitted thoughtful comments in response to the draft Transfer Plan Report, and the issues raised need to be discussed before they are incorporated in the Comp Plan.
- Kiernan reiterated that the division, department, and the County Executive have heard the cities' concerns and acknowledge their seriousness. A work plan that addresses those concerns will be developed. The Comp Plan will not foreclose the option of building a Northeast station.
- MacGillivray noted that there is a lot of angst around proposing a siting process. According to the current plan, the mitigation strategies could not be implemented until the pilot is completed in 2018. If the strategies do not work and a new station is needed – and he believes this will be the case – the siting and design and build process means Houghton may not close until 2026 or 2028. Houghton is aging and needs to be closed. He added that starting the siting process does not mean a station will be built; it just means that if we do need to build one, we will be two years ahead. He noted that the proposed motion aligns with SWAC's motion and that MSWMAC should consider voting on the motion in November.
- Kiernan expressed his understanding of the motion and the concerns raised. He noted that the County Council removed funding for the Northeast station from the budget and that it is ill-advised for the County Executive to act contrary to County Council directive. He also noted that the division has twice purchased properties for transfer stations and been unable to use them. The division has found limited value in this approach. What is needed instead is good data and retaining the option. He reminded members that the mitigation strategies are potential ways to save ratepayers

significant dollars. Also, if the strategies can reduce traffic and a transfer station is still needed, it would be smaller, less expensive, and have a smaller carbon footprint.

- Hansen noted that the City of Woodinville supports the county's decision to wait and test the mitigation strategies and potentially save ratepayers 50 to 100 million dollars.
- Jenkins expressed her appreciation for the motion, which captures city concerns and is in line with SWAC's motion.
- The City of Renton is interested in being at the table as the discussion unfolds. It also supports the draft motion.
- Kiernan acknowledged all concerns raised and asked MSWMAC to defer action until the division can develop a plan that addresses city concerns. The division will reach out to cities, begin the discussion of issues raised, and report the progress at the next meeting.
- Gary Schimek echoed Hansen's comments, supporting the Transfer Plan recommendations and urging caution not to overbuild the system.
- In reference to the third bullet of the motion, Kiernan asserted that the division does not intend to act contrary to approved permits.
- Hansen noted that when siting facilities it is important to look at how many essential public facilities already exist.
- It was requested that the motion remain on the agenda for the next two months.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.