

MSWMAC Advisory Committee Meeting

October 13, 2017 - 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

<u>MSWMAC Members</u>	
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Bill Peloza	Auburn
Sarah Ogier	Bellevue
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Sabrina Combs	Bothell
Brian Roberts	Burien
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Laura Techico	Des Moines
Chris Searcy – Vice Chair	Enumclaw
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Micah Bonkowski	Issaquah
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
Phillippa Kassover	Lake Forest Park
Diana Pistoll	Maple Valley
Asea Sandine	Mercer Island
Carol Simpson	Newcastle
Gary Schimek	Redmond
Eberley Barragan	Redmond
Linda Knight	Renton
Uki Dele	Shoreline
Scott McColl	Shoreline
Paula Waters	Woodinville
Lauren Broudy	Woodinville

<u>King County Staff</u>
Morgan John, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Ross Marzolf, Council staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD staff
Yolanda Pon, Public Health - Seattle King County
Terra Rose, KC Council staff
Christie True, DNRP Director
Eben Sutton, SWD staff
Glynda Steiner, SWD Assistant Director
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
William Chen, SWD staff
Katherine Taylor, DNRP staff
<u>Guests</u>
Cynthia Foley, Sound Cities Association
Janet Prichard, Republic Services
Lucy Lui, City of Bellevue
Phillip Schmidt-Pathmann, NeoMer
Sue Sander, Normandeau Associates
Keith Livingston, SWAC
Kim Kaminski, SWAC, Waste Management
Mason Giem, Recology

Minutes

Minutes from August were approved as written.

Updates

SWD

Factoria Recycling & Transfer Station grand opening

Meg Moorehead explained that the new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station is now open to the public. SWD is planning a grand opening. Grand opening will include speakers and tours. Committee members are welcome to attend, SWD will send out updates, invitations.

Expanded Polystyrene (Styrofoam) collection for recycling

Jeff Gaisford updated the group on the on-going EPS collection pilot at the Shoreline and Bow Lake Recycling & Transfer Stations. The pilot began at Shoreline in March 2016 and expanded to Bow Lake in June 2016 and has been on-going since that time and is considered a success. However SWD is exploring ways to reduce costs, including possible purchase of a “densifier” to reduce volume and reduce the cost for hauling a lot of air. SWD and the vendor are also working to reduce contamination.

Comp Plan Discussion - Introduction

SWD staff Meg Moorehead gave an overview of the Comp Plan process to date, the purpose of the Comp Plan, and next steps. The document under review is the culmination of a year-long process. The Comp Plan guides all activities and services of SWD and the solid waste system. The most recent adopted Comp Plan is from 2001. SWD has taken several “side-trips” in the meantime for more focused planning endeavors.

For today’s discussion, SWD recognizes that committee members just received the draft Disposal Chapter, and are not expected to have reviewed it for final comments and approval. More time is needed to review that; in addition there will be numerous other options for Comp Plan review and comments, as explained later in this presentation.

Committees have spent a year now reviewing Comp Plan components, focusing on policies with multiple meetings devoted to each chapter. We are now extending the review time with a November meeting for Disposal Chapter review and discussion. SWD is re-assessing the final review schedule but is still aiming for early 2018 for the release of the public review draft.

Moorehead reminded the group of the need to move the Comp Plan on for public review: that’s the point of this meeting. Do the policies reflect the priorities of the committee? Are they ready for public review?

Moorehead explained changes in the organization of the Comp Plan’s chapters and content. Some chapters were too dense and were broken up for improved readability. The content is essentially the same but was re-organized for clarity. Other changes reflect:

- The plan began as a 32 city system: Bellevue and the Point Cities are now included in the planning horizon; and
- *Transfer* and *Disposal* chapters each state options rather than recommendations.

Moorehead reviewed goals vs. policies vs. actions. Actions can change based on evolving situations but any actions must work to implement goals and policies.

SWD staff Beth Humphreys further explained the Comp Plan’s organization and the six major planning elements. Parts of the former *Planning* and *Introduction* chapters went into the new *Existing System* and *Forecast and Data* chapters. The former *Forward* became the *Introduction* chapter. Other pieces went into other chapters. The handout entitled “Status of Policies Reviewed by Committees” summarizes the location of and the current wording of existing goals and policies.

Comp Plan Discussion - Chapter 2: Existing System

The **Existing System** chapter describes how the system looks now and explains the planning foundation and regulatory requirements. Policies are as follows:

ES-1: Maintain a public and private mix of solid waste transfer, collection and processing facilities.

ES-2: Work with the division's advisory committees, the cities, and the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum on solid waste management planning and decisions.

ES-3: Incorporate principles of equity and social justice into solid waste system planning.

ES-4: Consider climate change impacts and sustainability when planning for facilities, operations, and programs

There was discussion about needing to see all chapters before approving any policies for public review. Members wished to wait for November for final review of all policies including disposal policies. Moorehead expressed interest in making as much progress today as possible, in minimizing the unknowns at next month's meeting. Can members at least state "No issues at this time"? There was remaining concern that the Disposal policies may impact other policies, they're all inter-related, and some cities still need more time for all staff to review, including the Disposal chapter. Reluctance isn't to be secretive, it's to have enough time for a thorough review.

DNRP staff noted that this is a draft Comp Plan for public review. Other chances for review include: during public review, after public comments, written comments to the KC Executive, and written comments to KC Council as well.

Members responded that it's important to complete a thorough review before public release, so nothing is missed before the public sees it.

County staff asked if there are any concerns as of now, any missing comments, any questions on the **Existing System** policies. No response, but did discuss means of sharing comments on text, words missing, etc. These can be shared "off-line", written on hard-copies or with Track-change.

Comp Plan Discussion – Chapter 3: Forecasting & Data

The **Forecasting & Data** chapter includes economic and tonnage forecasts, data on generators and waste disposed, and SWD's reports and studies. Policies are as follows:

FD-1: Monitor and report the amount, composition, and source of solid waste entering the transfer and disposal system.

FD-2: Update the solid waste tonnage forecast to support short- and long-term planning and budgeting for facilities and operations.

FD-3: Monitor and report waste prevention and recycling activity, including the amount of materials recycled, programmatic achievements, and the strength of commodity markets.

Humphreys noted that data may appear out-dated, and it is. SWD relies on Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) data; and the latest is from 2014. SWD will refresh to 2015 when available, after the Plan comes back from the Department of Ecology but before the final plan is transmitted to KC Council.

There was concern that this chapter omits business intelligence, following new technologies and/or waste-to-energy technology trends. Members wondered if that kind of research was covered in other policies or actions. Staff agreed to review and recommend either a policy or action.

Member responded that action level is fine but at a policy level, SWD must always be looking at trends. New technologies are critical.

Comp Plan Discussion – Chapter 4: Sustainable Materials Management

The **Sustainable Materials Management** (SMM) chapter was formerly the Waste Prevention, Recycling and Collection chapter. SMM is a concept that Ecology and the EPA use. SWD thought it important enough to use it in the Comp Plan. It is a life cycle approach, and many SWD programs fit into its circular strategy (see graphic on the slide). It can be used to guide collection practices too. The SMM goal is as follows:

Goal: Achieve Zero Waste of Resources – to eliminate the disposal of materials with economic value – by 2030, with an interim goal of 70 percent recycling through a combination of efforts in the following order of priority:

- a. Waste prevention and reuse
- b. Product stewardship, recycling, and composting
- c. Beneficial use

Policies are listed on the “Status of Policies...” handout. An additional handout, “Waste Prevention, Recycling and Collection Actions” includes comments from Bellevue, Kirkland, and Redmond as well as SWD responses. There is one new policy, #4, that was not discussed in committee. SWD added this to provide policy direction for waste prevention programs.

Comments and SWD responses are as follows:

It was noted that in the Summary of Recommended Actions, there’s no detail in the *Detailed Discussion* column. That will be updated with a page number, but since the page numbers will change, the numbers are not filled in yet.

It was also noted that in the “...Actions” table, there are numerous places that list both “city” and “county” in the *Responsibility* column. Will there be more detail on each of their roles? Other city reviewers may have comments on that, including councilmembers, so may want to address it in advance. SWD explained that it is meant as an indication of who has responsibilities. Staff will look at ways to make the responsibilities a bit more clear.

A member asked if there is a date for reaching 70%, but since each city is starting out from a different point, SWD chose this approach, also based on previous committee discussion.

If the region doesn't reach 70%, is there a Plan B? Action 32-s states that the division and the county will develop a strategy to address the issue if it becomes apparent that there is not enough progress towards the 70% target.

Humphreys also clarified that the 70% target is for the region as a whole, not for each individual jurisdiction.

It was commented that we need to address contamination going to organics processing facilities. We focus on maximizing diversion but need to address quality as well.

John MacGillivray commented that - Kirkland, Bellevue and King County are founding members of Envirostars and that there should be some mention of the program. He suggested that it could be a sidebar

Another comment was that mattresses and Styrofoam should be added to the list of priority materials

Referring to the list of efforts in the SMM Chapter goal, Chris Searcy asked if the listed order of efforts indicate a priority or hierarchy of efforts? Is there any intent in this order?

Jeff Gaisford responded that the a,b,c order was an intended hierarchy. Gaisford said that staff would look at it to make the hierarchy and priority actions more clear

The committee discussed China's announcement of severe restrictions on importing recycled materials. Members asked how much of King County's recyclables go there, and what's our strategy for 2018 and beyond? Moorehead responded that Comp Plan Actions do address this – monitoring the "designated materials" list and responding to changing markets. Some of KC's recyclables may go to Canada instead of China. Haulers are researching and preparing for the change.

Regarding equity, a member questioned Policy # S-7 and its references to "equity" and maximizing diversion. What kind of equity? SWD staff explained that equity in SWD's comprehensive planning includes geographical distribution of facilities. This plays out in hauling costs. Haulers pass on costs of haul routes to customers. We want those transportation costs to be distributed county-wide. Policy # ES-3 also includes "equity" considerations.

Comp Plan Discussion – Chapter 5: Transfer and Processing

Meg Moorehead presented Chapter 5, **Transfer and Processing**. It's organized differently than other chapters and includes alternatives for the Northeast service area rather than a recommendation. With Bellevue extending its interlocal agreement, the Demand Management (DM) pilot project is now de-funded as it was determined to no longer serve the area. Some DM funds were left in SWD's operating budget for planning transfer capacity in the Northeast service area.

The process for moving forward on the transfer chapter is to encourage a discussion of transfer capacity needs in the Northeast, and evaluate transfer needs through a structure kind of like an Environmental Impact Statement. The chapter lists 1) a "no action" alternative

(Houghton “as-is”), 2) a new Northeast station, and 3) a combination of facilities. The public will comment on these three options as part of the upcoming public review. KC executive will then review those comments and make a recommendation to the County Council.

The chapter also covers mitigation measures, includes an updated green building policy that clarifies that LEED is one of many green building standards, and recommends recycling at all transfer facilities.

Committee members requested that Comp Plan text clarify that future Northeast capacity will not come to the Factoria station. Members appreciate the intent of current language but would like that even clearer in Comp Plan text. Added clarity is not needed in any policies, just in the text of the Plan.

Comp Plan Discussion – Chapter 7: Finance

Moorehead continued with presenting the Finance chapter. She mentioned that there are lots of policies but that the focus would be on the policies that had changed. Policy # F-2 was changed to emphasize maintaining service levels, and there was some question of whether “and” should be “or”.

Discussion began with a comment that the committee hasn’t discussed this chapter in a while. Does this draft allow different rates at different stations? Not recommended at this time, but there could be different customer classes based on low income customers, need to comply with regulations and permits, or efforts to maintain service levels. There was a concern that this would have some paying more than others, and a concern that this sets us on a path of different rates in different areas. Moorehead stated that she appreciates the different interpretation of the language. The intent of the language is that in the future, if any station exceeds capacity, the county may consider some form of “demand management” NOT the “Demand Management” pilot that was just dropped. Members were still concerned as they still hear that different customers may pay different rates.

The committee discussed the use of “fee” and “rate”, which are used somewhat interchangeably in the plan. “Rate” is considered a unit charge, for tonnage for example. Fees are used for recyclables. “Rate Structure” is used to describe the primary revenue source (per ton tipping fees at this point) in combination with other fees that generate revenue for the division. SWD staff may need to clarify use of these in text and actions.

Back to Policy #F-2, it removes predictability for costs and raises the specter that prices may change and hauler contracts may need to be re-negotiated, an undesirable activity. The speaker understands SWD’s perspective but doesn’t want that unpredictability at the city end. Moorehead noted that many contracts include a revision clause if regulations change. Is that in city contracts? There are some openings but no guarantees.

A comment was made that some cities may have mandatory collection while others don’t. Self-haulers bring in less tonnage but cause more congestion than a commercial load. So individual city policies may impact station capacity.

There was uncomfortableness with the new language based on a concern that drop boxes are different from transfer stations, offer different services, and someone may argue that there should be different charges.

Moorehead asked if the old language was preferable. There was some head-nodding in response but limited response.

The other proposed change is to Policy #F-7. Based on committee input, language was added to explain circumstances of different financing methods. Life of the asset, financial benefits such as rate stability, and interest rates may make bonds favorable.

Comp Plan Discussion – Chapter 6: Disposal

Chapter 6, **Landfill Management and Solid Waste Disposal** looks at 3 options we've reviewed:

- Waste-to-Energy;
- Expanded capacity at Cedar Hills; and
- Waste export.

Similar to the *Transfer* chapter, these three options will go out for public review, the KC Executive will review public comments, then recommend one option. There are changes in this chapter since the last version, so please review and we will discuss at the November meeting. The WTE consultants (Normandeau and others) will present their study too, and committee members will be invited to that presentation and will have a chance to question them and their results. Since committee members haven't had a chance to review this chapter, there was no time for comments.

Discussion returned to the **Finance chapter**. A member stated that their city would prefer smaller, more frequent rate increases rather than having a large increase every few years. Other cities agreed. A member expressed concern that in financial action 8-f, there seems to be a call for cities to contribute to an Environmental reserve fund. If so, does this conflict with ILA language? The county responded that the intent of this language is to restate ILA language, so all ratepayers may pay into an environmental reserve fund if the cities and county decide to establish one. It's intended to reflect ILAs, not differ. SWD staff will review and report back to the group.

Other Comp Plan Elements:

Moorehead presented other parts of the comp plan:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- List of Acronyms
- Chapter 8: References
- Appendices
 - WUTC cost assessment
 - 6-year capital improvement program
 - Interlocal Agreements (ILAs)
 - Market Assessment

The first two appendices listed above are required by state law.

SWD staff commented that some web links are currently broken because SWD's website was just updated. Links were lost but they are being fixed now.

The **Discussion** slide included the following topics:

SWD wishes to have all comments received by November 3rd. Comments can be made using "track-changes". Again, there will be more comment periods as the plan progresses through next review phases. MSWMAC members may comment:

- As a committee member or jurisdiction during the January through February 2018 public review;
- If MSWMAC chooses to, can write a recommendation to Council and RPC;
- During County Council consideration of the plan in mid-2018; and
- During city consideration of the plan in late 2018.

The plan will be dated "2019" which is when it should become effective. With none opposed, the next meeting will be on November 17 after SWAC from 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. The Disposal chapter will be the main topic but other comments are welcome too.

Committee members noted that with comments due on the 3rd, there's interest in committee members seeing other's comments before submitting final comments to SWD.

Waste to Energy Study Presentation

Eben Sutton presented a high-level overview of the recently-completed Waste-to-Energy study. This will only hit the high points of the study, there will be more opportunities to review and discuss. The purpose of the study was to update SWD's knowledge of WTE. The industry has progressed, we need some re-acquainting with this disposal alternative, and we need updates to some financial assumptions too. Normandeau used SWD's waste characterization data and other local data to ensure that this study reflects King County's specific situation, and is not a generic report. The report concludes with a specific WTE technology that is best suited for consideration by King County.

It also covers some aspects of waste export including rail capacity, the likely rail-haul landfills we might use, and any capital improvements recommended for the county's transfer system.

Normandeau was the lead consultant with assistance from CDM Smith and Neomer. The report also benefited from consultations with WTE facility operators, regulators, and international research institutes. WTE in the US is as follows:

- 77 WTE plants in the U.S.
 - 12 tons per day to 3,300 tons per day (very large).
 - Most built before 2000. Palm Beach County, FL expanded plant beginning in 2011.
 - Typically include recovery of the heat of combustion via electricity, combined heat and power, and steam.
 - Typically developed due to land restrictions or higher energy costs.

Normandeau presented different planning options to help in sizing a facility:

- 20, 30, & 50 year planning horizon (2028-2078)
 - 1.1 million tons MSW annually, growing to 2.18 million tons

- Two plant sizing approaches
 - Maximize capacity
 - Requires secondary disposal method (i.e.: landfilling)
 - Minimize by-pass waste
 - Results in excess capacity during initial years of operation.

Normandeau reviewed numerous technology options and prepared a matrix to compare them. WTE key findings conclude that the best fit WTE technology is a Mass Burn thermal process. Mass Burn is a proven WTE technology that requires minimal pre-processing of waste. The report recommends sizing the facility to handle all needed waste tonnage for the initial part of the planning period, in other words to minimize by-pass waste. A typical mass burn facility can be expanded to increase capacity, although these expansions occur in large “steps” so it is not realistic to increase capacity frequently. It will also increase recycling rates, estimated at 2%, by capturing more metal that would otherwise be disposed.

For Waste Export, four regional landfills offer adequate capacity to handle the County’s projected waste volume. Rail capacity may be challenging given projected at- or over-capacity stretches of rail line in 2028. The railroads will respond to the limited rail capacity by developing more capacity to meet demand. The cost of this development will undoubtedly be passed on to customers; predicting this new cost presents a challenge for SWD’s efforts to predict the cost of waste export ten years into the future.

Next steps for disposal options: the study provided interesting, valuable insights to SWD. We will continue discussing results with the consultant team and will help guide the presentation so it serves all interested parties including committee members.

- In October, SWD will finalize the analysis of Waste to Energy alongside Waste Export and Cedar Hills to inform additional regional dialog about these options.
- In November, the consultant team will present their detailed findings and recommendations at a meeting open to interested Councilmembers, SWD’s advisory committees, and SWD staff.
- Feedback from MSWMAC and SWAC will help inform how to best represent these disposal options within the Comp Plan draft that will be released for public comment in January.

The Disposal options presentation raised many questions. Regarding by-pass waste: does the GHG analysis include the carbon footprint of that too, or only what is incinerated? Sutton answered that by-pass waste is not included, only waste that goes through the facility.

Does the study evaluate Stampede Pass as a rail option? It is under capacity but needs updating. Sutton responded that he’s unsure if that was part of rail evaluation.

Who internally in SWD is evaluating the consultant’s work? Sutton responded that the SWD team includes management, engineers, planners, and financial staff. A member commented that committee members rarely get to experience the thought processes from SWD staff as they review consultant work. That would be helpful to have that big-picture look, have a view

of that internal discussion. Moorehead responded that there are various angles to that review, and the draft Comprehensive Plan language is a window into different perspectives of SWD review.

Concerns were raised about siting a WTE facility, does the study address that? Where would it be? In-county? Elsewhere? That has to be part of analysis. Is there any analysis of siting requirements? Sutton responded that the study calls for ~40 acres proximal to an electric substation, but does not make any specific siting recommendation. A follow-up question asked whether the study describes the challenges of siting a WTE facility near schools and neighborhoods given emissions. The report discusses emissions expected of a modern WTE plant and compares those to benchmarks, it also describes technology options for further reducing emissions and potentially eliminating the traditional steam plume, but nothing more specific than these general parameters.

In response to questions regarding the logistics of the consultant's WTE presentation, SWD staff noted that county staff are currently looking for the largest room available, and will look into recording and/or web-casting the presentation.

Member and Public Comment

There were no additional comments.