

MSWMAC Advisory Committee Meeting

November 17, 2017 - 11:30 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.

King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Draft Meeting Minutes

<u>MSWMAC Members</u>	
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Sarah Ogier	Bellevue
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Sabrina Combs	Bothell
Austin Bell	Burien
Brian Roberts	Burien
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Chris Searcy – Vice Chair	Enumclaw
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
Phillippa Kassover	Lake Forest Park
Carol Simpson	Newcastle
Gary Schimek	Redmond
Eberley Barragan	Redmond
Karen Portfield	Sammamish
Trudy Olson	SeaTac
Uki Dele	Shoreline
Paula Waters	Woodinville
Kellye Mazzoli	Woodinville

<u>King County Staff</u>
Jamey Barker, SWD staff
Jenny Devlin, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Ashley Lara, KC Council staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD staff
Terra Rose, KC Council staff
Eben Sutton, SWD staff
Dorian Waller, SWD staff
<u>Guests</u>
Cynthia Foley, Sound Cities Association
Mason Giem, Recology
Janet Prichard, Republic Services
Phillip Schmidt-Pathmann, NeoMer
Sue Sander, Normandeau Associates

Minutes

Barre Seibert made a motion to approve October's meeting minutes as written; Carol Simpson seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously.

Updates

Pat McLaughlin introduced Dorian Waller as the new Government Relations Administrator.

SWD

Bellevue City Council Approves ILA

Pat McLaughlin, SWD Division Director announced the Bellevue has signed the interlocal agreement (ILA) to commit to the regional solid waste management system through 2040. Seibert announced the City of Clyde Hill has done the same. McLaughlin shared he recently attended the Yarrow Point city council meeting when they also voted to remain in the system. He mentioned that at the Factoria RTS Opening, the mayor of Medina said the City of Medina would also sign as will the City of Hunts Point. McLaughlin reminded the committee that due to the ILA extensions and county council direction the Demand Management pilot study is cancelled.

Intense Weather Affected the Division

McLaughlin reported that the intense weather of the past week had washed away some landscaping in a closed area of the Cedar Hills Landfill. The Houghton Transfer Station lost power and the backup generator cooling system failed. The station was closed for about an hour while customers were redirected to other stations. The backup generator is now repaired.

King County Council Approved ILA with Algona

McLaughlin announced King County Council has approved the second ILA which details a land transfer process with the City of Algona for the new South County Recycling and Transfer Station. The procurement process for the project contractor is underway with three design companies competing for the work.

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)

Phillipa Kassover reported on the November SWAC meeting, which occurred this morning at 9:00 a.m., and had the same agenda as this MSWMAC meeting. There was discussion primarily regarding Chapter six and the concern about the effects of China's new policies on recycling markets. She noted there is built-in flexibility in the Comp Plan that allows for changing our programs should it be necessary. Kassover said SWAC accepted the preliminary draft Comp Plan as written with affirmation SWAC will get the Comp Plan back after the public comments and the discussion in Chapter 6 regarding all three long-term disposal options will be edited to be more balanced (i.e. equal information will be presented). Kassover said there was also discussion about the fact that refocusing on reduction of waste versus targeted recycling is really what we need to be doing.

Review of Comments on Preliminary Draft Comp Plan

SWD staff Meg Moorehead thanked advisory committee members for their thoughtful read of the preliminary draft Comp Plan. The division received 187 substantive comments from the two committees. The goal of today's meeting is to find out if this draft is at a point where members will agree to release the document for public review; if that is the case, there would be no need to schedule an advisory committee meeting in December.

SWD staff Beth Humphreys began the review of comments by reminding members the division had sent them copies of a responsiveness summary, a tracked-changes version of the Comp Plan, and a clean version of the Comp Plan. She gave a quick overview of the major themes of the comments and changes to goals, policies and actions that were made:

- **Chapters 1&2, Intro and Existing System**: Themes: clarifying processes (such as ILA plan approval, agricultural involvement, how services are provided)
- **Chapter 3. Forecast and Data**. Themes: 2014 Recycling data are too old, terminology and approaches to describe recycling, construction and demolition (C&D) system clarification (the C&D system is new since the 2013 draft)

- New Policy FD-4 Continue to monitor new and emerging technologies to identify opportunities for their use in managing solid waste and recyclables.
- Chapter 4. Sustainable Materials Management: Themes: How do we work together? Goals/targets, what is mandatory or not?
 - Goal: Refined the hierarchy of approaches to put product stewardship above recycling and composting
 - Policy S-7 changed Efficient collection policy to say “promoting equitable service” instead of “creating equity”
 - Removed Action 29-s RE: material recovery facilities (moved to New Action 8-t in Transfer chapter)
- Chapter 5. Transfer: Themes: NE transfer options – need recommendation, opposition/support, criteria for selecting (equity, geographic distribution traffic, etc.)
 - Moved Material Recovery Facilities actions from Sustainable chapter to Action 8-t
 - Added Action 12-t “Provide transfer capacity in the Northeast service area to meet future needs
- Chapter 6. Disposal: Themes: Comments focused on the 3 options, especially waste to energy (WTE) (cost, logistics, siting) and greenhouse gas (GHG) calculations
- Chapter 7. Finance:
 - Policy F-2 reverted back to original 2013 plan language about retaining the same fees at all facilities
 - Added Action 16-f “When possible manage solid waste rates through smaller, more frequent increases which in combination with the rate stabilization reserve, smooths rate increases over time.”

Seibert asked what the next steps would be. Moorehead said if the committee agrees the plan is ready for public comment, the division will get charts and graphs in better shape, finish editing the plan for typos and clarity, and release the Comp Plan in early January. Everyone is invited to make comments during public comment. The division is also sending the preliminary draft to Ecology, which will conduct a 120 day preliminary review. After public comment, the division will create another responsiveness summary. Then the Executive will make a recommendation on the transfer and disposal options. Meanwhile, the advisory committees will see the draft again and review comments. Seibert asked what if a committee member makes more comments after the committee reaches agreement, would they be included in the public review draft? Humphreys said generally no because the committee would not be able to discuss and reach agreement if substantive changes were requested in the comments.

Alison Bennett said two days wasn’t enough time to review the documents and she noted not every change is part of the responsiveness summary. She is not comfortable with the preliminary draft Comp Plan going out for public review until she has had more time to review the documents to ensure that her comments are included. She also stated the Executive should put his recommendations up for public review instead of including only transfer and

disposal options. Chair Penny Sweet said she hoped during the public process we will be work with the Executive so that recommendations can be in the plan after public review.

John MacGillivray said he thought that the lack of recommendations in the Comp Plan was like a car without a steering wheel. Moorehead responded there are different theories about whether it is better to include recommendations or better to leave it open. In regards to Chapter Five, the transfer chapter was in draft form when King County Council gave the division legislation directing that new options for the northeast area be included in the Comp Plan. In regards to the disposal chapter, there are three big decisions the division wants public input on before the Executive settles on his decision. Chair Sweet said it was not a satisfactory response but understandable from the division's perspective. Humphreys said (in regards to the missing comments from Bellevue representatives in the responsiveness summary) that comments aimed at clarifying text may have been included in the revised chapters without needing to be in the responsiveness summary. If substantive comments were missed, if it was okay by the committee, she would be happy to incorporate them.

Bennett said in Chapter Four, Bellevue wants roles and responsibilities spelled out. SWD staff Jeff Gaisford said one of the challenges is that some people want a menu of options, or want to tailor actions to the demographics of their city. Regarding the plastic shopping bag action, discussions with city recycling coordinators found some were interested in a plastic bag ban and some were not. Bennett said there must be places where you carve out what the county does and where the cities are in supporting roles. Gaisford suggested the division could include a list of where County takes the lead and the cities provide support.

Bennett noted in Chapter Five that she would like the language from the ordinance on page 5-26 to be repeated again on page 5-30. She also stated that she would like to see more explanation of the additional factors to be considered when selecting how to provide transfer capacity in the northeast service area. Humphreys replied that those changes would be made.

Gary Schimek said he still has more to review of the documents but he had a major comment. He said that the process that was discussed when SWD staff met with Redmond was not reflected in the Plan. McLaughlin and Moorehead stated that a sentence would be added to describe the process that would be part of any decision about NE transfer options.

Moorehead said the Executive is going to weigh in on NE transfer options before county council action. The Executive recommendation may choose one option (which will include a public process for implementation) or describe process by which an option will be selected There's flexibility.

McLaughlin added to Moorehead's comments. He said that staff, the division, the department will make recommendations to the Executive that we focus on the process first in the northeast region. Kirkland, Redmond, Woodinville in particular, (not to exclude neighboring communities) would be engaged in a discussion on process to ensure that we understand city needs when we choose a facility site and design characteristics.

Schimek said that we should make the plan for NE transfer discussion in 2018 clear to the public. Sabrina Combs asked if Bothell was part of the northeast. McLaughlin said it absolutely is part of the northeast. Our commitment is to robust regional dialog. The whole system pays the tab, so everyone should have a voice.

Comp Plan – Review of Chapter Six

Moorehead said over the lunch break someone asked a question regarding the review process. If the committee decides that the plan is ready for the public to have a say, the plan will be released for a 60 day review period beginning in January 2018. The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) will receive the plan at the same time for their state-mandated 120 day review. Committee members can comment as individuals during public review, as a committee after public and Ecology comments are received, during county council review of the plan, and during the city approval process.

Eberley Barragan said table 5-6 a really great clear comparison but there isn't a clear explanation. Greenhouse gases – Why? Equity – what does equity means in this context? Schimek asked that the table be removed. Moorehead said a committee member had requested the table. MacGillivray said it was his table. He put it in and he thought it provided a useful summary. Bennett said to keep it but with explanation and other committee members nodded agreement. Moorehead said ok, we'll provide explanation.

Moorehead said the disposal chapter has four policies. Similar to the transfer chapter, it includes three options for long-term disposal. A recommendation will be made by the Executive before it goes to council for a decision. It also includes emerging technologies, closed landfills, illegal dumping, and disposal during emergencies. There were no comments on policies or actions only on the balance of how the three options were presented and how they were characterized. Comments submitted by the committee in advance of the meeting addressed issues including siting, costs, requests for more information, and questions about greenhouse gas emissions. The division used the WARM model, a GHG model used by EPA regarding lifecycle emissions and offsets. She noted people ask: How can a landfill have negative emissions? WARM model negative emissions are due to fossil fuels being displaced by landfill-derived gas and the burial of materials that otherwise would release gas as they decay, called carbon sequestration. The division offered calculations using both the WARM model and the MRR model, a model that does not account for offsets.

Bennett said she had no specific edits to suggest but she noted SWAC had a discussion regarding the balance of disposal options, that some were discussed more than others. She would support equal discussion of each. Sweet noted other nodding heads.

Brian Roberts wanted to discuss the Chinese Sword policy. He wondered if there ultimately needs to be a discussion on potential impact of the policy to Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and its closure date. He said it is prudent to assess lead times for disposal options relative to impacts of Chinese Sword. Gaisford said in the Sustainable Materials Management chapter, the division will have a process with cities and haulers. The plan provides flexibility to change course as things change. Rob Van Orsow said there is a Forum by the WSRA on December 6 all

about National Sword. Moorehead said the division has an announcement about that forum and will share with committee members.

Moorehead presented the adoption timeline noting that if the preliminary draft Comp Plan is accepted today, then there will be a 60 day comment period starting in January 2018 and plenty of more opportunities for comments. She said agreement means a lot of things to a lot of people – while someone might be raring to go and advocate participation to their community while someone else might say there are some parts I don't like or I'm not thrilled with but I'm not going to stand in the way of the public offering their thoughts. Moorehead deferred to the Chairs to decide how they want to handle the question.

Chair Sweet asked if anybody was interested in making a motion accept the plan with the edits as discussed today. Seibert made the motion and Kassover seconded it. The final tally of the vote was Ayes: 11, Nays: 5.

The discussed edits were:

- Add process to options of northeast service area
- Add balance to disposal chapter options
- Add text from the county motion on northeast area transfer services from page 5-26 to page 5-30
- Add clarity of roles and responsibilities for cities and county in Chapter 4 actions
- Remove mention of Factoria and Shoreline, keep efficient use of the system in Chapter 5 criteria
- Add explanation in text of the NE transfer summary table
- Add description of additional criteria with equity and efficiency in use of the entire system

Bennett said she would like more time to go through it but obviously she is on the losing end. It would be nice for the members to see a draft before it goes to the public. Moorehead said the division will be polishing the text and sending it through graphics. Bennett said she would like to see the changes made today and if committee members have additional comments after today's meeting would the division take changes? Moorehead said if they are not substantial changes it would be ok but substantial changes could not be incorporated because the committee as a whole would not be able to discuss the changes before release of the draft plan.

Member and Public Comment

Gaisford said beginning on January 2, self-haul customers will need to separate recyclables. Scale operators will hand out postcards so customers know what's coming. The division is working with employees to educate customers.

Phillip Schmidt-Pathmann said he is not affiliated with the Waste to Energy industry and is not being paid by that industry. He said there are studies that show in communities that have waste to energy facilities there are greater recycling rates. He said the WARM model is not

EPA recommended because it does not adequately address a lot of points and international models are better. He said in Europe there are waste to energy facility smokestacks that emit cleaner air than what is outside.