

MSWMAC Advisory Committee Meeting
June 8, 2018 - 11:15 a.m. to 1:15 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

<u>MSWMAC Members</u>	
Joan Nelson	Auburn
Bill Peloza	Auburn
Alison Bennett	Bellevue
Sarah Ogier	Bellevue
Sabrina Combs	Bothell
Robin Tischmak	Burien
Chris Searcy	Enumclaw
Barre Seibert	Clyde Hill
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way
Micah Bonkowski	Issaquah
Tony Donati	Kent
Penny Sweet – Chair	Kirkland
John MacGillivray	Kirkland
Diana Pistoll	Maple Valley
Asea Sandine	Mercer Island
Carol Simpson	Newcastle
Gary Schimek	Redmond
Linda Knight – Vice Chair	Renton
Maia Knox	Sammamish
Uki Dele	Shoreline
Paula Waters	Woodinville
Alex Herzog	Woodinville

<u>King County Staff</u>
Jenny Devlin, SWD staff
Jeff Gaisford, SWD staff
Beth Humphreys, SWD staff
Meg Moorehead, SWD staff
Yolanda Pon, Seattle-King County Public Health
Terra Rose, KCC staff
Glynda Steiner, SWD Assistant Director
John Walsh, SWD staff
Dorian Waller, SWD staff
<u>Guests</u>
Quinn Apuzzo, Recology
Sharon Hlavka, Green Solutions
Jessica Mitchell, Zero Waste Washington
Laura Moser, Waste Management
Janet Prichard, Republic Services
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann, NEOMER
Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington
Tay Yoshitani, Interested Citizen

Minutes

The May 2018 MSWMAC minutes were unanimously approved as written.

Updates

Solid Waste Division (SWD)

SWD Assistant Director Glynda Steiner gave the following SWD updates:

SWANA Excellence Award

The Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) announced that King County Solid Waste Division has been named the winner of the SWANA Gold Excellence Award in the Transfer Station category for our Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station. The award will be

presented at SWANA's annual conference, WASTECON®, on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, in Nashville, Tennessee.

Replacing the aging, undersized Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station with a modern, LEED Gold-certified facility allows King County to meet customer demands for the next 50 years," said Doug Chin, project manager. "The new 70,000-square-foot station improves efficiency and decreases truck trips to and from the site; and recycling and diversion efforts will keep 5,000 tons of waste out of landfills annually."

Industrial Waste Program Award

The Solid Waste Division was awarded the DNRP Industrial Waste Program 2017 Gold Award for our work regarding wastewater discharge at the Algona Transfer Station.

Washington City/County Managers Association (WCCMA) (King County Chapter)

Solid Waste presented the Comprehensive Draft Plan to the WCCMA. The presentation was well-received and will be distributed among its membership. If any of the cities would like a Comp Plan briefing before the Plan is transmitted to Council next month please let Dorian know.

Solid Waste Division Budget

It is anticipated the budget will be transmitted along with the overall county budget by the Executive to the County Council after Labor Day. The Comp Plan and proposed 2019/2020 rate is included in the budget proposal. If any of the cities would like a Rate proposal briefing before it is transmitted to Council later this month please let Dorian know.

Dirty Wood Pilot at Bow Lake

Starting in June, stained, painted, and otherwise "dirty" wood will now be collected at the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station and sent to Rainer Wood where it will be chipped into hog fuel to be used as bedding for temporary roadways at the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill.

MSWMAC Vice Chair, Linda Knight, asked for clarification that this wood would not be used to feed furnaces, as hog fuel is typically used as such. It was explained that hog fuel is the name used to describe wood chipped to a certain the size regardless of how it is used.

Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)

Jeff Gaisford, SWD Recycling and Environmental Services section manager for SWD, reported LHWMP will be presenting a third rate increase proposal to the Board of Health on June 21. The new proposal is for a 5.4 percent rate increase every year for the next four years beginning in January 2019. Knight asked if this rate would apply across all levels of charges assessed by LHWMP; Gaisford responded yes.

China Sword (Responsible Recycling Task Force)

Gaisford reported the task force met last Friday, June 1 with good attendance and discussed three matters. The first being confirming Task Force agenda topics and meetings from now through October, at which time it will produce a report detailing recommended short-term,

near-term and long-term actions solid waste management agencies and companies can take to respond to changes in the international recycling markets.

The second matter regarded a discussion of recommendations from the Comingled Work Group, comprised of recycling coordinators from participating cities, haulers, MFFs and the Department of Ecology who brought forward a list of categorized materials to be considered as part of a more uniform system of curbside recycling. The list included “materials that are not a problem” such as cardboard and cans, “problematic materials” such as plastic bags, film and shredded paper, and “materials that require caution” such as glass. The task force will consider these recommendations as it considers whether certain materials may not be best collected in a comingled recycling bin.

Lastly, the task force created a Communications Consortium comprised of communications staff from Seattle Public Utilities, the Solid Waste Division, the City of Bellevue, and the hauling companies. The consortium will create a toolkit that includes messages for use on websites, and a regional education outreach component that includes online ads and radio spots.

The next meetings are scheduled for June 18 and July 18. Gaisford said when the advisory committee meeting agendas open up in July, there will be opportunities for the advisory committees to discuss information and ideas arising from the Task Force.

Alison Bennett asked how the work of the task force will affect the Comp Plan. Gaisford said the flexibility written into the Comp Plan allows for the work of the Task Force, in particular the opportunity to modify the list of recyclable materials.

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)

MSWMAC Chair Penny Sweet noticed missing the SWAC update and said it discussed the same topics as MSWMAC during its meeting in May.

Sweet, in response to Gaisford’s response to Bennett’s question about the Comp Plan, reiterated the importance that the Comp Plan has the flexibility to accommodate market disruption like China Sword and any future discussions among cities with respect to possible future bans on problematic materials in curbside recycling bins.

Comp Plan

Meg Moorehead, Strategy, Communications, and Performance section manager for SWD, [presented](#) on recent input on the draft Comp Plan made by city representatives. This input will not be part of the formal response summary but will be part of the advisory committee record. The input consisted of written comments submitted by representatives from Federal Way, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Redmond, and Woodinville. These comments were made available to committee members prior to the meeting.

Moorehead said the comments fell into several categories: missed edits and typos, questions about updated data and text, clarifications about earlier comments, and a request to beef up content about the China Sword. Moorehead expressed gratitude for the close read on the draft Comp Plan, especially in regard to the typos and missed edits.

As to the updated data, Moorehead reminded the committee the division began writing the draft Comp Plan in 2016 when the most recent full year of data available was from 2015. Since then, the WA State Department of Ecology has released new regional recycling data and the 2016 tonnage forecast has been updated to reflect new information. Moorehead also clarified a question brought up in Woodinville's comments regarding recycling data in Table 5-1 and data in the Materials Recovery by the Numbers table on the next page. Table 5-1 recycling numbers reflect all recyclables received at each station while the Materials Recovery table shows only items recycled inside a transfer station building.

Moorehead also noted that the revised plan trims the draft plan's discussion of options in the transfer and disposal chapters and recommends a new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station and Further Development of Cedar Hills. The other options will remain in the Comp Plan but will be presented in a more streamlined manner.

Then there was the concern there is not enough about the China Sword situation mentioned in the draft Comp Plan. Moorehead said that more text about the China Sword situation has been added. She also noted the last Comp Plan was in place for 17 years so the division did not want to include actions to specifically reflect issues at the fore, but to be able to include what could be down the line. So this Comp Plan is written to provide guidance for the next 20 years, and is flexible enough to allow changes to actions in response to future market disruptions whatever they may be.

For example, in the Sustainable Materials chapter, Action 26-S addresses periodic re-evaluation of our common ground regarding what is designated recyclable – what we all recycle in common. We will revise if conditions warrant; there is no mention of time frame or specific mention of China Sword. The division added a new action: to form a regional responsible recycling forum to strengthen recyclable markets and improve the quantity and quality of materials through more uniform city and county approaches and other means. Moorehead asked the committee if these actions as written are adequate to address what is needed for the next six years.

Sweet said what was also missing in the Responsible Recycling Task Force is the representation of packaging, like someone from Amazon, or something about product stewardship. Gaisford said there are other actions related to closed-loop recycling. Moorehead said the division could add some language about encouraging product stewardship.

Bennett asked Moorehead to talk more about how we could strengthen markets. Gaisford said all agencies can make changes to their purchasing policies to require future purchases are made of recycled materials while the division works at the state level to get legislation passed. He said it was also worth doing the same kind of work for compost markets. He closed his comments with an anecdote about how SWD worked with King County Roads to use recycled asphalt roof material in road construction and getting the state Department of Transportation to allow for use in state road specifications.

Sarah Ogier said she was happy to hear more context and is eager to read the new language and asked about the timeline. Moorehead said she can share amended paragraphs, but her

staff are in the middle of preparing the document for transmittal to council so the whole document would not be available for a while. Ogier and Sweet both reiterated a need to see the new language. Moorehead said the division has to first give the Executive the opportunity to make changes, so only a draft can be available, but it won't be much different than the final document. Bennett asked when council would be taking it up. Moorehead said it was up to council prerogative, although it typically reviews materials within 60 days of receipt, yet in this case the document will be going to the Regional Policy Committee so this might take longer than 60 days.

Moorehead said another question that comes up occasionally is how the cities vote to approve the Comp Plan. Moorehead said the voting process was established in the amended and restated Interlocal Agreement (ILA), which was written before Moorehead joined the division. Knight said there was a lot of discussion about the voting process between staff, cities, and elected officials when the ILA was being drafted so that is what is followed.

Moorehead said that in the letter from Lake Forest Park, there was a concern about the need to be more explicit about when and how to begin planning for long-term disposal after 2040. Moorehead noted the old Comp Plan said when the landfill reaches capacity the option will be to begin exporting waste, but this current draft plan intentionally does not specify what the next disposal method will be in order to leave the discussion open for whatever innovation and technology makes the most sense in the future. She also cites the transfer plan that recommends not settling on details in regards to exporting any sooner than a five-year window because of changing market conditions, and also the ILA which says discussing disposal options will be initiated seven years in advance of needing it.

Moorehead said once there is a final decision about this draft Comp Plan, there will be time on the committees' work plans and the committees can decide disposal topics to add their yearly work plans. There are four more committee meetings scheduled this year, not counting the field trip, and there is nothing to say such discussions cannot be built into future work plans after this plan is approved. Chris Searcy said he strongly supports waiting a few more years for the discussion to allow technologies to advance. Sweet agreed with Searcy but says the committee is obligated to stay engaged on this issue and will expect ongoing updates from the division.

Bill Peloza said he has not read the draft Comp Plan thoroughly enough but wanted to know if there was a section that points out what happens after 2040. Moorehead said the division is recommending the development of the landfill and leaves open the question of the disposal method past 2040 so that technology advances can be considered. The post-2040 method would need to be identified with enough lead time. Peloza said five years is too late to make a massive decision for 2040; he says the draft Comp Plan should include a planning schedule.

Moorehead said the state requires the division to review the Comp Plan every five years so we could build a planning schedule into the next update although the ILA does when it says it will need to start at least seven years before reaching capacity. Knight said she sides with Searcy and Sweet and does not think we should talk about the next long-term disposal option until after 2019 since it takes up a lot of time discussing the various perspectives when there are more pressing issues regarding waste prevention, and in ten years' time, it is likely these

advisory committees will have entirely turned over. Moorehead summarized the discussion: Yes, we all agree we need to do advance thinking about long-term disposal, but we are not in agreement to immediately begin the conversation, but taking up long-term disposal as part of the next Comp Plan review is probably good enough.

Gary Schimek noted the third bullet on slide 12 of the presentation which says there is a need for the Comp Plan to make it clear the City of Kirkland is willing to host the new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station. Several people simultaneously reminded him it was still a requirement of the SEPA to include other location considerations.

Comp Plan Advisory Letter

Sweet thanked John MacGillivray for his help in drafting an Advisory Letter to King County Council on behalf of MSWMAC. Sweet asked committee members to take the letter to their city representatives, submit any recommended changes and it will be ready for reprinting in July. Bennett said she was not sure the July timing will work out, fearing that if the Comp Plan has to go to the Regional Policy Council, then July is too soon to submit it. Moorehead countered July would be good timing because it allows this committee an opportunity to influence both the Executive and Council. Sweet asked if there was a way to send the advisory letter to the Executive with language "in its current form, the Advisory Committee..." Knight wondered if there was a way to have a special meeting or get everybody to weigh in or vote online as has happened before.

Searcy asked if the policies, goals, and actions as they are currently written expected to change. Moorehead said relatively small changes may be made to the draft Plan, but beyond that the draft is pretty fixed. She suggested it could be possible to write "Based on what we have seen so far we are good with it...that what is transmitted is what we stand behind." Searcy suggested Sweet edit the letter to take out the word "text" in the 3rd paragraph and leave the rest.

Joan Nelson asked if the committee was okay with the word "majority" because if the committee waits and there are some people who are still not happy, then the postponement will have been for nothing. Sweet took an informal vote and noted there was a majority of present committee members in support of the Comp Plan as it is currently written.

Bennett says she did not vote yea because she has not had time to brief her council; she would need a final draft to present to the Bellevue council before the July committee meeting in order to consider supporting the letter. Barre Seibert asked for a definition of "unanimous:" does it mean everyone, and if so, what happens if everyone is not here for the vote, how does an abstention count, would that be a vote against the plan? Dorian Waller, SWD's Government Relations Administrator said in those cases it would not be unanimous.

Maia Knox, echoed Bennett, saying she also did not vote because she had not met with her council either. Pelozo said he wanted to wordsmith the letter: say "support," not "vote." And take out "majority and unanimous" and the letter does not need the number of cities included in it. He said the letter is intended to show the council and Executive the committee is in support but support cannot be stated until there is a final document.

Ogier said this letter implies the cities approved the document and while there is a lot of agreement, she does not want this letter to be interpreted as limiting the Bellevue council's opportunity to ultimately approve (or disapprove) the plan.

Sweet said she will re-work the letter and send it out again in two weeks so next month there can be more discussion about it, provided Meg can get her work done in two weeks.

Carol Simpson said, as a small city, she does not have the staff to evaluate this document and present it to her council, which is largely new and not current on the issues. She asks other cities to share their agenda packets with the rest of the committee and it would be appreciated. Moorehead said SWD has staff available to present the Comp Plan to anybody who needs it. Waller said he has already arranged for 22 presentations.

Member and Public Comment

Tay Yoshitani read prepared comments to committee members.

Paula Waters said there has been a history of opposition of a new Northeast Transfer Station but given the changes in population, she is looking forward to collaborating with other northeast cities on the siting process.

Sharon Hlavka, from Green Solutions, announced her offer to coordinate a recycling event at half her usual costs for the first city who wants to set up a dual stream system where fiber is collected in one cart and containers are collected in a second cart. Cities can decide if they want to set out both carts for collection in one week or alternate carts over two separate weeks.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by: Jenny Devlin