

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee
January 16, 2015 - 9:30 a.m. to 12:20 p.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Center**

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>King County Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
April Atwood	Alejandra Calderon	Gib Dammann
Jerry Bartlett	Anna Fleming	Chris Eggen
Elly Bunzendahl	Beth Humphreys	Jerry Henley
Joe Casalini	Kevin Kiernan	King County Councilmember Lambert
Jean Garber	Josh Marx	
Steve Gerritson	Laila McClinton	
Stacia Jenkins	Pat McLaughlin	
Jose Lugo	Thea Severn	
Barbara Ristau	Diane Yates	
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann		
Stephen Strader		
Thomas Wray		
Bill Ziegler		

Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda

The following revisions were made to the December SWAC minutes:

- Under the MSWMAC update, Jenkins should be referred to as the MSWMAC liaison, not the SWAC liaison.
- “Consider reevaluating” was changed to “reevaluate” to read as follows: “In the ‘Closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill’ section, *reevaluate* the assumption that the cost of waste export is lower than other disposal options.”

The December minutes were approved as amended.

Updates

SWD

- As requested, the division’s new organizational chart was distributed to SWAC.
- Construction of the new [Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station](#) is on schedule and on budget.
- King County transfer stations and the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill received a total of 848,163 tons in 2014. This constitutes a 4.6 percent increase over the previous year, about a third of which is attributed to the closure of Seattle’s North Transfer Station for reconstruction.

- At its meeting on Jan. 5, the Auburn City Council passed a resolution supporting the state's proposed paint product stewardship legislation.
- [LightRecycle Washington](#) is a new statewide recycling program for fluorescent and other mercury-containing lights. Both individuals and businesses can drop off up to 10 lights for recycling per day. Bow Lake, Enumclaw, Vashon, and Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Stations as well as Factoria HHW are now accepting these lights for free.
- Although King County will not be affected by the outcome of the case, Gaisford provided an update to Alameda County's secure medicine return program. In September 2014, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld Alameda County's Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance. The pharmaceutical industry association is now petitioning the Supreme Court. The pharmaceutical companies have met the first deadline and will need to submit their proposed stewardship plan by Feb. 12, 2015.
- As Area 8 of the landfill is designed and old areas are excavated, the county intends to experiment with landfill mining and recognizes that there may be opportunities for resource recovery. The division has had experience with landfill mining: construction of the Shoreline and Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Stations required excavating waste. Mining at these sites was successfully completed in compliance with regulators. A majority of what was excavated was soil, which was then separated and used as daily cover at the landfill.
- Members are encouraged to return their [2014 Financial Disclosure Form](#) to Diane Yates and Rick Ybarra.

MSWMAC

MSWMAC liaison Jenkins reported that MSWMAC reviewed the Transfer System chapter of the Comp Plan and asked that further review be postponed until the Transfer Plan Review Report is complete. MSWMAC members also noted that the county could achieve its desired tonnage reduction through waste prevention rather than by achieving a 70 percent recycling rate. Waste prevention measures should therefore not be overlooked.

Transfer Plan Review

The Transfer Plan Review workshop will be rescheduled. A new date will be announced shortly.

State legislation

Legislation that requires the Solid Waste Division and the Wastewater Treatment Division to be carbon neutral by 2025 is now being considered by the King County Council.

Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan

Severn presented [updates anticipated for Chapter 5](#): Transfer System. Comments included:

- SWAC was originally scheduled to review the Transfer System chapter in January, February, and March. Because the Transfer Plan Review is not yet complete, the work plan may be revised to review the Collection and Processing chapter in February.

- The change in policy TS-4 from seeking a “Gold or higher” to a “Platinum” LEED rating will affect all future facilities, but does not affect Factoria.
- Consider defining or clarifying what “resource recovery” means, especially if it is context-dependent.
- For Recommendation 7, consider specifying what is meant by “division facilities.”
- Yard waste is considered one of the “recyclable materials,” as referenced in the introductory section of the chapter.
- Per MSWMAC suggestion, when the Transfer Plan Review is complete, the chapter will be reviewed to ensure the sequence of events in the development of the transfer system is clear.
- In “The Transfer System and Services” section, consider clarifying that the concept in the 1960s of a regional transfer and disposal network was driven by federal regulations and restrictions.
- The “Services for Construction and Demolition Debris” section will include the process by which the C&D management system can change, as well as a list of C&D facilities.
- A member stressed the importance of maintaining household hazardous waste services as the population in the region grows.
- The division will continue to monitor demand at the Cedar Falls drop box to ensure there are sufficient recycling opportunities and to evaluate whether or not a second scale is needed.
- In the “Transfer Facility Siting” section, consider including a reference to the siting process, as prescribed by King County.
- At the MSWMAC meeting, the division reminded cities that it is their responsibility to find temporary debris management sites and that King County can provide assistance if requested. Chapter 8 of FEMA’s [Debris Management Guide](#) includes debris management site guidelines.

The comments provided will be considered for inclusion in the Draft Comp Plan, which is anticipated to be complete in September 2015.

Roadmap to 70 Percent Recycling Rate: Discussion

SWD Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Gaisford presented “[The Road to Zero Waste of Resources](#)”, which included a look at King County’s waste prevention and recycling goals, current recycling and disposal data, as well as future recycling potential. Points included:

- The Draft 2013 Comp Plan goals for waste prevention, waste disposal and recycling were established in relation to 2007 rates.
- Waste prevention includes seeking to reduce from all three streams: garbage, recycling, and organics.
- King County’s 70 percent recycling goal includes only what is coming into the landfill, and does not include C&D or alternative daily cover.
- The garbage data comes from the Cedar Hills regional landfill. The recycling data comes from monthly hauler reports. The division also uses the Department of Ecology’s annual data, which it matches up with the data from the haulers.
- Given the time that has passed since the goals were set, it may be worth reevaluating the county’s targets to determine whether they are too aggressive or not aggressive enough.

- 2012 data shows that King County has reached a 52 percent recycling rate, which is lower than the 55 percent goal that was set for 2015.
- A chart of King County disposal and recycling rates between 1988 and 2012 shows that large increases in recycling have occurred when collective action was taken. The first big increase in the early 1990s can be attributed to cities and the county instituting curbside and multi-family recycling programs, as well as banning yard waste from the single-family waste stream. The second big increase in the early 2000s can be attributed to single-stream recycling.
- In terms of quantity of waste disposed, the potential for diversion is biggest for non-residential, then single-family, followed by self-haul, and finally multi-family.
- The “2012 recycling and disposal by generator type” chart displays King County’s tons recycled and tons disposed broken down by generator type (single-family, multi-family, non-residential, self-haul). Because the breakdown varies tremendously by city, it is important to look at each city’s waste generators to figure out where to focus efforts.
- For single-family households, the greatest potential for diversion is found in food scraps and food-soiled paper. 70 percent of the “other materials” disposed is composed of animal feces, disposable diapers, and textiles.
- For multi-family households, the greatest potential for diversion is also found in food scraps and food-soiled paper. The “other materials” disposed category includes wood and plastic products in addition to animal feces, disposable diapers, and textiles.
- Non-residential customers have high recycling rates: they recycle 92 percent of scrap metal, 87 percent of yard waste, and 76 percent of paper. Again, the greatest potential for diversion for non-residential customers is found in food waste: 114,000 tons of food scraps and food-soiled paper is disposed each year. In addition, despite the high paper recycling rate, there are still 63,000 tons of paper being disposed each year.
- The self-haul waste stream is unique. Self-haulers are also often single-family curbside customers. Self-haulers recycle 21 percent of yard waste and 13 percent of curbside recyclables. 2014 data - especially for yard waste, paper and containers- will look very different due to recycling and resource recovery efforts at transfer stations. The greatest potential for diversion is found in wood (35,000 tons disposed each year), yard waste (28,000 tons), and scrap metal (19,000 tons).
- When single-family household recycling rates are viewed on a regional map, the wide range (from 7 to 65 percent) is evident. Half of what single family customers are recycling is yard waste. One thing all cities share in common is that the cost of recycling is included in the cost of garbage. A number of cities have also included the cost of yard waste in the cost of garbage, which boosts yard waste recycling considerably. There does not appear to be a correlation between mandatory garbage collection and higher recycling rates. Mandatory collection could be a valuable tool if coupled with other factors, such as mandatory separation and curbside collection and recyclables.
- When pounds of single-family garbage collected weekly is viewed on a regional map, Renton stands out as the only city besides Seattle that has less than twenty pounds collected on average per week. It is also the only other city that has every- other-week garbage collection.
- One of the primary benefits of increasing waste prevention and recycling rates is extending the life of the landfill, which keeps rates low for ratepayers. Each city has unique needs, and should work with its haulers to figure out how to best use its funds

for collection and education. Collectively working on campaigns can also produce great impacts.

- In conclusion:
 - To achieve higher recycling rates, adequate capacity at Material Recovery Facilities and compost processing facilities is needed.
 - Looking at all waste generators is important.
 - Diverting organics is critical.
 - More paper must be diverted from the non-residential stream.
 - The self-haul waste stream requires unique diversion strategies because of its unique makeup.
 - History has taught us that collective action translates into greater impact.
- Division Director McLaughlin noted that while King County does have some of the best rates in the nation, 78 percent of what is currently being trucked to the landfill contains resources that have markets. Recycling rates are flat, and haven't changed in three years. Moving the needle is going to require some different approaches and new partnerships. Assuming the county reaches a 70 percent recycling rate by 2030, the landfill will also reach capacity that year.
- Member comments included:
 - Waste prevention strategies include grass recycling, food waste reduction, waste exchanges, tool lending libraries, legislation, etc.
 - Making incentive programs (such as free kitchen compost containers and compostable bags) standard for all hauling companies could be an effective way of boosting recycling rates.
 - During warmer periods, every-other-week collection of food and yard waste and the resulting odors can be a disincentive to participation in organics recycling. Frequency of yard waste collection may be a topic to explore.
 - A member noted the importance of having data to encourage cities to include the cost of yard waste collection in the cost of garbage collection.
 - A member commented that there are clearly many materials with potential for diversion in the waste stream, as well as sufficient processing capacity and demand. The next step is looking at collection design, incentives, and education.
 - A member commented that having space set aside for recycling in multi-family housing (as required by state law) does not translate into diversion and resident participation. It is a critical first step, but there are lots of design factors that affect participation. It may actually be worth revisiting the law, and exploring collocating recycling and food waste next to garbage chutes.
 - A member commented that if locally produced compost was accepted for use in the agricultural sector, there would be no excess. The division's Link Up program is currently conducting trials to demonstrate to farmers the benefit of compost application.
- King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert expressed interest in looking more closely at why multi-family residences have lower recycling rates.
- The 70 Percent Recycling Committee will explore recycling and disposal data in more detail.

Sustainability Study Projects: Update

Severn provided an update on the three Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study projects. The budget for follow-up studies has been approved and staff members have been assigned. Draft scopes of work have not yet been created.

The anaerobic digestion feasibility study will likely be the shortest in length. A large amount of potential feedstock exists, which may include animal feces and disposable diapers. The study will include looking at potential feedstock sources, transportation options, technologies available, siting facilities, and markets. Products from anaerobic digestion include energy production, fuel, fertilizer, and residual compost.

The rates study for different “customers classes,” which are yet to be defined, should be completed by the end of 2015. The county needs a rate structure that would support its recycling goals. A proposed rate structure is currently undergoing an internal review.

A solicitation of proposals to explore alternative technologies for managing a portion of the waste stream will also be coming out this year. This project is expected to take 16 to 18 months.

Construction & Demolition Debris: Update

Gaisford presented [C&D Materials Management System Changes](#) in 2015. A [graphic of the proposal](#) was also presented. Points included:

- The new system is expected to be in place in September 2015. An ordinance will be transmitted to the Council this month.
- The materials will be going to source-separated recycling facilities, a concrete recycler, a designated C&D facility that separates materials, and a private transfer station.
- Disposal bans will be implemented for materials that have stable markets. There will be a provision that the Division Director can lift the ban if markets dissolve.
- The division will work with the Sheriff’s Department to enforce the bans in September. Until then, the focus will be on education.
- Cities can use C&D model code language from the Regional Code Collaboration for permitting purposes. The model language is still under development. For a copy of the most current iteration, please contact [Kinley Deller](#).
- Construction materials are always changing, so it is important to continue to look for new recycling and product stewardship opportunities.
- In the graphic, consider moving the blue triangle (identifying a disposal ban verification point) from the outgoing arrow to the ingoing arrow at transfer stations.
- A member noted that the diagram does not capture all the construction materials that are dismantled piece by piece and reused. Another member noted that the percentage of deconstruction versus demolition is still very small.

Open Forum

- Member Schmidt-Pathmann presented a [New York Times article](#) about waste incinerators in the United States and the perceived higher cost of recycling. He underlined the relative importance of recycling and waste prevention over waste-to-energy. Waste-to-energy is also an integral part of an integrated solid waste management system.
- Member Atwood who is an instructor at Seattle University's Albers School of Business and Economics, said that she is teaching a graduate-level class entitled [Sustainability Consulting](#) this spring. Small teams of MBA students, most of whom are working professionals, collaborate with client organizations on a project and provide deliverables at the end of the quarter. Past projects include solar panels for Boeing, a communications plan for Puget Sound Energy, benchmarking practices for commercial buildings, a marketing plan for minority-owned businesses, LEED certification for a major sports facility, etc. Atwood is looking for projects that would start at the end of March and run through early June.