

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee
February 19, 2016 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Center**

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>King County Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>
April Atwood	Anna Fleming	Kenmore Mayor David Baker, SWAC applicant
Jerry Bartlett	Jeff Gaisford	Doreen Booth, Sound Cities Association
Elly Bunzendahl	Eric Johnson	Suzette Dickerson, Teamsters 117, SWAC applicant
Gib Dammann	Kevin Kiernan	Evan Griffiths, CH2M HILL
Jean Garber	Laila McClinton	King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert
Kim Kaminski – excused	Olivia Robinson	Joan Nelson, City of Auburn
Kevin Kelly – excused	Diane Yates	Yolanda Pon, Public Health-Seattle & King County
Keith Livingston		Deanna Seaman, WISErg
Jose Lugo – excused		Auburn Councilmember Largo Wales, SWAC applicant
Barbara Ristau – excused		
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann		
Stephen Strader		
Bill Ziegler		

Approve Meeting Minutes; Review Agenda

One revision to the January SWAC minutes was made: “Kiernan noted that the division’s capture rate would be 110 percent more than estimated by the new model.” The minutes were approved as amended.

Updates

SWD

SWD Assistant Director Kevin Kiernan noted that historically MSWMAC and SWAC agendas have included parallel discussions related to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan). The division is continuing to work with MSWMAC on the transfer system section of the Comp Plan, while SWAC has completed its discussions on the transfer system. Kiernan acknowledged that progress on the Comp Plan has also been delayed due to several factors, such as not having been able to fill the Strategic Planning Manager position yet, and several staff members out on family leave.

Keith Livingston stated that demand management strategies will not meet the needs of the region’s customers and stressed the importance of building a Northeast transfer station. Chair Jean Garber noted that SWAC passed a motion in August 2015 stating its support for consideration of a Northeast transfer station at the same priority level as the demand

management strategies in the Comp Plan and that the county begin looking for sites for a Northeast transfer station immediately.

SWD transfer stations recycled a total of 18,174 tons in 2015, which is a 33 percent increase over 2014. SWD's two newest stations, Shoreline and Bow Lake, accounted for 75 percent of the materials collected.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the future South County Transfer Station was released on February 4 and comments are being accepted until March 9. Two open houses will be held: the first on February 22 at Auburn High School and the second on March 3 at the Filipino American Hall in Algona.

A [SWANA technical session](#) devoted to waste diversion will be held on February 26. Topics will include multi-family recycling, mercury lighting, construction & demolition materials, and transfer station resource recovery. SWAC members are eligible to receive the SWANA member rate.

The next Cedar Hills Regional Landfill community meeting is scheduled for April 13 at the Issaquah Library.

SWD will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill on Saturday, April 23. SWAC members will receive an invitation to attend and are encouraged to save the date.

On January 2, SWD's EcoConsumer attended a fundraiser for the new South King Tool Library, a non-profit tool lending library located in unincorporated King County and serving the Federal Way and Auburn areas. The EcoConsumer program is also supporting the formation of local repair groups. Federal Way will host a repair group session at Federal Way City Hall on March 14.

MSWMAC

The agenda included presentations on the new Construction and Demolition materials management policy, as well as construction of the Factoria transfer station. MSWMAC elected Penny Sweet as Chair and Chris Searcy as Vice Chair.

Diane Yates noted that because there is no longer a member who sits on both MSWMAC and SWAC to provide updates from the other committee, SWD will distribute the minutes from the other committee's meetings.

State legislation

SWD is tracking several items:

- Senate Bill 6605 “Ensuring that solid waste management requirements prevent the spread of disease, plant pathogens, and pests”
- House Bill 1571 “Concerning Paint Stewardship”
The bill passed out of the Washington State House of Representatives on February 10. A public hearing is scheduled in the Senate Committee on Energy, Environment, and Telecommunications on February 23.
- Section 122 of the Supplemental Budget
This section directs the State Auditor to investigate whether local governments have combined fees for commercial solid waste and source-separated recyclable materials collection. The Auditor will be reviewing if these cities are imposing a solid waste tax on recycling, which is in violation of RCW 82.18.010.

Transfer Station Recycling: Presentation

SWD staff Eric Johnson gave a [presentation](#) on transfer station recycling and resource recovery.

Comments included:

- Livingston asked about contamination associated with commingled recycling at transfer stations. Johnson noted that the region’s private haulers and processors are set up to handle commingled recyclables. If the local industry and community decide to take glass out of the commingled stream, the county could follow suit.
- Livingston asked how resource recovery is done on the tipping floor. Johnson explained that staff identify incoming loads with high volumes of cardboard, metal, or wood. They direct the load to a particular section of the tipping floor and then excavators are used to collect the metal, cardboard and clean wood. He added that the sorting process will continue to evolve, but that currently results are good.
- Livingston noted that while the division is tracking additional tons of materials recovered at transfer stations, it is also important to track how these efforts are contributing to the county’s overall recycling rate.
- Livingston noted that while the division tracks additional tons of materials recovered, it does not track tons collected for resource recovery separately from the other recyclable materials collected. Wood, metal, and cardboard recovered from the tipping floor is placed in the same collection bins as the other recyclable materials. Johnson explained that the division’s methodology may change over time as it expands its efforts and adds permanent staff dedicated to resource recovery.
- Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann noted that when the term “resource recovery” is used, it should be made clear that this does not include energy recovery. Jeff Gaisford explained that the term allows for differentiation between materials recovered off the floor and source separated materials.
- Elly Bunzendahl asked how the closure of the North Seattle transfer station has affected resource recovery numbers at Shoreline. Johnson said that while the closure has certainly increased tonnage at Shoreline, he believes that when the Seattle facility reopens, Shoreline will not lose all of its recycling customers.

- On behalf of the Vashon Island community, Gib Dammann expressed his appreciation for SWD's ongoing partnership with Zero Waste Vashon. Dammann noted that Vashon Island residents have brought very little food waste to the transfer station, so far. Because haulers do not offer organics collection it is the responsibility of the Vashon community to provide a food waste collection system. He noted that individual residents are unlikely to pay the \$12 minimum fee for one bag of food waste.
- Dammann asked if data surrounding the final destination of the region's recyclable materials exists. Bunzendahl suggested that haulers may have this information. When SWAC toured Recology CleanScapes' material recovery facility, they were informed where materials were being shipped. She added that each facility is likely to have a unique chart that changes from month to month as markets fluctuate. Dammann stated he would like to make a motion asking haulers for this data at the next meeting.
- Stephen Strader asked about the residual rate of the recovered materials after they are processed at sorting facilities. Johnson explained that the curbside residual rate is about 12 percent while the rate for recyclables from transfer stations is currently unknown. Based on his observations, comments from processors, and the fact that staff monitor materials at transfer stations, there is likely less contamination in transfer station materials than curbside materials.
- Livingston asked about the cost of resource recovery to customers. Gaisford explained that customers are currently being charged the standard garbage rate. In future rate studies the division will explore different rate options. Johnson added that staff are already advising customers to sort their recyclables and save money, rather than dumping it all as garbage.
- Dammann asked what happens to the CFL bulbs that are collected for recycling. Johnson explained that the bulbs are recycled locally at Total Reclaim. Garber suggested that SWAC tour the facility this year.
- Livingston asked if the increases in recycling can be attributed to the strong economy or if they are reflective of stronger community participation. Gaisford stated that as the economy has improved, garbage and recycling numbers have increased, but the division has also invested in recycling opportunities at transfer stations. Kiernan added that there has been about a 4 percent increase per year for garbage, but a much bigger increase for recyclables.
- David Baker noted that plastic film recycling at transfer stations is a good option for people whose haulers do not offer plastic bag recycling. He also noted that it is a challenge to know what to put in the recycling bin because it depends on your location. Kiernan noted that while this causes confusion, rules vary because there has been innovation and competition, which can be an advantage for pushing the needle forward.
- Gaisford highlighted the steady increases in the self-haul recycling rate over the last few years: 5 percent in 2013, 6.5 percent in 2014, and nearly 8 percent in 2015. These small increases will help the region achieve its 70 percent recycling rate goal.

SWAC Discussion Guidelines: Review and Discussion

Garber proposed the following language to replace provision 10: "During meetings, SWAC encourages members to use electronic devices only for SWAC-related business and job-related activities. Members are encouraged to mute their cell phones and other communication devices during meetings so as not to disturb other members."

Strader proposed the following language to replace provision 6: "No member may speak longer than 5 minutes each time they are recognized by the chair and no more than a total of 10 minutes on each subject."

The SWAC discussion guidelines were approved as amended. In response to a question, Yates noted that SWAC has separate member presentation guidelines.

Schmidt-Pathmann suggested that at the beginning of each meeting the Chair announce that non-SWAC members may make one-minute comments during each agenda item prior to any decisions, as stated in provision 11.

Open Forum

- April Atwood will teach a [Sustainability Consulting](#) class at Seattle University's Albers School of Business and Economics this spring. Small teams of MBA students collaborate with client organizations on a project and provide deliverables at the end of the quarter. Atwood is looking for projects that would start in March and run through June.
- Schmidt-Pathmann read the attached statement.

February 19th, 2016

February SWAC Meeting

Good Morning,

I like to share some thoughts with you in regards to the direction we are heading. Originally, I wanted to share some facts about waste management and realized that we will not be able to reach our recycling goal of 70% and should instead focus on reaching the current 52% or 54% not by weight but by identifying the new products that are created out of the recyclables including the majority we send to China and instead build the necessary local infrastructure. We should also re-evaluate our Greenhouse Gas emissions from Cedar Hills not for a closed cell or the period of 10-30 years but for at least the 100 years, an internationally recognized standard, as that waste will be with us for 1000s of years so we can more realistically recognize the limitations of our landfill (Cedar Hills) in regards to methane recovery. Methane, a very potent Greenhouse Gas > 42 times as potent than CO₂, from landfills is still one of the largest local methane producers.

But this sounds very depressing so let's look at the opportunities that are presented to us.

The Paris Climate talks were very clear in regards to immediate action being of fundamental importance. Several points became clear:

- The Global Warming Goal of staying below 2 Degrees Celsius is necessary, but due to inaction or slow action/responsiveness unobtainable and all countries need to do whatever possible to turn talk into action;
- How we manage our resources has a major impact on getting as close to the 2 Degrees mark as possible – the more efficient we manage our resource the more likely we can get as close to the 2 Degrees as possible;
- This includes how we manage our resource 'waste' in the form of waste avoidance, reduction at source, product re-use, quality improvements, recycling and resource recovery – which all is currently not possible or only with great limitations due to not including the cost to the environment and resources when landfilling resource waste;
- We are running out of fossil fuels: and be it 30 or 300 years for oil; 150-300 years of natural gas; 400-500 years of coal; This is a minimal fraction in time when compared to the existence of mankind for 10,000 or thousands of years – due to our actions today on consuming our natural resources and the emerging economies of China, India etc. that will continue to deplete our resources at an ever faster pace, we need to find solutions to manage our resources and greenhouse gas inventory much more efficiently;

- => Which all leads to the most important fact identified at COP 21 in Paris: Making these improvements to our environment has been identified as "The largest wealth creating opportunity of our time"

Looking around our group I do see very engaged individuals, who want to improve and possibly change the way we do 'things'. However, I have realized that we are not making much, if any headway but business as usual. I do not think it is a lack of motivation.

We are facing incredible difficult odds coming our way such as global warming, draughts, fires, food shortages, acidification of the oceans, plastic in the oceans, rising water levels, etc. and we need to realize that we need to fight harder and take much bigger steps to reach the goals, just recently again identified in Paris. And if I look at countries like Germany and China(!) and how they continue to speed up their actions to reach these goals and can show accomplishments/successes (not just talk) I am amazed.

Where are our flagships? Are we satisfied if our resource 'waste' is utilized in China? Are we showing enough responsibility? I don't think so. What is it then? It cannot be our capital! We always have good ideas and technologies be it a trip to the moon or Internet Silicon Valley! Money was always available. Why don't we utilize new technologies and allow for new developments? Have we become to lazy or are we simply too well off?

Let's be honest, we have to do more. We have to invest into our future today. We don't need steps but need to start leaping ahead otherwise we will not arrive in time. I don't want to create panic but we have to realize that what we are currently doing and our current planning is not enough.

We need to decide if we want to participate in the securing of our future and participating in not only improving the environment and our resource availability for us and future generations but have access to the greatest wealth creating opportunity of our time.

Thank you,
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann