

**King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee
 October 20, 2017 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
 King Street Center 8th Floor Conference Center**

Meeting Minutes

Members Present	King County Staff	Others
April Atwood – Vice Chair	Jamey Barker	Karl Hufnagel, Parametrix
Elly Bunzendahl	Krista Carmenzind	Sue Sander, Normandeau
Gib Dammann	William Chen	Phillip Schmidt Pathmann, NEOMER
Karen Dawson	Jenny Devlin	Ian Sutton, Parametrix
Jean Garber	Jeff Gaisford	
Kevin Kelly – Chair	Beth Humphreys	
Phillippa Kassover	Ross Marzolf	
Keith Livingston	Pat McLaughlin	
Ken Marshall	Meg Moorehead	
Barbara Ristau	Terra Rose	
Stephen Strader	Eben Sutton	
Penny Sweet		

Minutes

Jean Garber made a motion to move that all minutes retroactive to the August 2017 SWAC minutes include motions, motion text, and motion votes in SWAC minutes. Keith Livingston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Garber made a motion to add “long-time member of SWAC” to her comment in the August 2017 SWAC minutes about the passing of former SWAC and MSWMAC member Joan McGilton. Gib Dammann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Penny Sweet moved to approve the September 2017 SWAC minutes. Gib Dammann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Updates

SOLID WASTE DIVISION (SWD)

Factoria Grand Opening

Pat McLaughlin mentioned that the division had a grand opening for the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station on Monday, October 23.

Bellevue Council Supports Signing ILA

McLaughlin stated that the Bellevue City Council had expressed support for signing the Amended and Restated ILA on Monday night, so the city is expected to be in the system thru 2040.

Styrofoam Collection

SWD staff Jeff Gaisford provided an update on a Styrofoam and plastic film recycling pilot program. The pilot began in 2016 at the Shoreline Recycling and Transfer Station. SWD learned a lot regarding contamination. The pilot expanded to the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station in June 2016. The division has collected 30,000 pounds of material, 40 percent being Styrofoam and 60 percent being plastic film. The division is deciding if it will purchase a densifier to avoid shipping air. There is also the possibility of using the cardboard baler at the Bow Lake station to reduce the volume of plastic film. Styrofoam is currently recycled at Styro Recycle in Kent, WA.

Ken Marshall expressed concern about China no longer accepting recyclables. Gaisford says the division is keeping an eye on the situation. Marshall says the state of Oregon changing what recyclables are being collected, per the Waste Dive newsletter that he receives; Oregon will divert plastics sent to China and keep them in storage. Marshall questioned whether SWD's 70 percent recycling goal is going to be accomplished because of this new policy. SWD Director Pat McLaughlin responded he thinks this topic ought to be discussed in a future meeting, with the understanding that China is not rejecting all plastics, just bales of plastics above a certain contamination level. SWAC Chair Kevin Kelly said China has canceled export licenses for vendors who ship out through the end of the year and plastics and paper must have less than one half of one percent contamination. This is a topic that should have a longer conversation but there is not the time for it today. Gaisford mentioned Washington State Recycling Association is hosting a forum on plastic recycling on December 6 in Federal Way.

http://www.wsra.net/index.php?option=com_jevents&task=icalrepeat.detail&evid=125&Itemid=115&year=2017&month=12&day=06&title=the-wsra-fall-policy-forum-&uid=dc11f189b17bb59ec9c560bed1b2a5)

Marshall says Oregon, Washington, and California are the cleanest recyclers in the country and what China is offering to accept is not feasible. SWAC members need to educate all to clean out all containers or we are going to have to go the direction of Oregon because we don't have mills in this country; it's a big issue.

Keith Livingston expressed concern about using transfer stations to bale and asked how much energy we want to invest. Gaisford said we currently bale cardboard at Bow Lake. Dammann said contamination is best dealt with on a local level, and if we can educate folks on a smaller scale, the better. Dammann asked for clarification – was it 3 percent contamination or 1 percent? Kelly responded that it depends on the material, but definitions are murky since China is playing around with definitions as we understand them. He says all medical waste is rejected.

Dammann said this is an opportunity to create markets for our own stuff. Garber said the Green Fence issue a while ago didn't seem to affect local haulers, because their recyclables were clean. Kelly said in 2013 the focus was on plastics 3. Philippa Kassover said Lake Forest Park has an education campaign "empty, clean, dry" and Lake Forest Park has always done well. She encouraged all SWAC members to do it now in their own communities without further discussion. Garber asked how much water is needed to make plastic clean enough to recycle. Dammann asked if Styrofoam is compressed is it still valuable to those who would use it. Gaisford said he didn't know but it would reduce transportation costs.

MSWMAC

MSWMAC Chair Penny Sweet reported MSWMAC is concerned there may not enough time to review the Comp Plan. SWD staff Meg Moorehead said the Comp Plan is scheduled to be ultimately approved by Ecology in March 2019. Sweet reported state Department of Ecology is also concerned about China.

Livingston asked for a status update on the South County Transfer Station. McLaughlin reported Algona's City Council has already approved the ILAs for the project and that the King County Council is now reviewing them. The Committee of the Whole voted unanimously to approve the ILAs last Wednesday. The ILAs will have a public hearing on November 13 at the full Council and then will be voted on that day. It is presumed that they will pass. Livingston asked what changes were made to the ILAs that require them go back for approval. McLaughlin said the ILAs are not the ones for participation in the regional system but that they are specific to the development process for the new recycling and transfer station. An RFP is now out for design of the facility. The division is using a Design, Bid, Build procurement method.

Karen Dawson asked if a date has been set for the Fall Cedar Hills meeting. Moorehead said November 8.

Comp Plan Presentation

Chair Kelly introduced the agenda item by setting the scene: SWAC is tasked with agreeing that the Comp Plan – except for Chapter six – is ready for public review. It won't be a perfect document at the end of this meeting but it should be good enough to allow the public to voice their views

Moorehead introduced the presentation noting the three-hour meeting was intended to allow enough time to go over the entire document but there was a delay in getting the disposal information together in September which is why it was delivered to SWAC last week. Members are encouraged to bring their comments, whether over the phone or written, to Beth Humphreys by November 3. Stephen Strader asked how the Office Hours conducted earlier in the week went. Moorehead said nobody from SWAC called, but last week, a few from MSMWAC called. She conceded it may not have been the best strategy but it was an attempt to give advisory members more opportunities to comment.

Moorehead continued: The Comp Plan has been discussed in committee for a solid year beginning last October. The plan presented today has no surprises as it has all been reviewed by committee members. There were changes to the plan's organization with the chapters comprising goals, policy, actions, and six major planning elements.

SWD staff Beth Humphreys began the presentation noting the Policy Status handout, a document describing the policies in each chapter and where each policy originated and how it was changed.

There were no comments or questions for the first policy chapter, Chapter 2: Existing System Policies.

After Humphreys presented Chapter 3: Forecasting and Data Policies, Livingston asked of Policy FD-2 if the data in the chapter will reflect Bellevue and the Point Cities continued participation in the system thru 2040. Humphreys said the chapter does include Bellevue and the Point Cities. She also mentioned that the data comes from 2014, 2015, and 2016. She mentioned that there is a lag in receiving the county-wide recycling number from the Department of Ecology. Before the Plan is released for final approval, the data will be updated. Kassover commented this chapter ought to include information on business intelligence to track developments in new technology. Vice Chair April Atwood seconded Kassover adding it was clear our forecasts can be imprecise and the division needs a system to improve forecast capabilities.

In regards to Chapter 4: Sustainable Materials Management Goal and Policies, Kassover foresees a lot of public confusion since sustainable materials management is recycling. Marshall asked why the division felt like it needed to change the title. Humphreys said it was in the 2013 Transfer Plan and since this chapter included a collection piece, this title change is more reflective of that. Marshall says people want to know recyclables are recycling. Strader said we did talk about changing the title. Moorehead said it speaks to the priorities of the regulator and maybe the division could use subtitles. Sweet thought it was a fairly comprehensive title. Kelly says we get it and he agreed with Penny; sustainable materials management is more than recycling. Barbra Ristau asked who our audience was and would most of the general public who reads it get it. Elly Bunzendahl doubted many people would read the Comp Plan and noted this wasn't a marketing plan.

Humphreys said this chapter includes minimum standards and the recycling goal. Sweet reported there was some discussion about this in MSMWAC, that the goal is written just vague enough without an end date. Livingston said he does not see it as a mandate; it's a goal, a target and without one there would be no effort. He said a mandate would require you to think differently. Dammann noted he continues to not see the word 'education' and he would really like to see redundancy in practice. Moorehead noted he would see it in the next couple of slides. Kelly asked about the phrase 'economic value' in Goal-S – what are we saying about it. Moorehead said the plan leaves that open. Gaisford pointed out Action 29-s on the Waste Prevention, Recycling and Collection Actions handout.

Strader asked don't cities get to determine what they get to recycle and how would King County do the education. Gaisford said the Comp Plan sets minimum standards for cities but cities can exceed the standards; King County does regional education on things we all have in common but it is up to the cities and haulers to do education where things are different. Livingston mentioned that things are as sustainable as we like and things are heavily subsidized to prolong value. He thinks the chapters are fine but if we are assigning economic value to materials people will think cities are making money at best. He said if we bring up economies we may want to consider putting economics in context of recycling.

Atwood said she did not remember what was meant by the term 'beneficial use' in Goal-S. Humphreys referred to state law which says the division can be permitted to use a reusable material for lower value use such as using material for landfill cover. Humphreys said there was some discussion about the ABC list of Goal-S about what priority is given to each action and maybe there is a better way to list the hierarchy of options.

Moorehead spoke to Chapter 5: Transfer Policies noting the advisory committees saw two versions of this chapter, the second time occurring on October 9 after the division had legislation in front of council to move money from the Demand Management pilot to the siting of a northeast transfer station. Council left half of the money in the Operations Budget and directed the division to explore options for providing transfer capacity in the northeast area. The chapter was rewritten to include options on how we might meet capacity and explains why the Demand Management pilot would not work. This chapter is now written along the lines of an Environmental Impact Statement exploring the different ways the division can best meet service options for the Northeast. Bunzendahl asked what happened to the other half of the money. McLaughlin said with no need to spend it, it was 'disappropriated' – it is still in the account, but we don't have authority to spend it. Strader expressed concern the northeast transfer station project will get derailed again and wondered what council wants to see in the Comp Plan. Moorehead said they would want to see options but at the same time they gave the division money to put boots on the ground and fund the upfront work such as working with haulers to better understand their needs and with the potential host cities.

Strader said we looked at those options and asked if we can pull that forward. Moorehead said the division will use whatever information it has and provided the sequence of the scenario – the chapter with options goes out for public review, then goes to the Executive's office, he will pick an option and recommend it to council, and then they approve the plan. Then the biennial budget is developed and approved with a new capital budget, which could include a new station. Strader asked about timing. Moorehead said county and city approval happen in 2018 and March 2019 is the Department of Ecology's final approval.

McLaughlin said this recent legislation was a nod to the fact that Demand Management is not a solution with tonnage increases in a 37-city system and that service in the northeast part of the system requires a station. He says the division has a lot of work ahead of it, needing to work with cities to determine what station is appropriate for the region. Marshall commented that the search for a new northeast station is like the 70 percent recycling goal and we are chasing our tails again since we are no farther along today than we were in 2004 per the documents he found from his predecessor. McLaughlin said he was encouraged where the division is at especially since a host city has already expressed interest and there is growing support. McLaughlin says we have progressed significantly in the last three years. Garber said sites cannot be limited to Kirkland per SEPA; since Redmond is the centroid of waste generation (in that area), the division will get pushback from Woodinville and Redmond and may have to go through a process with appeals and the Supreme Court. Garber said sites cannot be limited to Kirkland, because SEPA requires that the county look at alternative sites. She said it would make sense to determine the centroid of waste generation in the NE area, which is probably Redmond and Woodinville, and may have to go through EIS appeals, including a Superior Court appeal. Garber said as project manager for numerous siting studies, she knows that by complying with the law and involving the public, you can get through the siting process.

Moorehead said the ILA must be signed by Bellevue by October 31; and all things seem to be indicating Bellevue and the four Point Cities will sign so this issue will ultimately be resolved in the next few months, which is great news from the division's perspective. Bunzendahl asked, to Marshall's point, could the division just be explicit as to how they're going to combat nimbyism from a vocal entity that has hijacked the process and stay true to its environmental

and economic and social justice goals without spending millions of dollars and professional time against one strong, non-equitable entity.

McLaughlin cautioned against entering the 'doom loop.' He said planning assumptions have changed radically and economic uncertainties among the cities of the Sound Cities Association have changed. He agreed that Garber was correct – the division cannot say “we’ll just build it here.” He said Kirkland has been a great host and is open to continuing as a host city. He said the division remains committed to equitable service levels across the region and equitable distribution of impacts. The division has been listening to the advisory committees but was restricted from looking for a site, which was defunded until now. The division told the council what funds the division needed to evaluate NE area capacity and they gave it to the division. He said the next steps are to work with stakeholders and advisory boards to design the process. McLaughlin said he cannot answer whether we will build another station like the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station or maybe the division will need two stations, or would those be enclosed or with compactors, or FEMA-certified. He said the division does not yet know what best solution is – whether it is in Redmond, Kirkland, or Woodinville.

Kelly suggested members drive to Algona to see what an antique looks like. He said transfer stations are the backbone of the disposal system. He said Algona had been in discussion for five years and this new station could be a 10-year process, wrestling with the concerns of vested stakeholders. He said making transfer stations work well is the most critical piece to operate and manage. Marshall said he appreciates the comments and maybe this is the time. He noted the northeast region is expected to have 17-22 percent growth each year and asked if this process could be expedited or would the division invest in the aging Houghton station. McLaughlin said if the division needs to make investments in the interim, it will.

Marshall said a Houghton transfer station that includes self-haul and commercial is what the complaints are about; it brings too much traffic through a residential neighborhood. He said Redmond and Woodinville are not as accessible for haulers. Marshall said commercial haulers should stay where they are and self-haul should get a new station. Garber said when the Shoreline station was sited, everyone was up in arms, and now they love it; in Bellevue, everyone loves Factoria. She is convinced Algona will love their new transfer station. She said people really love having one, they’re proud of it – it makes them a green city. Garber asked what role the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum (SWIF) will have. She said there is one person on it – a powerful person – who does not want a new transfer station in Redmond. She said this person has direct connections with council staff. She wishes we could break the cycle. Moorehead said the Regional Policy Committee is acting as the SWIF. The Comp Plan goes to Regional Policy Committee first, relying on their recommendation for county council action. Garber then commented that maybe Marshall is right.

Kassover asked who nominates members of the Regional Policy Committee– was it county council? Moorehead said it was created when Metro and King County merged. Krista Carmenzind from Councilmember Balducci’s office said three KC Council members nominated by the Council are on the RPC – the chair and two other council members, two members are from Seattle, and six members are from the suburban cities. These members are nominated by the Sound Cities Association. Garber commented they seemed to have all the power while

SWAC had none. McLaughlin said SWAC has the power to advise. Livingston pointed out there is an RCW that gives SWAC standing by state law.

Moorehead said the SWAC members could provide additional comments on the Comp Plan during the public review period.

As for Chapter 7: Finance Goal and Policies, Livingston said he attended a MSWMAC meeting and reported they preferred a smaller rate increase on an annual basis instead of every few years.

In regards to Chapter 6: Disposal Policies, Moorehead said there are three choices presented and a sequence of actions to follow: the draft plan goes out to the public with the three options, then a decision will be made by the Executive that will be informed by public comment.

Edits to the Comp Plan before it goes for public review are due on November 3.

Kelly asked if it was okay that the next SWAC meeting will be on November 17 from 9 a.m.–11 a.m. There was a unanimous vote.

Dawson had two questions – she asked what happens with the public comments and what happened to the public comments for the scoping comments on the DEIS. Moorehead said MSMWAC requested that comments would be track changes for the word edits such as where ‘shall’ should be ‘should’ and policy comments would be discussed at the November 17 meeting with a list of distilled comments. Humphreys said next month comments from everybody will be in tracked changes and in a responsiveness summary and again after the public review period. She said the Department of Ecology need to see the comments as well. She said as for the scoping document for the DEIS, the document is still being finalized. Moorehead acknowledged Humphreys great work.

Moorehead presented the updated timeline of the Comp Plan to indicate there are a lot of opportunities to send comments to Humphreys.

Waste to Energy Study

McLaughlin began his presentation on the Normandeau Waste to Energy Study by saying this presentation is not a comparison of the three long-term disposal options the county is exploring but rather sets the stage for discussion beginning with learning the purpose of the study and its core scope, what the highlights of the study are, and what the division’s next steps are. He said Normandeau Inc. was chosen due to the fact they already had a state contract and in writing the report, Normandeau worked with other experts in the Waste to Energy industry.

McLaughlin explained division staff looked at the options and recognized the division had gaps in knowledge and experience when it came to Waste to Energy. The division needed to know if we choose the Waste to Energy option what would be the best technical solution, the costs, the expenses, and the revenues. Kelly asked why does the project scope go out to 2048 while the ILA goes to 2040. McLaughlin said the Comp Plan gives us a look at a 20-year window and he noted Waste to Energy has a lifespan farther than that. Garber asked if the consultant had

asked owners of potential waste-export landfills about rail capacity and greenhouse gas emissions, because the landfill owners could provide site-specific answers. Pat said that he didn't know for sure if the consultant had spoken directly to the waste export landfills, but the division had given the consultant all of the contact information to consult with them.

McLaughlin noted that in a Waste to Energy project in Palm Beach, FL where landfilling is difficult due to their low water table, Waste to Energy preserves green space by reducing the volume of garbage by 90 percent. Revenues from Waste to Energy vary by region. He also noted Waste to Energy has a very high capital cost.

McLaughlin said we have ILAs thru 2040 which require us to provide disposal services and yet the Cedar Hills Landfill is projected to reach capacity by 2028. Current forecasts predict tonnage will double in the next 50 years. The division currently processes 260 tons per day. Knowing this, if the division chose Waste to Energy as a long-term disposal option, the division would have to decide to which capacity level they ought to build the facility. If it is built for maximum capacity there will be a lot of unused capacity for the first twenty years of operations. He also said there may be an option to build the system for today's capacity and landfill the rest. For the purposes of this study, the focus is on maximum capacity with an option to sell excess capacity to other regions.

McLaughlin noted not all Waste to Energy technologies are proven or scalable, so for now, of those options reviewed in the study, mass incineration seemed to be the most feasible for the division with a focus on minimizing by-pass waste and progressively build capacity. He described advanced screening techniques to recover alloy and non-alloy metals from the ash magnetically. He said one of the biggest challenges would be landfilling the ash and how to get it there largely because the rail lines between King County and the four nearest landfills that could take the ash waste are nearing capacity.

Livingston asked what would happen if we were under contract and rail capacity was exceeded, what would the division do? McLaughlin said when we under such circumstances, service levels would be impacted. He recalled this past winter when 400 rail cars could not move on the rails due to ice storms. He noted railroads are a private enterprise and they would figure out how to meet their demand. He said currently haulers have contracts with the rail lines and they would have the experience. Ristau asked if railroads are at capacity with or without us in the system. McLaughlin said without us. Bunzendahl asked if King County has baseline criteria on which landfills we would use. McLaughlin said they would be Subtitle D Landfills, like Cedar Hills, lined and with gas collection. Garber said the four landfills are in arid areas and have lower decay rates and lower gas generation. She doubts aridity formulas for these landfills were used in this study.

McLaughlin said we are in the early phases of this process. Analysis of the study is still underway and the sixth chapter of the Comp Plan is still in draft. Normandeau Inc. will soon present their study. Dammann asked for a date. McLaughlin said probably sometime the first week of November. Marshall commented that if the division found it hard to site a transfer station, it will be even tougher to find a location for a mass burn facility. Garber said when she was last tasked with siting an incinerator, her life was threatened.

Open Forum

Phillip Schmidt-Pathmann commented that 4 percent of the recovered metals were ferrous, and .4 percent were non-ferrous. He said upwards to 10 percent of the bottom ash is used in Europe as aggregate to build roads and runways and there are many applications for it. The study makes 27 recommendations on what can be done with different models.