



Management Coordination Committee (MCC)

MEETING MINUTES

October 21, 2025

Item 3

ATTENDANCE

MCC Members:

- ☒ Dylan Orr, Public Health – Seattle and King County (PH SKC), MCC Chair
- ☒ Rebecca Singer, King County Solid Waste Division (KC SWD), MCC Vice Chair
- ☒ Josh Baldi, King County Water and Land Resources Division (KC WLRD)
- ☒ John Boyd, Sound Cities Association (SCA), City of Kent Councilmember
- ☒ Susan Fife-Ferris, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

Other Attendees:

Amanda Miller, KC WLRD	Katie Swanson, SPU	Michell Mouton, KC WLRD
Anahi Sandoval, KC WLRD	Kendrick Stewart, KC WLRD	Monica Ayers, KC WLRD
Andy Smith, KC SWD	Kerwin Pyle, KC SWD	Myles Perkins, PH SKC
Charles Wu, KC WLRD	Kristen Wieland, Resource Recycling Systems (RRS)	Nicole Chardoul, Resource Recycling Systems (RRS)
Dave Ward, KC WLRD	Laura Belmont, SCA	Nolan Kappelman, KC WLRD
Enrique Gonzalez, KC WLRD	Linda Morales, KC WLRD	Pam Johnson, SPU
Halima Lozano, KC WLRD	Matthew Weintraub, KC WLRD	Ray Samonte, KC WLRD
Jourdan Keith, PH SKC	Maythia Airhart, KC WLRD	Trevor Peckham, KC WLRD
Julie Mitchell, KC SWD		

GENERAL BUSINESS

Introductions and Announcements

There were no introductions or announcements this month.

MCC Meeting Minutes

MCC Member Susan Fife-Ferris moved to approve the meeting minutes for August 19 and September 16, 2025. Councilmember John Boyd seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved. During the approval, MCC Chair Dylan Orr asked how the group can track items in prior minutes that require follow-up and suggested establishing a clearer way to identify whether outstanding items have been completed or information has been provided.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Hazardous Waste Collection Services Wastemobile

Presenter: Julie Mitchell, Solid Waste Collections Project Manager

Collection Service Program Manager Julie Mitchell, provided a high-level overview of the Wastemobile program, noting it is part of the Program's collection services for residents and small quantity generators outside fixed facility service areas. She clarified that the Wastemobile is not a roaming truck but a permitted two- or three-

day mobile collection event. Julie summarized event frequency, attendance, setup and operations, materials collected, and storage procedures.

MCC Member Susan Fife-Harris (SPU) asked about site specifications and space needs; Julie provided examples and followed up with additional details in the meeting chat.

MCC Member Josh Baldi (WLRD) raised marketing questions about whether the mobile collection program name “Wastemobile” accurately reflects the service and if rebranding could expand reach. MCC Member Councilmember John Boyd (SCA) expressed similar concerns. Julie deferred to the Communications Team, who noted the topic has been considered and will require follow-up. Josh also asked whether events could be longer; Julie said additional analysis would be needed.

Councilmember Boyd asked about arranging a site visit; Julie agreed. He also asked about the origins of the Algona build-out, and Julie noted that a transfer station already existed at that location.

Dylan asked whether the program is meeting current demand. Julie emphasized the need for better ways to determine true demand. Dylan suggested exploring opportunities tied to life events (moving, estate cleanouts, etc.) to better understand needs.

Josh asked whether co-locating services at the Vashon Transfer Station is feasible. He requested Solid Waste follow up on a comparison between co-location and continued mobile setup. Susan added that service delivery options should reflect the broader Haz Waste Program, not fall solely on Solid Waste.

Collection Services and Facilities Study

Presenters: Dave Ward, Policy & Planning Manager; Linda Morales, Program Planner; Kristen Wieland, Resource Recycling Systems (RRS), Consultant; Nicole Chardoul, Resource Recycling Systems (RRS), Consultant

1. Overview of Study Purpose and Facilities Study (Dave Ward, Policy and Planning)

Policy and Planning Manager Dave Ward began the presentation by providing broader context for the Collection Services and Facilities Study and explaining how it fits into the larger chain of activities to assess and improve collection services. This work builds on:

- the service equity analysis reported earlier this year,
- market research conducted by the Communications team, and
- the community needs assessment prepared by RRS.

Dave noted that the study provides an independent external assessment of current collection services and facilities, with recommendations for improvements as well as capital project and equipment needs. These items will require future discussion on prioritization and funding.

2. Study Development and Draft Report (Linda Morales, Policy and Planning)

Policy and Planning Program Planner Linda Morales explained that the consulting firm RRS conducted the analysis and prepared the final recommendations, which were compiled into the draft final report included in the meeting packet. MCC members’ review and comments are due November 4, 2025.

3. Consultant Methodology and Key Findings (Nicole Chardoul and Kristen Wieland RRS Consultant Team)

RRS consultant staff Nicole Chardoul and Kristen Wieland presented the study’s methodology and approach. Kristen noted that RRS and START Consulting partnered on data collection and demographic surveying beginning in 2024.

RRS developed individual task reports that reflected findings related to facility and community needs. Those informed a synthesized set of 27 recommendations organized around:

1. Enhancing user experience and increasing participation,
2. Assessing fixed and mobile facility needs through 2035, and
3. Estimating capital and facility maintenance costs.

4. MCC Member Questions and Discussion (MCC Board Members)

Josh Baldi, WLRD, MCC Board Member - Josh asked how the program is meeting the public where they are, and whether curbside collection was assessed. He also asked for examples from other states and noted interest in pop-up models. RRS responded that curbside is referenced under recommendations to improve accessibility, and shared examples from other jurisdictions.

Dylan Orr, Public Health, MCC Board Chair - Dylan expressed interest in curbside pickup and costs, referencing Seattle's home collections program. RRS clarified that recommendations include adding three operational days at the north facility and expanding home collection to Sundays and potentially evenings. RRS added that cost analysis was limited to capital improvements.

Susan Fife-Ferris, SPU, MCC Board Member - Susan commented that many recommendations lack deeper fiscal feasibility and options analysis. She raised concerns about the absence of operational alternatives for fixed facilities and limited analysis of the north facility's constraints, including staff facilities. She also noted that service-improvement recommendations lack feasibility evaluation, and the report does not compare capital costs to recent regional facility projects or best practices for facility design. Susan also shared disappointment that SPU's initial suggestions were not reflected in the draft and questioned the analytical depth of the recommendations. RRS stated they would incorporate SPU's feedback.

Susan added a few more comments after the meeting to reflect SPU's concerns:

- **No options analysis or systems review for current collection system as a whole, nor for future facilities improvements.** It is impossible to take recommendations from this study and understand what combination of fixed facilities and services are the best options based on feasibility, cost, and reaching the goals outlined by the study. The set of recommendations presented seem to be just a list to pick from.
- **The recommendations on service improvements include a list of ideas direct from the community without analysis of feasibility, cost, and how it fits into the overall system.** It falls short of the statement of work.
- **The only costs included in the study are tied to facility improvements – and those are minimal at best. No cost estimates for increased labor and operating expenses for other recommendations.**
- **No comparison to other facilities in region that have had recent upgrades or new construction.**
- **No best management practices for facilities design documented.**
- **There are no significant changes from the previous drafts SPU provided comments on.** It appears that SPU's initial suggestions have not been incorporated.

Rebecca Singer, SWD, MCC Vice-Chair - Dylan asked Rebecca for questions; she noted her concerns align with Susan's and will provide further comments after reviewing the hard copy.

Follow-up on Dave's Introductory Table - Susan asked about separating services and capital investments in the table. She stated these should be considered together. Dave clarified that operational and physical improvements must be evaluated jointly, and the table was intended to illustrate different pathways and how they could be sequenced.

UPDATES

Director's Report & Look-Ahead Calendar

Presenter: Maythia Airhart, Program Director

Program Director Maythia Airhart highlighted key items from the Director's Report and shared a three-month look-ahead calendar. Members were encouraged to review the full report for additional updates.

MCC Chair Dylan Orr noted that he and MCC Member Susan Fife-Harris will be unavailable in November and suggested rescheduling the Executive Session; Maythia will follow up with him.

Susan asked who will conduct the next alternatives assessments included in the roadmap, whether the work will require a new contract or be done in-house, and what the anticipated timeline is, noting her expectation that study findings would inform capital planning. Maythia will follow up to discuss.

Next Meeting: November 18, 2025, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, Zoom Teleconference.