

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Staff Work Group Meeting
Summary
June 29, 2005
King Street Center**

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Susan Fife-Ferris – City of Bellevue
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Linda Knight – City of Renton
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Marilyn Cope – Council Staff
Beth Mountsier – Council Staff
Jeff Gaisford - SWD
Kevin Kiernan - SWD
Theresa Koppang - SWD
Bert Tarrant - SWD
Diane Yates - SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD

I. SWD Updates

Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford reported that a recycling workshop was held on June 16 at the Tukwila Community Center to involve the cities in recycling planning and to help connect the planning processes for recycling and waste export. The workshop was well attended with good representation from many cities. Table sessions on strategies for dealing with target materials generated valuable input for the division, which is now working on next steps. These may involve issue papers on the strategies developed at the workshop, as well as formation of a subcommittee. Recycling planning, like waste management planning, will be an iterative process. The fourth report will include a sensitivity analysis to illustrate the effect of a reduction of tonnage from the current system and a description of the role the transfer stations will in play in future recycling services (e.g., level and types of services provided at transfer stations).

ITSG discussed the differences in the regulatory framework for siting transfer stations and material recovery facilities. Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue pointed out that municipalities can control the amount of garbage coming out of recycling facilities through contractual penalties for high residual rates. ITSG decided to postpone further discussion on this topic and plan to review cities' land use regulations/permitting requirements related to siting private recycling facilities at a later date.

Gaisford announced that the division has won three awards from the Solid Waste Association of North America. The awards were received for the division's electronics recycling program, landfill operations and landfill gas project design.

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates reported the ordinance changing Ordinance 14971 deliverables due date to April 30, 2006 was passed unanimously by the King County Council on June 20th. The third report is with the Executive's office and is

expected to be transmitted to Council soon. The division will send copies of the report together with copies of the transmittal letter and adopting motion to ITSG members.

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan asked if the ftp site worked for distributing meeting materials. Most cities said they were able to download the files from the ftp site. Kiernan commented that so many different computer systems are involved there may not be any one communication method that will work for everyone.

II. Development of the Fourth Milestone Report

Lead Planner Theresa Koppang referred ITSG to a handout containing a draft outline and timeline for the development of the fourth report, Preliminary Transfer and Waste Export Facility Recommendations. She said the division plans to develop the report in stages with review of the report also expected in stages because there is not enough time to wait until all the analysis is complete before beginning to write the report.

The answer to the question, “How does the work get done?” varies by chapter. Elements of the analysis such as comparisons between barge, trucking and rail for waste export are closer to completion than other components, and will be the first sections of the report written. Many of the options for the plan, for example service area alternatives for the Northeast Lake Washington geographic area, have been under consideration for years. Elements such as facility costs will require more analysis and be more time consuming. Private companies may not be forthcoming with cost data. In order to fully evaluate the range of facility options, the division may need to develop a number of cost estimates.

ITSG decided policy discussions should constitute a chapter in the report and be integrated into each chapter relating to policy issues. Identification of outstanding policy issues and shared assumptions will be the first step in development of the report. The Comprehensive Plan policy documents that Mike Huddleston submitted to ITSG and MSWMAC last month may serve as good references for this work.

ITSG agreed the first step in writing the report should be reaching consensus on shared assumptions, for example, that Cedar Hills will close. The division has begun to draft a list of possible assumptions for discussion. The list will include both technical and policy assumptions. The division will also prepare a draft list of definitions in order to avoid misunderstandings that terms like “self-haul” can cause.

III. ILA/Governance Discussion

ITSG discussed the decision-making process for reaching consensus in the development of the waste export system plan. Members confirmed that the role of ITSG is to inform and advise MSWMAC on technical matters while decision-making responsibility rests with MSWMAC, RPC and the county council. Ideally, ITSG members will confer with their cities’ policy makers so that their input at ITSG will be reflective of their

jurisdictions' position. In this way, consensus achieved at ITSG should move smoothly into the other groups.

Text from page 5 of Ordinance 14971 describes the contents of a report that ITSG must produce. This report is separate from the four milestone reports the division must produce. ITSG discussed whether monthly general meetings would be sufficient for the amount of work that must be done. It was agreed that ITSG will not reactivate the governance subcommittee, but will continue to meet as a whole. Regular monthly meetings will be supplemented with additional meetings to discuss ILAs and Governance. Diane Yates will schedule the meeting by email. ITSG members should provide her with names of their cities' intergovernmental staff to invite to this meeting. Members will also attempt to ensure that appropriate staff from their cities participate.

IV. Criterion 17 Recommendations to MSWMAC

Kiernan explained that the second traffic criterion in the Criterion 17 Application table contains no data because a huge level of effort was required to collect the data. Police records of traffic incidents are readily available, but the difficulty is separating transfer station traffic from regular traffic in analyzing the incidents at relevant intersections.

In response to a question about the maps on pages 12 & 13 of Report Three, Kiernan replied that since the regional direct fee changed, the maps have become obsolete. The current data is reflected in the tonnage tables. The division is transitioning to a new cashing system that may delay generation of updated maps.

ITSG questioned the importance of Criterion 17 in relation to other criteria. The broad question of whether the station is compatible with surrounding land use is broken down into components. Without ranking the components, it is difficult to evaluate their role in decision making. ITSG decided not to make a recommendation because weighting the components of the criterion constituted a policy choice that was not appropriate to the Technical Staff Group.

ITSG considered whether First NE and Enumclaw Transfer Stations should be included in the distribution of tonnage and transaction analysis. ITSG recognized that Enumclaw is underutilized, and discussed whether policy choices such as rate incentives could encourage commercial haulers to use the station more. The point was made that the facility's remote location would remain a disincentive to customers, and that ITSG should not make recommendations on a principle that is at odds with reality. Commercial companies may be more likely to open additional private stations rather than travel to a remote facility. ITSG also considered the point that a long term planning process should allow for changing conditions over time. Policy makers may determine that equal distribution is not a priority. Transfer stations in residential areas may be assigned lower thresholds than stations in industrial areas. ITSG decided data cannot be discarded without knowing what policy choices will guide the use of the information. ITSG recommended that all seven stations be included in the analysis.

Note:

The division suggests you might check with the IT folks at your work site and explain you want to download documents from the KC website. Some people may be having trouble because special permissions or clearances are needed to allow files to be downloaded.