

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
Meeting Summary
July 20, 2005
King Street Center**

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Susan Fife-Ferris – City of Bellevue
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Peggy Dorothy – County Council Staff
Mike Huddleston -County Council Staff
Jeff Gaisford - SWD
Kevin Kiernan - SWD
Theresa Koppang - SWD
Diane Yates - SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD

I. SWD Updates

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said that Chair Garber has asked for a city staff person to provide an ITSG update each month at the MSWMAC meeting.

Yates said that vacation schedules are going to make an August meeting to begin discussions of the ILAs/Governance issues impractical. She will work on scheduling a meeting in September.

II. Draft of Report Four Planning Assumptions

Lead Planner Theresa Koppang described the six classic steps of a conventional planning process as they relate to waste export.

1. Data Gathering: Reports One through Three were part of this step.
2. Define Assumptions: This is what we are working on now.
3. Data Analysis: For example, examining the feasibility of rail, barge and trucking transportation options.
4. Evaluate Alternatives and Options: This involves forming specific packages of options, narrowing the range of choices and identifying policy decisions that must be made and who is responsible for those decisions.
5. Policy Making: Decision makers step make the choices identified in the last step.
6. Implementation: The selected option in implemented.

The current step is defining assumptions. In the context of the planning process, the word “assumptions” has a more specific meaning than its general definition. In planning, assumptions are the basic facts that form the basis for analysis and decision making. Planning assumptions often consist of the conclusions from previous analysis.

ITSG discussed the first category on the Revised Draft Report #4 Waste Export Planning Assumptions. ITSG recommended adding an assumption to the Planning Assumptions section that would read “The planning horizon for the waste export system plan is twenty years.”

ITSG recommended the Landfill Capacity Assumptions section should read:

Landfill Capacity Assumptions

1. All mixed municipal solid waste (MMSW) generated in King County currently is disposed at Cedar Hills Landfill, and will continue to be disposed by landfilling after Cedar Hills closes.
2. A new solid waste landfill will not be sited by King County.
3. Landfilling is the least expensive method of MMSW disposal.
4. Landfills designated for waste export in the final export system plan will meet the standards of existing and projected environmental regulations.
5. In conformance with the current adopted Site Development Plan and EIS, Cedar Hills will be filled to its current permitted capacity.
6. The division will extend the useful life of the Cedar Hills Landfill through operational efficiencies.
7. The timing of Cedar Hills’ closure determines the timeline for transfer system improvements.
8. If waste continues to be disposed at Cedar Hills Landfill at the current rate, then it will reach capacity and have to close in the next decade.
9. ITSG did not reach consensus on the inclusion or deletion of this item, originally written as, “All King County waste will go to Cedar Hills until it closes.” Part of the discussion over this Assumption is captured below, and discussion of this Assumption will continue at the next meeting of the ITSG.
10. The division will analyze the option of preserving emergency capacity at Cedar Hills for backup after closure.
11. Existing landfills outside of King County have legally permitted capacity to handle King County waste for at least 20 years.
12. Solid waste generated within King County (outside the boundaries of the Cities of Seattle and Milton) will need to be transported to an out-of-county disposal site once Cedar Hills Landfill closes.

13. There are three independent companies that operate landfills in the local market. They are expected to bid competitively when King County's waste is marketed.

ITSG also discussed the creation of a second list, the “bucket list” of items that are not assumptions, but that should be flagged for policy makers, whose choices may alter the assumptions.

The bucket list items are as follows:

- Alternative disposal methods exist for exported waste, however landfilling is the method of choice in the current comp plan.
- Expanding Cedar Hills’ permitted capacity by construction of additional cells would require policy changes and new permits.
- Settling of solid waste and operational efficiencies at Cedar Hills Landfill may provide additional capacity within current permits.

In relation to proposed Assumption #9, ITSG discussed whether early waste export should be considered as an option. Based on two factors- 1) annual feasibility studies and 2) preserving waste export competition does not depend on early closure of Cedar Hills Landfill, the division believes that early export cannot be cost effective. Bellevue suggested that these two considerations replace assumption #9, but also wanted to review the studies referred to by the division. The division agreed to provide ITSG with the most recent report evaluating early export. Bellevue also raised their concern that Assumption #9 as currently proposed would preclude the consideration of phasing in waste export if it becomes impractical to bring on-line the necessary transfer system for waste export. Bellevue felt by allowing for early export and prolonging the useful life of Cedar Hills, the entire system might benefit.

Yates offered to schedule another meeting so that ITSG could continue discussion of the assumptions in advance of the August MSWMAC meeting. ITSG asked the division to poll MSWMAC to determine whether a quorum would be present for the August 12th meeting. Yates will e-mail members.

ITSG agreed to meet again on Wednesday, July 27, from 10-12 at King Street Center. The division agreed to provide ITSG with draft minutes of the July 20 meeting in time for members to review the notes before next Wednesday.