

Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
Governance Discussion Summary
June 14, 2006
King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue
Cary Roe – City of Federal Way
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
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline
Amy Ensminger – City of Woodinville
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff
Beth Mountsier – Council Staff
Grover Cleveland – DNRP Director’s Office
Kevin Kiernan - SWD
Diane Yates - SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD

I. Introductions

Everyone present introduced themselves.

II. Review of Governance Report Requirements of Ordinance 14971

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported that the legislation amending the report due date is tentatively scheduled for action by the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee next week.

Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way began the discussion by saying that Ordinance 14971 provides for nonbinding discussions of governance issues. The ordinance identifies a number of issues for discussion. The ordinance does not state what role MSWMAC may have beyond reviewing the report.

Intergovernmental Staff Liaison Diane Yates said that MSWMAC wants to receive regular updates from ITSG’s city members. MSWMAC intends to discuss its role in the governance discussions at its July meeting.

Cary Roe of Federal Way said the basic question is whether or not the cities are satisfied with the ILAs and their role in the solid waste system.

ITSG reviewed Section 2, lines 96-107 of the ordinance and confirmed the list of issues:

- Potential modification or replacement of the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum
- Dispute resolution options
- Development of a framework for financial policies and host city mitigation
- Evaluation of the Waste Export System Plan’s impact on provisions of the ILAs
- Identification of potential amendments to the interlocal agreements.

ITSG members agreed that the issues discussed should not be considered “city issues” or “county issues,” but should be considered beneficial to all parties involved. As an

example, Nina Rivkin of Redmond said that extending the life of the ILA's could benefit the county by allowing longer bond terms, and benefit the cities with lower rates.

Grover Cleveland of the Director's Office and Kiernan noted that the County's primary goal in the discussions was to help build and improve the relationship between the cities and the County.

ITSG members agreed that the primary outcome of this process should be a system that allows the division to operate efficiently, and the development of plans that can be implemented.

ITSG discussed the cities role in the solid waste system, and whether cities are "customers" or "partners."

In response to a question, Kiernan said that the cities are responsible for the collection part of the solid waste system and that the division cannot manage the rest of the system without the cities' approval of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

Rivkin commented that relationships between the division and the cities have improved dramatically in the past two years, and that those relationships are more important to developing an effective system than the specific terms of a contract.

Roe asked whether the County was willing to engage on discussions about dispute resolution provisions of the ILA. Cleveland said the county is willing to engage with the cities on any topic that they feel is important.

III. City Caucus

County staff left the room for the cities to caucus.

IV. Post-Caucus Discussion

The cities asked if the Waste Export System Plan can be implemented without a completed Comp Plan update.

Kiernan responded that portions of the Waste Export System Plan that are consistent with the current Comp Plan, such as construction of the new Bow Lake Transfer Station, can proceed. Elements of the Waste Export System Plan that are inconsistent with the current Comp Plan, such as construction of a new South County Transfer Stations and partial early export, would have to wait until the Comp Plan is approved. Implementation of the Waste Export System Plan is unlikely to be delayed by this because there is enough work to keep the division busy until the Comp Plan is completed.

The cities asked the division to provide a fact sheet on Waste To Energy (WTE). Kiernan replied that the division cannot provide a fact sheet at this time because is has not done the analysis on WTE yet.

ITSG discussed how WTE fits into the planning process. ITSG members agreed that WTE is a disposal option that must be thoroughly analyzed as part of the Comp Plan. The Waste Export System Plan deals primarily with the transfer system, and does not

foreclose any disposal method. Whatever disposal method is chosen in the Comp Plan Update, an improved transfer system will be needed.

Council staff Mike Huddleston offered to draft a brief paper for the cities that will outline where WTE fits into the planning process and will provide a list of the analysis questions.

V. Next Steps

The next regular ITSG meeting is June 28 from 10-12. The next ITSG meeting dedicated to governance issues will be June 28 from 12-2. The meeting will continue today's agenda.