

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**January 11, 2006**  
**King Street Center**

**Meeting Attendees:**

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue  
Rick Watson – City of Bellevue  
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way  
Erin Leonhart – City of Kirkland  
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond  
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac  
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff  
Beth Mountsier – Council Staff  
Peggy Sanders – Council Staff  
Kevin Kiernan - SWD  
Theresa Koppang - SWD  
Gemma Alexander - SWD  
Diane Yates - SWD

**I. Review December Minutes**

The December 14 minutes were approved without changes.

**II. Draft 4<sup>th</sup> Report Discussion**

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said the revised draft showing track changes, together with the responsiveness summary, will be available Friday. On Wednesday, MSWMAC will discuss the new draft and select its Chair and Vice Chair for 2006.

Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said the division will not include an executive summary in this draft of the report, but will provide one by the end of January.

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan said the division had received comments from several cities, MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber, and haulers. Most of the comments were received late yesterday, and the division has not had time to review them. He said official written comments would be included in a responsiveness summary and all edits for the next draft of the report will be shown in a single set of tracked changes.

ITSG briefly discussed comments from the haulers. In general, the haulers seem to want improvements to facilities while maintaining existing roles in the system. Rabanco was interested in seeing more analysis of public/private options, and wanted to see analysis of early export integrated into the report more fully. Council staff Mike Huddleston commented that it is natural for companies that own disposal facilities to want to use them. It was noted that benefits of early export identified so far are not economic, for example, preserving emergency capacity. Kiernan said that Rabanco strongly recommends siting intermodal facilities where there is access to both rail lines. That would place a facility between Harbor Island and the south county line.

ITSG discussed the economic analysis, which extends to 2028 when the Interlocal Agreements (ILAs) expire. ITSG agreed that the results of the analysis may be different if a longer time frame is analyzed. Capital investments in the system would last beyond 2028, but in the current analysis, those costs must be recouped by 2028. The haulers have said that pricing would be affected by contract terms less than 20 years. Further, any operating efficiencies resulting from capital investments will continue beyond the ILA terms, and the current analysis will not capture the full effect of those savings.

ITSG agreed that the current financial analysis through 2028 was necessary, and also agreed that analysis through a later date would be helpful to understanding the real system costs and impacts. ITSG agreed that a longer period of analysis would reveal differences among the packages that may not be apparent in the initial analysis. Several possible dates were suggested for analysis. Huddleston suggested there should be discussion of extending the ILAs to a date tied to Cedar Hills' closure. This would provide the 20 year contract term necessary to achieve the best contract.

ITSG considered the obstacles to compactor installation at existing stations and the long term impacts of exporting uncompacted waste. Kiernan said that haulers have said there is not a big impact from exporting small amounts of uncompacted waste, but would not quantify the tipping point where the impacts become significant. Huddleston commented that over time, self-haul tonnage is likely to grow past that unidentified tipping point.

Nina Rivkin of Redmond asked what will happen if the implementation schedules are not met before export begins. Kiernan said that although it is costly, waste export can begin before all transfer stations are equipped with compactors.

ITSG discussed the relationship between Level of Service traffic criteria and self haul. Although self haul customers on average bring only 20% of the tonnage to transfer stations, they make up 80% of the traffic. Most self haul customers have curbside service and are using the transfer station for activities such as cleaning out the basement. Yates distributed copies of the customer survey to cities that stayed after the break.

Council Staff Beth Mountsier asked about reload facilities. Kiernan replied that at this point it is speculative whether reloading is more or less expensive than exporting uncompacted waste. He said it would depend in part on whether the situation was permanent and on the specifics of the contract.

Huddleston commented that at MSWMAC the haulers said they did not want to build to public standards or to provide self haul service. He suggested that the report include a preamble laying out several rules of thumb:

- Uncompacted waste costs more to export and dispose than compacted waste
- Front-loading capital costs will reduce operational costs
- Staffing needs are different for commercial, self-haul and full service stations
- Private companies tend to negotiate with railroads more successfully than the public sector

ITSG discussed railroad negotiations. Rivkin commented that Sound Transit's negotiations resulted in huge cost overruns. Kiernan said that Sound Transit was at a disadvantage because it needed commuter trains that would run at specific times. Solid waste is more flexible because trains can run at any time. Mountsier commented that intermodal siting with access to both rail lines will help in negotiations. Rivkin asked for analysis of the possibility of more than one intermodal facility.

ITSG reviewed the comments on the draft report that were submitted by MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber. There was discussion about her comment relating to regional equity statements in the Addendum to Report 2. ITSG agreed that this was a topic for MSWMAC to address.

Huddleston asked about assumptions for capital improvements at stations that will be maintained as self-haul in some of the packages. Kiernan said that, for example, at Algona the assumption is that no changes will be made, although at some point in the future it would be necessary to replace the pilings.

Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said that all of Garber's comments, as well as written comments received from the cities, will be included in the responsiveness summary that will be available on Friday. The responsiveness summary, like the report itself, will be a draft that will be revised.