

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group**  
**Meeting and Governance Discussion Summary**  
**July 27, 2006**  
**King Street Center**

**Meeting Attendees:**

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Alison Bennett – 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  
Amy Ensminger – City of Woodinville  
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff  
Mike Reed – Council Staff  
Theresa Jennings - SWD  
Diane Yates - SWD  
Gemma Alexander - SWD  
Jeff Gaisford – SWD  
Bill Reed - SWD

**I. Review Agenda and Finalize June 28 Notes**

June 28 meeting notes were approved by consensus.

ITSG reviewed the agenda and agreed to try to work through the complete agenda. ITSG members agreed to save time for the recycling discussion in particular.

**II. Updates**

Bellevue is the ITSG member scheduled to present the ITSG update at MSWMAC's August 11 meeting. Due to scheduling conflicts, Kirkland staff may give the update instead. City staff will coordinate to determine who is to give the update.

The division received one comment on the Waste Export System Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). As a result, responding to comments will not take as long as expected and the final EIS will be completed ahead of schedule.

The division's recommendations for the Waste Export System Plan have been sent to the three hauling companies. Waste Management has not responded yet. Waste Connections and Allied responded that they do not have any comments.

The division has requested time on the Regional Policy Committee's (RPC) September agenda to discuss recycling options and the Waste Export System Plan recommendations.

**III. Effective Meetings**

Some ITSG members said they are frustrated by these meetings. Concerns mentioned included:

- Failure to complete agendas, resulting in additional meetings
- Meetings delayed due to members' late arrival
- Some members feel their comments are ignored, or feel uncomfortable voicing opinions
- Emphasis on consensus slows decision making process

ITSG discussed a variety of options to make meetings productive for everyone, including having meetings facilitated or selecting a member to chair ITSG. Everyone agreed that outside facilitation or a formal chair position is not necessary. ITSG members discussed several steps to improve meetings:

- Highlight action items on the agenda to help members prioritize topics.
- Begin each meeting by reviewing the agenda to decide how to spend time.
- Have the division note when the allotted time for an agenda item has passed.
- Be conscious of time during the meeting and speak up if a topic is taking too much time.
- Welcome everyone's contributions.
- Be willing to ask questions.
- Begin each agenda item with a brief introduction, providing context for discussion. Responsibility for this introduction belongs to the person most involved in the topic.
- Before beginning discussion of a topic, check with members for context – has everyone read the relevant documents, and did everyone understand the introduction?
- If extra meeting time is necessary, it may be preferable to extend the length of meetings rather than schedule additional meetings.

Several members highlighted the importance of asking questions, especially in a group with varied backgrounds. ITSG agreed that the concerns of members who have been frustrated are related to process and do not invalidate the work that ITSG has done so far. All agreed that this conversation was useful in creating an atmosphere that welcomes full participation of all members.

#### **IV. Draft Waste Export System Plan and Business Plan**

ITSG discussed the schedule for completing and approving these documents, as well as the third party review, and how long it might take council to review and approve them. ITSG decided not to spend meeting time reviewing the draft Waste Export System Plan. Members will submit their comments on the plan to the division in writing by Tuesday for inclusion in the next draft, and will review the plan again at a later date.

ITSG members felt that the draft Business Plan, which precisely follows the requirements of the ordinance, does not meet the intent of the ordinance. The division agreed to add a more detailed introduction to the document explaining that it has been prepared in response to Section B of Ordinance 14971, and will be followed by a traditional business plan four months after the Waste Export System Plan is approved. ITSG members felt the topics covered in this document should be included in the later business plan as well. A draft of the new introduction will be available next Friday. The name of the document will also be changed since it is not a traditional Business Plan.

Council staff Mike Huddleston commented that several of the topics in this document received cursory treatment, in particular: Environment, Emergency Capacity and Reliability, Impacts on Employees and Benefits of a Federated System. He felt this last topic should include the county's reliance on cities to implement recycling programs.

## **V. Recycling Goals**

The purpose of today's discussion is to introduce the topic of overall recycling goals. No decision is expected until after cities have had a chance to discuss the strategies that would be required to achieve various goals.

The recycling document that ITSG edited at its May 10 meeting will be incorporated into the Waste Export System Plan appendices, and is summarized in today's handouts. That document dealt with the impact increased recycling rates would have on the transfer system and the life of Cedar Hills.

ITSG members asked for a thorough discussion of multifamily recycling issues, noting that multifamily recycling rates are low and multifamily housing is expected to increase in the future. It was noted that measurement methodologies (relating to yardwaste) differ for single and multifamily, complicating comparison of their recycling rates.

ITSG discussed the history of the recycling goal and the reasons why the division would want to have both an overall percentage and a per capita goal. ITSG members expressed concern at the introduction of the "Zero Waste of Resources" concept, noting that few policy makers are familiar with the term. Despite the fact that the division has already demonstrated that tonnage will not decrease during the planning horizon, and the fact that transfer stations could become integral to expanded recycling programs, the term "Zero Waste of Resources" may connote "zero garbage" to many people unfamiliar with trends in recycling. This would be counterproductive when the division is recommending construction of several new transfer facilities.

ITSG discussed alternative methods of introducing the topic of recycling goals to MSWMAC. ITSG suggested the division should use the document developed in May as an introduction, and present an overview of the goals in the current comp plan, together with the county's performance relative to those goals. ITSG members agreed to email comments on the remainder of the handouts from today's meeting identifying any parts that are useful for the August MSWMAC presentation.

## **VI. Rate Study**

Division economist Tom Karston presented the rate study in a PowerPoint available at: [http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Rate\\_Study\\_Draft\\_July.ppt](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Rate_Study_Draft_July.ppt)

The main purpose of the rate study is to project future short and long term rates. Capital costs consistent with Package One are included in the model for the study. The model assumes closure of the Cedar Hills Landfill at the end of 2016. If the life of the landfill is extended beyond 2016, rate increases may be smaller than currently forecast. The division will perform a capacity study next year to examine the potential life of Cedar Hills.

Since 1999, two rate increases have been postponed to maintain the division's current rate. A rate increase in 2008 is due whether or not the Waste Export System Plan is implemented. The Waste Export System Plan will only impact the amount of the rate increase.

The rate study will be transmitted to council together with the Waste Export System Plan and other documents by September 28.

**VII. Next Steps**

The next ITSG governance meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 1 from 10-12. The cities plan to continue to caucus. Huddleston may be asked to attend to answer questions.

The next pre-MSWMAC ITSG meeting will be scheduled by email. The division will look for available dates on any day of the week, including Fridays.