

Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
Meeting and Governance Discussion Summary
October 3, 2006
King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue
Tom Spille – City of Bellevue
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Kristn McArthur – City of Redmond
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff
Mark Buscher - SWD
Diane Yates – SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD
Jeff Gaisford – SWD
Jane Gateley – SWD
Josh Marx – SWD
Tom Karston - SWD
Theresa Jennings – SWD
Kevin Kiernan - SWD
Sandra Matteson - SWD

I. Review Agenda and Finalize Notes

ITSG amended the September 20th notes to include the assignment of MSMWAC updates for October and November. The draft September 20th minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

Everyone present introduced themselves.

II. Updates

Kevin Kiernan discussed the status of the Bow Lake Transfer/Recycling Station Facilities Master Plan. A neighbor who owns land surrounding the transfer station has appealed the mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance conclusion of the EIS that was prepared for the Master Facilities Plan. The division is preparing its response to the issues raised in the appeal. The Master Facilities Plan cannot be forwarded to council before SEPA issues are resolved.

The Transfer and Waste Export System Plan has been transmitted and hard copies have been prepared for mailing to the advisory committees. There are a limited number of extra copies, so a second printing may be necessary if many people want additional copies.

III. Comp Plan Schedule

The rate study, titled “Executive Proposed Solid Waste Disposal Fees 2008-2010,” is available and was transmitted on Thursday, September 28. If approved, the new rates will take effect in January, 2008. The proposed rate increase is for a three year period. The Comp Plan will include rate projections for a twenty year period.

Planning Supervisor Mark Buscher gave a powerpoint presentation on the proposed draft schedule for updating the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, available at: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Schedule_10-3-06.ppt

The schedule included milestone reports in addition to the legally mandated process steps. The four milestone reports that have been identified are:

- Waste Reduction and Recycling Goals and Issues
- Cedar Hills Landfill Capacity
- Analysis of Long Haul and Intermodal Transport Issues
- Conversion Technologies (analysis of Waste to Energy)

ITSG clarified that there will be a qualitative difference between the reports. The WRR and Landfill Capacity reports will provide recommendations that will determine what direction to take in completing the Comp Plan. The Transport and Conversion Technologies reports will be more informational. Rather than specific recommendations, these two reports will identify a process and timeline for decision making after the Comp Plan is complete. Analogous to the process used for the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, all four milestone reports will be transmitted to council for review and approval. Also analogous to the milestone reports that were developed before, the milestone reports preceding the draft Comp Plan will identify alternatives but defer recommendations until the final plan is developed. The milestone reports will address the fundamental issues of their topics, but there will be additional details included in the Comp Plan.

Buscher commented that topics such as Conversion Technologies need to be addressed because there is a lot of interest in them. However, it is too soon to make decisions on these issues, so adoption of milestone reports should mean that the work done so far is adequate, and there is agreement about the next steps to be taken.

Alison Bennett of Bellevue suggested that if ILA discussions are completed, discussion of the WRR milestone report could begin in December. Nina Rivkin of Redmond commented that in January, the division should provide information in more of an outline format rather than a full draft so that ITSG can focus on the content rather than the language. ITSG agreed that it would be helpful to begin scoping the WRR milestone report at its October 24 meeting if there is time.

ITSG decided that an additional column should be added to the schedule for council presentations and action. It should also be clarified which topics are related to development of the milestone reports and which are for chapter development.

Huddleston commented that when council acts on the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, milestone report deadlines will be included in the legislation.

The division clarified that the proposed schedule is intended to be practical, but that ultimately the work will drive the schedule. If council asks for a briefing, it will be provided, and if additional work is identified, the schedule will be changed.

IV. Mitigation Funding for Cities

Jennings said the division routinely performs mitigation. In construction projects, elements such as sound walls, and the inclusion of aesthetic standards in the design, are forms of mitigation. Routine litter clean up and special parking arrangements for trailers are both ongoing mitigation in response to neighbors' concerns. During closure of the 1st

NE Transfer/Recycling Station for reconstruction, payments supporting additional recycling events were made to the four north end cities. The division distributed a handout that identified mitigation performed by the division. Mitigation projects are routinely funded through capital construction budgets, usually out of contingency. There is no dedicated mitigation fund.

The rate proposal that has been transmitted to council includes a budget of 75 cents per ton for ongoing mitigation. This is a placeholder number that was considered reasonable based on historical spending.

ITSG considered whether the division should develop uniform mitigation policies to replace the more ad hoc approach that has been used to date. Cities commented that policies would guarantee consistency and inform potential host cities' expectations for mitigation. Wastewater was mentioned as an example of a utility that has moved from an ad hoc approach to developing firm standard mitigation policies.

Bennett said that Sound Transit has a community development fund for relocating businesses that are displaced by capital projects and to compensate for financial impacts.

Huddleston said there must always be a balance between adequate compensation for host cities, and reasonable cost to ratepayers throughout the system.

Kiernan commented that host cities could ask for lower rates in their collection contracts because haulers spend less on short haul to collect from those cities.

VII. Next Steps

The next meeting is Tuesday, October 10 from 10-12, and will continue the cities' caucus on ILA issues. Subsequent meetings are scheduled for:

Wednesday, October 18 – ILA/Governance

Tuesday, October 24 – Pre-MSWMAC Planning

Wednesday, October 25 – ILA/Governance