

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 11, 2005

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Jeff Viney	City of Algona	Councilmember
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Brad Miyake	City of Bellevue	Utilities Director
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Gary Sund	City of Bothell	Utility Engineer
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Councilmember
Linda Kochmar	City of Federal Way	Deputy Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Jim Lauinger	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Councilmember
Glenn Boettcher	City of Mercer Island	Maintenance Director
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Lys Hornsby	City of Renton	Utilities Director
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Paul Haines	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Director
Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager
Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Manager
Jeff Gaisford, Recycling & Environmental Services Manager
Neil Fujii, Managing Engineer
Diane Yates, MSWMAC Staff Liaison
Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff
Roxanne Malatesta, Solid Waste Division staff
Tami Litras, Solid Waste Division staff

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

Dave White, Acting Waste Export Project Manager

King County Council Staff

Peggy Dorothy, King County Council Staff
Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Elaine Borjeson, City of Kirkland

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05.

3

4 **Introductions**

5 Those in attendance introduced themselves.

6

7 **Approve January Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

8 *MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin moved that the January minutes be amended at page 4, line*
9 *113 by striking the word ‘chair’ and inserting ‘MSWMAC.’*

10

11 Rivkin said it was her intent that MSWMAC as whole, rather than just the Chair, should decide
12 at each meeting whether it would aid discussion of an agenda item to have an outside party
13 present at the next meeting. Chair Garber commented that this can be tried for awhile as long as
14 the agenda for the next meeting is known.

15 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

16

17 **King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Update**

18 MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini noted that SWAC would be devoting its entire meeting
19 next Friday, February 18th, to the transfer system level of service evaluation criteria and would
20 make an attempt to rank the criteria by order of importance.

21

22 **Bylaws – Discussion and Adoption**

23 Garber noted that while the draft bylaws contain provisions for voting that differ from Robert’s
24 Rules of Order, the bylaws would be approved according to Robert’s Rules using a simple
25 majority vote.

26

27 MSWMAC staff liaison Diane Yates said the Solid Waste Division staff had provided the
28 Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) with examples of SWAC’s and the
29 Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee’s (MWPAAC) bylaws as a
30 starting point for developing MSWMAC’s bylaws.

31

32 Garber said she would go through the bylaws article by article and asked that anyone wanting to
33 request changes be specific when proposing amendments.

34

35 *MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza moved to adopt the bylaws.*

36

37 *MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway seconded the motion.*

38

39 **Article I: Name:**

40 *MSWMAC member Jon Spangler moved that the word “Management” be added to the title.*
41 *The motion passed unanimously.*

42

43 **Article II: Purpose:**
44 Armanini asked about the purpose of the text on page one lines 18 to 20 regarding MSWMAC
45 defining a relationship with SWAC.
46
47 Solid Waste Division Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan said that the ITSG’s Report
48 on the Function, Structure and Responsibilities of MSWMAC included language about the need
49 to define the relationship between the two advisory committees.
50
51 Rivkin said it was intended to address issues that were raised but weren’t necessarily intended to
52 be included in the bylaws.
53
54 *Armanini moved to strike lines 18-20.*
55
56 *The motion passed unanimously.*
57
58
59 *Spangler moved to strike the text at pages one and two, lines 22-25.*
60
61 *Armanini seconded.*
62
63 *The motion passed 14 to 1, with Kirkland opposing.*
64
65 **Article III: Membership:**
66 *Spangler moved to add text at page 2, lines 36, that ‘new participants must provide ten days*
67 *notice for eligibility to vote.’*
68
69 *The motion died for lack of a second.*
70
71
72 *MSWMAC Vice-Chair Joan McGilton moved to add at page 2, line 36, ‘Director or designee,’*
73 *after the word ‘Division.’*
74
75 *Greenway seconded.*
76
77 *The motion passed unanimously.*
78
79
80 *Armanini moved that the same language be added at page 2, line 37.*
81
82 *MSWMAC member Lys Hornsby seconded.*
83
84 *The motion passed unanimously.*
85
86
87 **Article IV: Officers:**
88 *McGilton moved that the term for chair and vice chair be one year.*
89
90 *Greenway seconded.*
91
92 *Armanini made a friendly amendment that the term be for one calendar year.*
93

94 *The motion passed unanimously.*

95

96

97 **Article V: Meetings:**

98 *Section III: Quorum:*

99 *McGilton moved to strike the text at page 3, line 64, ‘in excess of 40%’ and insert the words,*
100 *‘a majority.’*

101

102 *Peloza seconded.*

103

104 MSMWAC member Linda Knight asked if it was a majority of those present or all the members.

105

106 Garber said a majority of the full membership would need to be present in order for the
107 committee to take action, so nine cities would need to be present.

108

109 *The motion passed unanimously.*

110

111

112 *Armanini moved to strike the text at page 3, line 64, “For the purpose of voting.”*

113

114 *The motion passed unanimously.*

115

116 *Section IV: Voting:*

117 *Greenway moved to strike the text referring to weighted voting at page 3, lines 69 to 76.*

118 *Peloza seconded.*

119

120 Greenway said that Kirkland would always be at a disadvantage in a weighted vote. Every
121 participant should have equal weight. When consensus is not possible, a simple majority seems
122 fair.

123

124 Peloza stated that a weighted vote is administratively cumbersome and unfair. All represented
125 cities should have one vote. MWPAAC uses one vote per member, which works very well.

126

127 MSMWAC member Brad Miyake stated that Bellevue would oppose the amendment on the
128 principle of fairness. A larger city has more constituents.

129

130 MSWMAC member Linda Kochmar said Federal Way agrees with Bellevue; that weighted
131 voting provides for more fair representation of constituents.

132

133 Armanini said that it is easier to function with a popular vote rather than an electoral-college
134 type vote. She noted that Suburban Cities Association has also stepped away from using
135 weighted voting.

136

137 Garber said she would support the motion. Each city has an Interlocal Agreement with the
138 county for solid waste management and planning and has an interest in the future of the solid
139 waste system. She said that a cost-effective, well-managed system for one is the same for all.
140 Small and large cities are capable of objectivity and each city can have impact by the strength of
141 its arguments.

142

143 *The motion passed by a vote of 12 to 3 with Renton, Federal Way, and Bellevue opposing.*

144

145 *Section 5: Proxy*

146 In response to a question, it was noted that a city may appoint a new representative or alternate
147 at any time and that the new member would be able to vote. There is no limitation on the
148 number of representatives or alternates a city may appoint.

149

150 **Article VII: Parliamentary Authority (Rules of Order)**

151 *Armanini moved to strike the text at page 4 lines 112 - 113, 'The Open Public Meetings Act,'*
152 *and the word 'two.'*

153

154 *Greenway seconded.*

155

156 Armanini stated that MSWMAC is not subject to the Open Public Meetings Act and had
157 decided at its January meeting that attendance by outside parties would be on an invitational
158 basis.

159

160

161 *The motion passed unanimously.*

162

163

164 **Article VIII: Amendment of Bylaws:**

165 *Garber moved to add to the text at page 5, line 123, 'with a 2/3 majority vote.'*

166

167 *Greenway seconded.*

168

169 In response to a question, Garber said it would be a 2/3 majority vote of those members present.

170

171 *The motion passed unanimously.*

172

173

174 Garber said if there was no further discussion of the bylaws that the group would proceed with
175 voting on the main motion

176

177 *The motion to adopt the bylaws as amended passed by a vote of 13 to 2 with Renton and*
178 *Bellevue opposing.*

179

180

181 **Waste Export System Plan Process:**

182 Kiernan referred members to their notebooks and the tab on ordinance deliverables and
183 deadlines. He went over the four milestone reports due to council leading up to the December
184 15, 2005 due date for the Waste Export System Plan.

185

186 The second report on the Analysis of System Needs and Capacity is due to the King County
187 Council by April 15th, which means it needs to be submitted to the Executive by March 15th.
188 The motion approving the first report on the Transfer System Evaluation Criteria and Standards
189 set the due date for the second report.

190

191 The division plans to have a draft of the second report out to MSWMAC the first week of
192 March.

193

194 The third report is the Analysis of Options for Public/Private Ownership/Operations of the
195 Transfer System and Intermodal. The ITSG targeted June 15th as the tentative due date for this
196 report.

197
198 The fourth report has a tentative due date of September 15th.

199
200 The division has begun meeting with Rabanco/Allied and Waste Management and is also
201 involving Waste Connections, which has an intermodal facility in south Seattle. The division
202 will also be talking to the Unincorporated Area Councils.

203
204 The second report will be the focus of today's presentation. The intent of the second report is to
205 identify when a transfer station needs to be upgraded in place, relocated or a new transfer station
206 needs to be built.

207
208 Tables presenting descriptions of the evaluation methodology and the results of applying the
209 criteria to each of the five urban stations were distributed.

210
211 McGilton asked that revision dates and page numbers be included in a footer in future
212 documents.

213
214 Kiernan said that 16 criteria have been applied to five sites. While the rating for whether each
215 station meets the 16 criteria is shown as a simple yes or no, the answer is much more complex
216 than that. All the supporting data collected and analyzed for this work will be contained in
217 appendices with the second report.

218
219 In response to a question about how the 100 foot buffer was determined, Kiernan responded that
220 it is a standard used by the division even though it applies to new facilities and used to be in the
221 Washington Administrative Code.

222
223 MSWMAC member Jim Lauinger asked about Criteria No. 1, Maximum Travel Time to a
224 Transfer Facility. Lauinger said he would expect it would take those coming to the Houghton
225 Station from Sammamish, Woodinville, and Redmond longer than 30 minutes.

226
227 Kiernan responded that urban islands outside of the Urban Growth Boundary were not included.
228 The distinction was that if you don't live in the contiguous urban area, you're not receiving
229 urban levels of service. GIS staff looked at posted speed limits and direct routes within 30
230 minutes. Self-haulers tend to not want to drive long distances or for a long time.

231
232 Kiernan went over the service area map that showed the service area for each facility

233
234 In response to a question, Division Director Theresa Jennings said that commercial haulers will
235 go to the facility with the shortest travel time combined with the shortest wait since they are
236 trying to achieve the lowest hourly cost. In general, self-haulers go to the closest station.

237
238 Kiernan discussed the division's waste reduction/recycling goal of zero waste of resources,
239 which is not to say zero garbage. It means that any material having value would be removed
240 from the waste stream. The more material that is diverted from disposal, the fewer rail cars will
241 be needed for export. Recycling can affect what is done with transfer stations. Providing the
242 household hazardous waste services at Factoria has added, on average, 60 to 120 cars/day at the
243 facility. The renovated First NE station will have separated yard waste for recycling and that
244 will add to space needs. So, it will be important to look at how recycling is integrated.

245

246 In response to a question about transfer station recycling services for commercial haulers,
247 Kiernan said that currently there is only space at most stations for self-haulers to drop off
248 primary recyclable materials.

249

250 Kiernan said that the cost of providing recycling services at the stations is low if space is
251 available. If added space is needed to provide the service, then the cost of providing the service
252 can be high.

253

254 Jennings said the bigger subsidy for providing service to self haulers is in disposal.

255

256 Kiernan said that the transfer stations fill a gap in services. In looking at travel time, the choices
257 are to build more roads or build more transfer stations.

258

259 Knight said that small businesses use the transfer stations for recycling since curbside collection
260 of recyclables is not available to many of them.

261

262 *Criteria 8: Space exists for station expansion*

263 The division evaluated space availability for each site within existing property lines and on
264 adjacent property.

265

266 In response to questions, Kiernan said that the division looked at availability of physical space,
267 not ability to get permits. The capital cost for the 1st Northeast Transfer/Recycling Station
268 reconstruction is approximately \$22 million. Houghton and 1st Northeast are comparable in that
269 they're both in residential areas.

270

271 In response to a question, Jennings said that First Northeast handles 60,000 tons/year and
272 Houghton handles 175,000 tons/year.

273

274 *Criteria 9: Roof Clearance*

275 The Factoria and Houghton station roofs were designed and built in the mid-1960s.

276 Commercial trucks are much larger now than they were 40 years ago. When the haulers try to
277 fully tip their loads, they hit the structural supports, damaging the roofs. The division recently
278 repaired the roofs but they keep getting hit.

279

280 *Criteria 10: Safety*

281 All the stations rated a 'No' for meeting the safety criteria. This does not mean that the stations
282 are operating in an unsafe manner, but that efficiency is reduced in order to operate safely.

283

284 *Criteria 11: Ability to accommodate waste export*

285 The most cost effective way to accommodate waste export is to have compaction at transfer
286 stations in order to load compacted trash onto trains. Alternatives are to export un-compacted
287 waste or to re-handle waste, which means taking waste collected at the transfer stations to a
288 facility where it is compacted and loaded onto rail cars. Both these alternatives are more
289 expensive than compaction at transfer stations.

290

291 Installing compactors may be difficult at all stations. For instance, it would be difficult to install
292 a compactor at the Algona Transfer Station where you have steep slopes on one side and a
293 highway on the other side.

294

295 *Criteria 13: Noise*

296 Kiernan said there is a noise study for each of the 5 stations being evaluated. The study will be
297 included in the technical appendices for the second report.

298

299 Houghton does not meet the noise criteria for 2 reasons. One, the activity is close to the property
300 line and two, the station is in a residential area where noise limits are lower and the standard is
301 more stringent.

302

303 At the Factoria Transfer Station the activity, and therefore noise, occurs close to the property
304 line. However, the facility is in a light industrial area and the standard isn't as stringent.

305

306 *Criteria 17: Subjective Criteria*

307 Kiernan said the ITSG classified these criteria as subjective and thought they should be
308 forwarded to MSWMAC for consideration.

309 1. Land use compatibility: This can be looked at objectively by considering traffic impacts
310 to the surrounding community, landscaping and complaint history on noise and odor -
311 both complaints called in and regulatory action.

312

2. Aesthetics.

313

3. Sensitive areas: Impacts are arguably not subjective. They can be objective if based on
314 local critical areas ordinances.

315

4. Regional Equity: Some city staff thought other public facilities in addition to transfer
316 stations need to be included in this discussion.

317

318 Armanini said that depending on where you draw from, some people see a transfer station as an
319 amenity. They're great for those who want a place to take a load of trash or recyclables.

320

321 Greenway said that a new transfer station would not be sited in a residential area because it is
322 not compatible.

323

324 Garber said that you have to look objectively at what contributes to compatibility - noise, odor,
325 traffic, safety, views, landscaping, etc. Garber said she will work with staff to develop a
326 proposal for addressing these criteria.

327

328 Kiernan said these facilities will be in a community somewhere.

329

330 **Next Steps**

331 Members decided to keep the March 11th meeting date. If some members are not able to attend
332 because of other obligations, Garber suggested their cities appoint an alternate.

333

334 Garber said that every member represents its council and should come with their council's input.

335

336 Pelosa asked that action items and the next meeting date be identified on future agendas.

337

338 **Adjournment**

339 The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

340

341 Submitted by:

342 Diane Yates, MSWMAC Staff Liaison