

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 8, 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>
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Gary Sund	City of Bothell	Utility Engineer
Dave Zabell	City of Bothell	Public Works Director
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Councilmember
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Councilmember
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Lys Hornsby	City of Renton	Utilities Director
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Valarie Jarvi	City of Woodinville	Maintenance Supervisor
Mick Monken	City of Woodinville	Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Director

Brad Bell, Landfill Operations Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Manager

Diane Yates, MSWMAC Staff Liaison

Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff

Josh Marx, Solid Waste Division staff

Bert Tarrant, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Dorothy, 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 12:10.

3

4 **Introductions**

5 Those in attendance introduced themselves.

6

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

8 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway complimented the accuracy of the March minutes and
9 requested that lines 295-296 be changed to read, “Kiernan noted that the paragraph may be
10 better at the front of the report, and MSWMAC concurred.”

11

12 **MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton moved to approve the minutes as amended.**

13

14 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

15

16 Garber thanked MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini for chairing the March meeting.

17

18 Garber divided agenda item five, Motion on Analysis of System Needs/Capacity Report, into
19 5A and 5B, with 5B to consist of two motions on due dates.

20

21 Garber suggested that the committee discuss inviting the haulers to MSWMAC’s May meeting
22 as part of agenda item eight.

23

24 **SWAC Update**

25 Armanini reported the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) concurred with MSWMAC
26 that ranking criteria is not appropriate at this point in the process. SWAC supported extending
27 the waste export system plan deadline to April 30, 2006. SWAC unanimously passed a motion
28 supporting the current iteration of the Analysis of System Needs and Capacity report. Armanini
29 reported MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton may apply for the newly created second local
30 elected official position on SWAC.

31

32 **SWD Update**

33 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that on April 6 she, Jean Garber, and
34 Kevin Kiernan attended the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) meeting and presented
35 information on the second report.

36

37 Jennings said the Division has been meeting with the haulers to discuss the second and third
38 reports. The Division will also be meeting with all the unions that represent Division employees
39 on April 29.

40

41 **Analysis of Transfer Station Needs and Analysis Report**

42 **McGilton moved approval of the current iteration of the draft report on the Analysis of**
43 **Transfer System Needs and Capacity with the changes made by MSWMAC at its March**
44 **11, 2005 meeting.**

45

46 *The motion passed unanimously.*

47

48 Garber referenced Ordinance 14971 and said that in addition to changing the due date for the
49 Waste Export System Plan from December 2005 to April 30, 2006, there are three other
50 deliverables on pages 4-6 for which the due dates should be changed. Garber noted the
51 Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) has recommended these due dates be changed
52 to coincide with the due date for the Plan.

53

54 **Armanini moved that MSWMAC recommend the County Council amend Ordinance**
55 **14971 to change the following three dates from December 31, 2005 to April 30, 2006: (1)**
56 **the date through which the ITSG shall advise MSWMAC (line 84); (2) the date by which**
57 **ITSG shall provide a report on its findings and recommendations on the various issues**
58 **associated with interlocal agreements (line 92); and (3) the date by which the interlocal**
59 **forum or its successor shall make a recommendation on whether or not the ITSG should**
60 **continue (line 110).**

61

62 *The motion passed unanimously.*

63

64 Garber said report three is purely identification of public/private options for the waste export
65 system, and will not contain any recommendations. A June 30 deadline for report three will
66 allow MSWMAC one additional meeting to review the report before it is transmitted to the
67 Executive and County Council.

68

69 **Armanini moved that MSWMAC recommend the county council establish June 30, 2005**
70 **as the due date for the third milestone report.**

71

72 *The motion passed unanimously.*

73

74 MSWMAC Staff Liaison Diane Yates said an ordinance will be drafted amending the due dates.

75

76 **Recycling Briefing**

77 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford asked how the cities want to be
78 involved in planning for the future of recycling. He said the same kind of work ITSG has been
79 doing for waste export planning needs to be done for recycling. In the past, the Division worked
80 with haulers, SWAC and city recycling coordinators for recycling planning. The Division
81 would like to add MSWMAC to that list.

82

83 Gaisford said ITSG discussed options for involvement at their March 30 meeting, including:

- 84 1) Form a subcommittee for discussion of recycling issues.
- 85 2) Hold one or two workshops to identify future strategies for increasing diversion from the
86 waste stream. The Division would also welcome input in planning the workshops from
87 MSWMAC and ITSG.
- 88 3) Develop a list of strategies for presentation to the cities for review. This option would
89 require less involvement from the cities.

90

91 Gaisford said ITSG liked the idea of a workshop that would bring elected officials and staff
92 together, and some members have volunteered to help with planning. Workshops were effective
93 in a prior comprehensive solid waste management plan update process. If MSWMAC agrees,
94 the Division will solicit involvement from SWAC and the recycling coordinators as well.
95 Involvement by email only is encouraged for those who cannot attend.

96

97 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza said it is a great idea to learn more about recycling by getting a
98 workshop together.

99

100 In response to a question, Gaisford said the workshop would be open to all cities as well as the
101 Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), which includes representatives from the
102 commercial collection companies, labor and business. The first workshop would be a broad
103 discussion of the background and current trends in recycling.

104

105 Armanini asked about the desired result of the workshop.

106

107 Gaisford said the workshop is to lay a foundation, first informing those involved about the
108 current system, then generating input on strategies for the future. This requires the same kind of
109 detailed study that the export planning process involves. The Division also needs input on
110 workshop planning to make sure the right topics get included.

111

112 McGilton said the next step is to go beyond primary recycling, and mandatory recycling should
113 also be discussed.

114

115 Jennings said recycling rates have peaked over the last few years. Significant policy decisions
116 will have to be made to determine the future direction for recycling programs.

117

118 Greenway asked whether the Division's goals are to increase cities' participation in existing
119 recycling programs or to increase the number of materials recycled.

120

121 Gaisford replied that under the current Solid Waste Division Comprehensive Solid Waste
122 Management Plan all cities follow some standards for recycling and residential service is fairly
123 uniform. Beyond that, recycling varies by city. More materials vs. efficient collection of
124 current materials, and whether action is required by the county or the cities are questions that
125 need to be addressed.

126

127 Greenway said a workshop is certainly best for education, and asked about next steps.

128

129 Armanini said workshops may result in the determination that a committee is needed.

130

131 The committee agreed the Division should proceed with planning the initial workshop.

132

133 Gaisford said a room at the Tukwila Community Center has been tentatively reserved for both
134 Wednesday June 15 and Thursday June 16 pending responses from cities on which date works
135 for the most people.

136

137 MSWMAC member Don Henning asked about public input. Solid Waste Division Engineering
138 Services Manager Kevin Kiernan replied that SWAC, which includes citizen representation
139 from both incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county, will be invited to the workshop.

140 Garber added that the comprehensive planning process also includes citizen input.

141

142 Gaisford said the Division has collected data on customer behavior and performed surveys of
143 customer opinions that can be used in planning.

144

145 **Criterion 17: Other Local and Regional Considerations**

146 Garber said Criterion 17 is a continuation of the Level of Service Criteria for the Analysis of
147 System Needs/Capacity report evaluating the current transfer system, and does not address
148 siting new transfer stations.

149

150 Garber referred members to the handout “Objective Criteria for Evaluating Subjective
151 Considerations Under Criterion 17- Preliminary Draft” as well as comments submitted by
152 Auburn and Kirkland.

153

154 Garber said she developed the criteria for Land Use Compatibility by looking at Environmental
155 Impact Statements (EIS’s) on transfer stations and other solid waste projects to see how the
156 issue of compatibility with surrounding land use was addressed. Typically, the factors
157 considered in determining land use compatibility were consistency with land use plans and
158 zoning regulations, aesthetics, noise, odor, traffic, and sometimes air and water quality.

159

160 *Consistency with Land Use Plans and Zoning Regulations:*

161 Greenway said Kirkland was concerned that transfer stations be compatible with surrounding
162 land uses.

163

164 Garber said transfer stations are not inherently incompatible with residential or recreational use.
165 There must be reasons for incompatibility, such as noise, odor or traffic, which are addressed by
166 other criteria. Garber suggested leaving this criteria, which only addresses consistency with
167 land use plans and zoning regulations, unchanged, and addressing issues of noise, odor,
168 aesthetics and traffic under subsequent criteria.

169

170 In response to a question, Garber said the criterion refers to the land use plan of the community
171 in which the station is located.

172

173 Greenway commented that Kirkland may be unique in that each neighborhood has a chapter in
174 the comprehensive plan. Their comprehensive plan would not include specific land use
175 descriptions.

176

177 Armanini said the Growth Management Plan covers this situation. No city has a “transfer
178 station” zoning category. The stations must be located in urban areas to meet a level of service
179 standard criterion stating everyone should be within 30 minutes of a transfer station. Transfer
180 stations are an important part of the system. People want them to be convenient, and the Growth
181 Management Act requires cities to accommodate them.

182

183 Greenway said the criterion, as written, only means that a station isn’t illegally sited, which is
184 pointless. The real question is whether stations are appropriately sited.

185

186 Garber said some cities have industrial zoned areas where transfer stations are permitted
187 outright, but in most cases transfer stations are sited under a conditional use or special use
188 permit that considers whether the station is unreasonably incompatible with surrounding land
189 use as determined by factors such as aesthetics, noise, odor, traffic, air quality, and water
190 quality. The purpose of the preliminary draft criteria is to attempt to objectify the legitimate
191 question of compatibility.

192

193 Garber said she believes it is worthwhile including Consistency with Land Use Plans and
194 Zoning regulations as a criterion to determine whether any existing stations are non-comforming
195 uses and would therefore not be expandable.

196

197 In response to a question, Garber replied that Division staff should be able to apply the objective
198 criteria and bring the results to the May MSWMAC meeting.

199

200 Greenway said Kirkland wants meaningful criteria that don’t automatically result in a ‘yes’ for
201 every station.

202

203 Garber said Houghton would likely receive a ‘no’ under the first aesthetics criterion.

204

205 Greenway explained that the reason she was participating on this committee was not to get
206 “no’s” for Houghton, but because she wanted to help develop a solid waste system that serves
207 the needs of *all* cities.

208

209 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the proposed criterion for Consistency with Land Use**
210 **Plans and Zoning regulations.**

211

212 *Aesthetics:*

213 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka said Auburn would like to add “Cleanup as deemed
214 necessary by the host City shall be the full responsibility of the station operator,” to the second
215 point under Aesthetics.

216

217 Garber commented that it is important to remember that the criteria are being applied to existing
218 transfer stations. She suggested that the comment be phrased, “The Solid Waste Division
219 implements dust and litter control measures to minimize offsite impacts.”

220

221 Hlavka replied that the purpose of the comment is to clarify that the host city determines what
222 constitutes necessary control measures and the county implements them.

223

224 Armanini said the criteria need to be measurable in order to evaluate what already happens. The
225 comment, as written, is not measurable.

226

227 Garber said the criterion must address the question, “Is there a dust or litter problem?”

228

229 Pelosa suggested adding the phrase “pursuant to host city standards” to assign power to the
230 cities to determine what is sufficient.

231

232 Kiernan said that use permits in some cities do specify litter pickup practices.

233

234 Landfill Operations Manager Brad Bell said two stations have made litter pickup arrangements
235 with cities. The Division employs one full time staff person to pick up litter at Houghton. The
236 Division maintains an area on the West Valley Highway where Algona is located. Jennings said
237 the Division has a litter crew specifically to keep the area around the stations clean.

238

239 Greenway suggested adding “effective” to the criterion.

240

241 Garber read the amended point two under Aesthetics, “Effective dust and litter-control measures
242 are implemented by King County to minimize offsite transfer station-related dust and litter.”

243

244 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the two proposed Aesthetics criteria with the above**
245 **amendment.**

246

247 *Noise:*

248 Armanini commented that the first criterion under Noise is the same as Criterion Thirteen.

249 Garber responded that it is deliberately the same in order to indicate that this issue is already
250 considered by existing criteria.

251

252 Garber said it is virtually impossible to locate a facility in a community without increasing the
253 noise level. The goal is to keep noise at a level that doesn’t impact other uses. She suggested
254 using the federal criteria for significance typically used in EIS’s. Although federal criteria for
255 significance are not really applicable here, because no federal permits or funding are involved,
256 they are often used in EIS’s to indicate the significance of noise impacts. For example, under
257 EPA guidelines, if a facility increases noise levels by over 5 dBA, it is considered a significant
258 impact, while under FHWA guidelines, if a facility increases traffic noise so it approaches or
259 exceeds 67 dBA in residential areas, it is considered a noise impact.

260

261 Kiernan said that some data are already available from analysis of Criterion 13, so the Division
262 can do this analysis.

263

264 Pelosa withdrew Auburn’s comment on this criterion.

265

266 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the two proposed Noise criteria.**

267

268 *Odor:*

269 Greenway supported Auburn’s suggested change to Odor criterion 1, which added the words,
270 “Odors shall not be discernible beyond the transfer station property line.” She said that
271 basically this criterion measures whether odor impacts quality of life.

272

273 Garber commented that while she believes it is the Division’s goal to avoid any detectible odor
274 beyond the transfer station boundary, odors will happen.
275
276 Armanini pointed out that the language “shall not” is directive and not evaluative.
277
278 Garber suggested adding “and odors are not detectable” to the end of point one.
279
280 Jennings said this is similar to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) standard for a
281 detrimental odor used for Criterion 14. Kiernan read the standard:
282
283 ... any air contaminant in sufficient quantities and of such characteristics and duration as
284 is, or is likely to be, injurious to human health, plant or animal life, or property, or which
285 unreasonably interferes with enjoyment of life and property.
286
287 He said the suggested addition may be more appropriate on point two, which concerns results,
288 instead of point one, which concerns practices.
289
290 Jennings said duration is the issue. The Division can’t avoid receiving a smelly load. The
291 question is then whether the Division takes immediate action to eliminate the odor.
292
293 Garber said it sounds like the PSCAA standard covers the issue.
294
295 Pelosa supported Kiernan’s suggestion to move the additional phrase to point two.
296
297 Garber said odors will at times be discernible. The question is do operational best management
298 practices deal with it?
299
300 Hlavka said some days a station may meet the criterion and other days not.
301
302 Garber replied that it is hard to measure inconsistent results.
303
304 Greenway said both points are important because confirmation by regulatory agencies is hard to
305 get. Agencies rarely go out to verify complaints.
306

307 Garber asked how else measurements can be made. She said it is a practical issue. No odor
308 beyond the station property line is a good goal, but it is not a criterion that can be applied to
309 existing stations in a meaningful, measurable way.

310

311 Kiernan said there have been odor complaints against the transfer stations that were from other
312 sources. For example, one complaint was verified as resulting from a nearby vector operation.
313 Some element of verification is necessary to ensure that the transfer station is really the source
314 of the odor.

315

316 Jennings said the Division takes odor seriously and has staff trained in this area.

317

318 In response to a question, Kiernan said the Division will begin applying the criteria as soon as
319 they are finalized.

320

321 Greenway said in reality one stinky load isn't the problem. The problem is full trailers sitting
322 onsite on hot days.

323

324 Jennings said the Division has a system in place to ensure that trailers are removed within
325 twenty four hours.

326

327 Greenway said Kirkland has a new complaint procedure. When their code enforcer receives a
328 complaint, the complaint is confirmed by letter, because PSCAA doesn't verify all complaints.

329

330 Garber said the Solid Waste Division has a hotline for citizen complaints.

331

332 Bell added that the Division investigates every complaint it receives and keeps careful
333 documentation of each investigation.

334

335 MSWMAC member Mick Monken said existing criteria thirteen through sixteen cover these
336 concerns. He asked why seventeen is repeating the same work, since a 'yes' or 'no' in 13-16
337 automatically makes 17 also a 'yes' or 'no.'

338

339 Garber replied that some of the criteria are deliberately redundant in order to point out that
340 previously applied criteria are important components of land use compatibility.

341

342 Pelorza withdrew Auburn's comment on Odor.

343

344 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the two proposed Odor criteria.**

345

346 *Traffic:*

347 Garber said the comments submitted by Auburn are siting criteria for new facilities rather than
348 evaluation criteria for existing facilities.

349

350 Hlavka agreed that the comments were siting criteria and do not belong in Criterion 17. She
351 said that Auburn did want to make sure these concerns were covered somewhere in the process.

352

353 Garber acknowledged their concern and asked members to bring these criteria to the table when
354 siting is discussed.

355

356 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett suggested adding language to the beginning of Criterion 17
357 clarifying that it provides evaluation standards for existing stations and not siting criteria. The
358 group agreed.

359

360 MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder said the word "neighborhood" should be removed from
361 point two.

362

363 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the three proposed Traffic criteria with the above**
364 **amendment.**

365

366 *General:*

367 Garber said she called Ecology and confirmed that WAC 173-340, which contains specific
368 buffer standards, is no longer applicable to transfer stations. The currently applicable rule is
369 WAC 173-350, which includes only performance standards.

370

371 Greenway suggested changing point two to read, "Transfer station meets all state and local
372 regulations governing design and operation of transfer stations."

373

374 **MSWMAC approved by consensus the two proposed General criteria with the above**
375 **amendment.**

376

377 *Regional Equity:*

378 Garber said she hoped that one of the three standards would be chosen. She preferred the option
379 that referred to impact area.

380

381 MSWMAC member Dave Zabell said from an environmental standpoint, the impacts of side by
382 side public facilities would be about the same.

383

384 Armanini said the criterion should measure whether a facility receives a fair share, or generally
385 proportional share of tonnage and customers.

386

387 Garber said the term regional equity originated in the discussion over building an incinerator,
388 and is now a consideration in solid waste facility siting.

389

390 Armanini commented that although everyone wants a transfer station within 30 minutes drive,
391 this criterion assumes that transfer stations are undesirable.

392

393 Jennings said the Division can easily provide data on service area, population and tonnage.

394

395 Greenway said it is appropriate for stations to be geographically dispersed so that each serves
396 similarly sized populations and receives similar tonnage. For example, if there are eight service
397 areas and one of them generates 25% of the region's tonnage, there is not regional equity.

398

399 Jennings agreed that this criterion doesn't address whether service areas are appropriately sized.

400

401 Kiernan said the criterion addresses equity within a service area, but should look at equity
402 between service areas.

403

404 **MSWMAC agreed by consensus to eliminate all proposed criteria for Regional Equity,**
405 **and to develop a new criterion for equity between service areas in terms of tonnage**
406 **received.**

407

408 Garber asked staff to take a first cut at developing the new criterion and get it out to the group to
409 comment on before the May MSWMAC meeting.

410

411 *Critical Areas:*

412 There was no comment on this standard.

413

414 **Analysis of Public/Private Options for Transfer and Intermodal Facilities**

415 Kiernan presented a diagram illustrating the current transfer system. Currently construction,
416 demolition and landclearing debris (CDL) is entirely privatized. Recycling is primarily
417 privatized. When Cedar Hills closes, the region's waste will be sent to a distant private landfill.
418 The discussion of public/private options will deal with transfer and intermodal functions.

419

420 Kiernan said the Division has met with Waste Management and Rabanco, and will meet with
421 Waste Connections. The Division has developed a summary of alternatives from these
422 discussions, which the haulers are currently reviewing.

423

424 Kiernan said transfer station needs could be met by public construction, private construction, or
425 some mixture of the two. An intermodal facility includes several functions, primarily 1)
426 weighing/cashiering, 2) putting containers on trains and 3) building trains. Each of these
427 functions could be performed by either the public or private sector. The Division will provide
428 MSWMAC with the summary of these options.

429

430 In response to a question, Kiernan said Waste Connections provides waste collection on Vashon
431 Island and in Pierce County. They also own a landfill, and recently purchased an intermodal
432 freight facility in Seattle.

433

434 Garber said MSWMAC will not make decisions on report three in May. The June 30 due date
435 will allow one extra meeting for discussion, and it may be useful to have the haulers present.

436

437 **Members agreed by consensus to invite representatives of Rabanco/Allied Waste, Waste
438 Connections, and Waste Management to the May meeting.**

439

440 Jennings commented that the Division is very interested in an open process and welcomes the
441 haulers' presence at the May meeting.

442

443 Kiernan said the third report will identify choices and their characteristics but will not make
444 recommendations. He asked members to submit their thoughts on the alternatives that will be
445 presented. The Division is interested in hearing suggestions on any additional options, or
446 comments on the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative.

447

448 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow said the haulers would not want to sit through discussion
449 of Criterion 17, and should be invited to arrive later in the meeting. The group agreed that the
450 three haulers will be invited to join the May MSWMAC meeting at 12:30.

451

452 **Adjournment**

453 Greenway said she recently toured the Enumclaw transfer station and Cedar Hills landfill, and
454 recommends that everyone do so. She said Enumclaw is clean and well-sited and Cedar Hills is
455 incredibly well run. She learned a lot at the tour and thinks the tour is helpful in forming a big
456 picture of the solid waste system.

457

458 Kiernan added that anyone is welcome to tour the landfill.

459

460 Garber said Enumclaw was sited with community support and without an EIS.

461

462 The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

463

464 Submitted by:

465 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff