KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
July 8, 2005
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center
Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

Name	Agency	Title
Sharon Hlavka	**City of Auburn**	**Solid Waste Supervisor**
Rich Wagner	**City of Auburn**	**Councilmember**
Alison Bennett	**City of Bellevue**	**Utilities Policy Advisor**
Brad Miyake	**City of Bellevue**	**Utilities 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**
Jon Spangler	**City of Redmond**	**Natural Resources Director**
Nina Rivkin	**City of Redmond**	**Senior Policy Analyst**
Linda Knight	**City of Renton**	**Solid Waste Coordinator**
Frank Iriarte	**City of Tukwila**	**Deputy Public Works Director**
Valarie Jarvi	**City of Woodinville**	**Public Works Maintenance Supervisor**

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Director
Theresa Koppang, Lead Planner
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Staff Liaison
Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff
Bert Tarrant, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff
Mike Reed, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue
Elaine Borjeson, City of Kirkland
Sarah Ruther, City of Woodinville
Karen Goroski, Suburban Cities Association

Call to Order

MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:15.

Introductions

Those in attendance introduced themselves.

Approve June Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda

MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the June minutes.

Greenway asked about lines 292-293 reading, "Garber noted there was no time left for discussion and asked that Kiernan identify by email the conflicts between comments." The division responded that has not been done because the report was submitted with *all* comments reflected.

The motion passed unanimously.

SWD Update

Solid Waste Division Lead Planner Theresa Koppang reported the division held a workshop on June 16 in Tukwila to address recycling planning. Over fifty people attended the workshop, which included presentations by members of MSWMAC and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC). Presentations addressed the past, present and future of recycling services in King County. The division got a lot of good feedback from participants and there was interest in continuing to be involved in planning for recycling. The division is pursuing next steps. The Waste Export System Plan and the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan will include discussions of recycling at the transfer stations.

Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings said the motion changing Ordinance 14971 deliverables due dates was approved by County Council on June 20. The third report, Options for Public and Private Ownership and Operation of Transfer and Intermodal Facilities, has been submitted to the county council, the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) and the Natural Resources and Utilities Committee (NRU). RPC will have a briefing on the report and take action on July 14.

Jennings announced the division has won three awards from the Solid Waste Association of North America. The division received Bronze awards for Landfill Management and Electronics Recycling. A Gold award was received for the Landfill Gas Program design.

Jennings reported the division met its $9.5 million savings target in 2004.

She also reported the rate increase originally scheduled for 2006 to be deferred until 2008.

Criterion Seventeen

Chair Garber said MSWMAC last discussed Criterion 17 in April, when it reviewed the application of each point to each station and asked the division for changes. She said the requested changes have been made and asked MSWMAC whether it wanted to make conclusions on the application of the criterion, or leave that to the policy makers.

In response to a question, Garber said all the sub-criteria that affect adjacent land use should factor into any conclusions that MSWMAC makes. For example, Bow Lake met all sub-criteria except those related to traffic. Since traffic does not seem to be a land use issue, Bow Lake might be considered a compatible land use.

MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini commented that in a previous discussion MSWMAC decided it should not weigh criteria, but should leave such considerations to policy makers.

MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton said she would rather provide conclusions to policy makers.

MSWMAC member Alison Bennett agreed with Armanini's comment. She said weighting criteria should be left for the future, as it would be too long a discussion for this meeting.

Garber replied that the discussion need not be lengthy. She said the discussion on weighting criteria referred to all of the criteria in the second report, not to the sub-criteria of Criterion 17.

Armanini commented that it may not be necessary to make a "Yes" or "No" determination for each station. The conclusion could be "Largely."

MSWMAC member Jon Spangler said all the other criteria are presented with "Yes/No" conclusions, and that Criterion 17 should be consistent with the others.

Greenway said that if decisions were to be made strictly on the number of "Yes" or "No" scores then she did not want to make a conclusion for fear of minimizing the importance of other criteria. She said she did not want to reach conclusions that would not show the whole picture.

Garber said that if MSWMAC decided to make conclusions on Criterion 17, she would recommend looking at the issues that really affect land use. For example, Algona only received a “No” under the Traffic sub-criterion. She said she would ask the division if this “No” affected land use, and if it does not, she would say that Algona was compatible with adjacent land uses. She said she would go quickly through the stations, because a great level of detail was not required. Bow Lake also has issues only with traffic, so might also receive a “Y” rating. Factoria has aesthetic issues- the station is visible to adjacent commercial land uses, and barely meets the traffic standard. This one is marginal, so it might require a footnote to explain its rating. Houghton is also visible to surrounding land uses, and does not have a 100 foot buffer, so she would say “No” for Houghton. Renton has “Yes” for all sub-criteria, so would receive an overall “Yes.”

McGilton moved to retain the Conclusions section of the Compatibility With Adjacent Land Uses criterion.

MSWMAC member Alison Bennett asked why each subcriterion didn’t qualify to be its own criterion. Garber responded that some of them are already addressed in the first 16 criteria, and are only drawn out here to identify that they are relevant to land use compatibility. She said that Criterion 17 intends to answer the question, “Is the station compatible with adjacent land use?” on an objective basis. The sub-criteria are the standards typically used to answer that question. The initial intent of Criterion 17 was to provide a conclusion.

Rivkin stated her concern that the application of Criterion 17 could become a bellwether. MSWMAC has not yet talked about how the criteria will be applied. Speaking about Houghton, she said there is a solid waste transfer system in place now, that won’t be dismantled. Even if a transfer station fails the criteria, that doesn’t mean the station will be jettisoned. MSWMAC must deal with the existing system.

Garber agreed, saying Criterion 17 speaks to needs at the stations. For example, at Houghton, technical issues can be resolved but if the aesthetic issues are not addressed to make the station fit into the neighborhood better, it still won’t be compatible.

Rivkin asked how this process would get us to that point.

MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini said this is still part of the data gathering stage.

Jennings said she is concerned that four of the sub-criteria are already addressed elsewhere. The only element that is unique to Criterion 17 is Aesthetics. Criterion 17 is double counting some issues, and the benefit of doing that is unclear. Several of the other criteria, such as Safety, consist of many components that were all folded into one overall score of Yes or No. This is only one of seventeen criteria, and if we keep all the subcriteria without drawing a conclusion, it may be growing into more than it was meant to be.

Greenway said she didn't think MSWMAC was convened to maintain the current system. She said MSWMAC was to analyze the system, and present accurate and complete data to decision makers so they could change the system. For this reason, all information is important. Whether MSWMAC makes a conclusion or not, the information in Criterion 17 is important to the decision makers.

Rivkin replied that she is not advocating maintaining the present situation, but she does want to recognize that we have a current system and aren't developing a new system from scratch.

Greenway said it is important for MSWMAC to analyze and report the information without letting assumed conclusions drive the presentation of information.

Garber agreed with Jennings that Criterion 17 should follow the same format as other criteria, such as Criterion 10, that are summarized with a single conclusion and footnoted to explain the details.

McGilton repeated the motion to retain the Conclusions section of the Compatibility With Adjacent Land Uses criterion.

Greenway asked whether the conclusions Garber suggested were included in the motion. Garber responded that those conclusions were intended as examples, and that if the motion passed, MSWMAC would discuss the conclusions.

The motion passed 9 to 3, with Bellevue, Lake Forest Park and Renton opposed.

Garber introduced Algona Transfer Station for discussion. Algona received a “No” score for weekend traffic overflows.

MSWMAC member Don Henning said Algona is on the frontage road to Highway 167. There are no houses nearby and only a few businesses. He suggested that the interference from traffic overflows is a low priority.

Garber asked if Algona should receive an overall “Yes” score for Criterion 17.

MSWMAC approved a “Yes” rating for Criterion 17 at Algona by consensus.

Garber introduced Bow Lake Transfer Station.

MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte said three cities are impacted by Bow Lake: Tukwila, SeaTac and Kent. Tukwila is minimally impacted because the station is away from residences in Tukwila. He said some residences in Kent and SeaTac are nearby, and while the impact is minor in his opinion, he is not comfortable speaking for the other cities. Most of the impacted traffic is commercial.

McGilton added that the traffic is mostly related to the I-5 ramps, rather than local businesses.

Armanini commented that it is important to consider impacts on businesses as well as residences. She asked what was meant by “significant degradation of Level of Service.”

Jennings replied that she was unsure exactly what was meant by “significant.” She said there is a study underway looking at Bow Lake impacts related to a private development.

Rivkin said she is uncomfortable making a decision without information. She suggested deferring a decision on Bow Lake to the next meeting.

Garber asked the division to report back on Bow Lake traffic issues at the next MSWMAC meeting.

Greenway asked to hear more about the adjacent land uses.

Henning said Algona had very little impact, but Bow Lake is at an I-5 junction, so it is more important. He commented that mitigating the effects of traffic at Bow Lake is important.

MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka suggested that all the necessary information is already presented in the table, and MSWMAC should just recap what has already been determined. For example, Algona is “Yes” with a footnote about traffic. This would allow a conclusion without ignoring the issues.

Garber agreed that footnoting “No’s” was a good idea, and consistent with the approach taken for other criteria. She introduced Factoria Transfer Station for discussion.

MSWMAC member Brad Miyake said Factoria would be “No” with a footnote, explaining that Factoria is on the approach to commercial uses.

Bennett added that Factoria is within 100 feet of commercial uses.

Garber added that Factoria is over 30 years old and doesn’t add much to the neighborhood from an aesthetic standpoint. She suggested Factoria rate a “No” with footnotes One and Seven referenced.

MSWMAC approved by consensus a “No” rating for Criterion 17 at Factoria.

Garber introduced Houghton Transfer Station for discussion.

Greenway said Houghton is a classic example of “not consistent with surrounding land uses.” Houghton is closely surrounded on three sides by residences. Trucks use neighborhood streets to get there and there is overall a very negative impact on the neighborhood.

Garber asked if Houghton should be rated “No” with reference to footnotes 2, 3 and 8.

Armanini commented that would be consistent with the treatment approved for Factoria.

MSWMAC approved by consensus a “No” rating for Criterion 17 at Houghton.

Garber introduced Renton Transfer Station for discussion.

MSWMAC member Linda Knight said the data speaks for itself. Renton received “Yes” ratings for all sub-criteria. While that does not necessarily mean there are no issues at Renton, those issues are addressed elsewhere, and Renton should receive a “Yes” rating for Criterion 17. Unless future residential development makes it incompatible, Renton Transfer Station does meet Criterion 17.

MSWMAC approved by consensus a “Yes” rating for Criterion 17 at Renton.

Garber said Criterion 17 will still need discussion at the next meeting to reach a conclusion on Bow Lake. She asked for a motion approving the conclusions made so far.

Greenway moved approval of the conclusions reached for Algona, Factoria, Houghton and Renton Transfer Stations.

The motion passed unanimously.

Garber asked for someone to present ITSG’s recommendations on Fair Share of Tonnage and Transactions.

ITSG member Susan Fife-Ferris reported ITSG recommends including seven stations in the analysis of tonnage and transaction distribution, and that the analysis be presented as background information in Report Four rather than as a criterion in the addendum to Report Two. ITSG further recommends changing the name from “Fair Share” to “Distribution,” which does not imply a judgment.

Henning commented that at this time, equal distribution among stations may not be appropriate, since each station is in a unique area. Houghton is in an area that has already grown up, while Algona is still developing. The distribution of waste will change over time with regional growth.

Jennings said Report Four will include a twenty year forecast. So far, MSWMAC has discussed existing service areas. For planning purposes, geographic areas must be considered because service areas may change.

Greenway said she thinks the evaluation included in the distribution charts is important.

Garber said her understanding was that the evaluation would not be included, because it is somewhat subjective. Only the data would be provided.

Fife-Ferris clarified that ITSG considered that the term “Fair Share” implied a value judgment. ITSG decided all seven stations should be included because it provided more information for decision makers who need a clear snapshot of the present in order to plan for a twenty year timeframe. ITSG did not discuss whether to include the evaluation calculations.

Garber stated that calculating the average of tonnage and transactions among the stations and highlighting those that exceed the average by more than 10% implies that ideally the stations would receive equal tonnage and transactions.

Fife-Ferris agreed that such analysis implies a value judgment, but said that particular question was not discussed at ITSG.

Henning commented that accessibility to major roads could account for some disparity in numbers among the stations because haulers will take garbage where it is most efficient for them to do so.

Jennings added that Bow Lake is open 24 hours, so it is certain to receive more tonnage than other stations. Because so many variables influence customer traffic at the stations, the numbers in the tables are not very informative.

Henning stated that the value of these distribution tables is to provide a baseline for planning.

Garber agreed that the data is important as background for Report Four. She asked if MSWMAC agreed data on all seven stations should be included.

Rivkin said it made more sense to decide whether to include the analysis in side-tables before deciding how many stations to include.

Spangler moved to eliminate analysis applied to the distribution tables.

Spangler stated that including the analysis is making a value judgment that 10% is a meaningful number when there is no real evidence that it is.

Armanini asked why it mattered in this case if MSWMAC makes a value judgment, when it has not mattered elsewhere.

Garber responded that this case is different because it is not a standard applied to criteria like those in Report Two. In this case it is background information for Report Four.

Greenway said she wanted to make it clear that this point is extremely important to Kirkland. The decision whether to evaluate capacity and identify which stations are overburdened is the most important decision MSWMAC has made so far. She asked how to show decision makers that some facilities are handling more than they are capable of while state-of-the-art facilities are handling only a small amount of waste.

Spangler said the distribution data doesn't shed any light on whether a station is overcapacity for the amount of waste it is handling.

Garber said she could not see how applying criteria tells more than the percentage data themselves. She agreed the percentages do not address station capacity. Other criteria in Report Two do address capacity, and have already shown where stations are over capacity. The numbers themselves tell the story of how solid waste is distributed among transfer stations.

Greenway said the numbers may tell the story but do not draw attention to it.

Rivkin commented this data is not concerned with whether a station is over capacity, but addresses the question of regional equity and whether a station receives more tonnage than other stations.

MSWMAC member Rich Wagner stated that distribution of tonnage is a matter of efficiency, and is driven by the cost to the hauler to reach a station. He said level of service standards can mean what you want them to mean. While regional equity should be addressed, it requires a lot of study beyond the simple evaluations presented here. He agreed with Greenway that equity needs to be addressed, but said he favored a different method of highlighting the issue.

Rivkin said looking at tonnages and averages is too narrow an approach to the issue of regional equity, which is really a policy discussion belonging to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan process. MSWMAC hasn't even defined what the term regional equity means in the context of solid waste.

Henning said it is natural to want to jump to a conclusion, but problem solving requires data collection without conclusions.

Garber called for a vote on the motion to eliminate analysis from the presentation of distribution data.

The motion passed 10 to 2 with Kirkland and Auburn opposed.

Greenway expressed disappointment with the result.

Rivkin commented that the issue of regional equity requires more attention and should not be dropped. She said it segues nicely into the next agenda item, Report Four.

Wagner asked why it could not be addressed in Report Three.

Garber replied that Report Three has already been completed, but suggested that the Addendum to Report Two on Criterion 17 could include an explanation that regional equity was dropped from the criterion in order to be more fully discussed in Report Four.

King County Council staff Mike Huddleston said the council would welcome that transmittal as being informative for them and as a way to flag the issue.

MSWMAC approved by consensus Garber's suggested approach to discussing regional equity.

Garber asked the division to provide draft language for the Criterion 17 Addendum to Report Two at the next MSWMAC meeting.

Wagner asked if MSWMAC could agree on a term for the issue. He preferred “regional equity” to “fair share.”

Garber responded regional equity can mean many things, and requires a definition. Equitable distribution of facilities is another option, but this discussion should be postponed.

Jennings commented that this group is only involved in solid waste, but must remember that decision makers will be familiar with the term Locally Undesirable Land Uses (LULUs), which includes other facilities beside solid waste facilities.

Garber added that LULU in this context generally refers to all of what the Growth Management Act calls regional and essential facilities. She suggested waiting until the next meeting to select a term.

Wagner moved to establish the term regional equity to describe the equitable distribution of facilities that are regional and essential whether or not they are involved in solid waste.

The motion died for lack of second.

Rivkin said MSWMAC will footnote for council and others that the issue called fair share has been dropped from Criterion 17 because it requires more discussion. The footnote can also say that a new term is required which will be carefully defined as to scope and definition.

<u>Report Four</u>

Garber said although Report Four Basic Assumptions is on the agenda, ITSG will look at basic assumptions first. She said MSWMAC’s discussion of assumptions may be haphazard at this point so ITSG will provide focus before MSWMAC’s next meeting.

Armanini commented that she understood the value of having topics filtered before presentation to MSWMAC, but wanted to point out that there is a downside as well. Some of the information can be lost through that filtration.

Garber suggested that ITSG should provide a regular presentation at MSWMAC so that MSWMAC can get a better sense of ITSG's input.

Solid Waste Division Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said the division made a careful reading of Ordinance 14971 to identifying any outstanding issues. She welcomed feedback on the list from MSWMAC.

Greenway suggested adding a bullet that would read, "Should there be additional or different service areas?"

Rivkin commented that she would like to raise the level of conversation from reviewing documents presented by the division. She said she would like to hear what the division is thinking about how to approach making recommendations, so that MSWMAC can weigh in on those ideas.

Koppang replied that Reports 1-3 together with existing analysis provide the framework. The division will compile all of that information and identify the gaps together with MSWMAC.

Jennings added that this is a classic planning process, just like the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. Staff analysis, consultant work and advisory group input will all be considered. The first and most important step is to define and agree on the assumptions. The assumptions are the foundational issues that everyone can agree on, such as Cedar Hills will reach capacity in the next decade, and the division will examine various modes of transport, including train, barge and truck for getting waste out of King County. She said that Greenway's concern that service areas are fixed is not one of the division's assumptions. The division will look at geographical areas and may determine that different service areas are needed.

In response to a question, Jennings said brainstorming may result in 15-20 options. Discussion may quickly reveal fatal flaws that will eliminate 10 of those. The short list of remaining options will merit careful analysis, which will result in various packages of options.

In response to another question, Jennings said the division uses a 20 year planning horizon, but action on the waste export system plan will begin much sooner.

Garber commented that it seems policy choices on issues like self-haul and recycling services at transfer stations are required to develop a plan.

Jennings replied that packages will be presented together with identification of how policy choices affect those packages. The options will represent various policy choices, such as all full-service stations or a mix of service levels. It is impossible to meet process deadlines if policy decisions have to be made first.

In response to a question, Jennings said that Ecology does not have to review the Export System Plan, but that the Export System Plan will inform the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, which Ecology does have to approve.

Rivkin said that for each option presented, policy choices must be called out and recommendations for policy changes identified. Policy issues will be woven throughout the entire document.

Garber asked how it is possible to look at elements of the system, for example transport, separately from the rest of the system.

Jennings replied that a number of jurisdictions use each of the considered modes of transport. The division has cost information from consultants who specialize in rail, from the division's own trucking data and through contact with barging companies. More data has been collected than might be expected.

Rivkin commented that the ordinance requires rate impact information as well.

Jennings said that in the end, the division must ask, "What is the impact on the average household?" The way to answer that question is to analyze system scenarios. Each month the division will update MSWMAC on the work it has been doing.

Bennett suggested ITSG review the report timeline to develop more detail.

Jennings commented that the division has a conflict between providing advisory groups with too much detail or too little. She said she has directed staff to err on the side of bringing work to the committees early on in order to allow the committees to provide feedback before the division produces details.

Wagner said there are three bullets addressing station costs but none addressing system costs. He said there are bigger issues than the handout addresses.

Garber said the division will flesh out the assumptions and outline with ITSG, as long as MSWMAC can see what has been left out. She added that the Criterion 17 discussion took longer than planned, and she had hoped MSWMAC would have time to discuss some important issues raised by Woodinville. She said she would email these issues to the group, as well as to ITSG, for discussion at the next MSWMAC meeting.

Adjournment

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

Submitted by:
Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff