

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 14, 2005

11:45 – 2:15 p.m.

King Street Center, 7th 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
Brad Miyake	City of Bellevue	Utilities Director
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
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
Elaine Borjeson	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Director
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Lys Hornsby	City of Renton	Utilities Director
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Mick Monken	City of Woodinville	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 Relations Liaison

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff

Beth Mountsier, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue

Karen Goroski, Suburban Cities Association

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:00.

3

4 **Approve September Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

5 **MSWMAC Member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the September minutes.**

6 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin questioned the sentence on lines 34 and 35 quoting

7 Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan. Kiernan suggested removing the text.

8 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

9

10 **Report Four Schedule**

11 Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said that in response to cities' concerns, more time has
12 been built in for review. MSWMAC now has until its January meeting to approve the
13 report. Koppang said MSWMAC will receive drafts of part of the report in October, and
14 will receive the entire draft report in November.

15

16 Greenway and Rivkin commented in favor of these changes.

17

18 **Greenway moved approval of the updated schedule.**

19 *The motion passed unanimously.*

20

21 **Planning Assumptions**

22 Garber said she hopes to adopt the assumptions as-is quickly for two reasons. First, the
23 introduction makes clear that this is a working document intended for use in-house in
24 preparation of the report. Second, division staff have agreed to use the additional issues
25 in preparing the report, and the outline reflects this. Garber commented that she thinks
26 the outline supplants the assumptions and is more worthy of MSWMAC's time.

27

28 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza pointed out the phrase in the first paragraph "analysis
29 that MSWMAC has directed be included," should be changed to read "analysis that
30 MSWMAC has recommended be included." Garber agreed.

31

32 Pelosa asked about the second Waste Stream Assumption on page two. Kiernan replied
33 that there are two elements. First, CDL is managed through contracts with Rabanco and
34 Waste Management for ten years. Second, is the fact that waste reduction and recycling
35 is privately managed as described in the purple flow chart in Milestone Report #3. There
36 is currently no expectation that will change.

37

38 Pelosa asked about the phrase “federated system” in the Financial Assumption. Kiernan
39 replied that the phrase comes directly from Ordinance 14971 and refers to the system of
40 King County with 37 cities.

41

42 Pelosa asked if the existing landfills referred to in Additional Issues #6 on page 2 were
43 identified anywhere. Kiernan responded that they are identified on page 3 of the outline.

44

45 **MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby moved approval of the Planning Assumptions**
46 **and Introductory Paragraphs.**

47 *The motion passed unanimously.*

48

49 **Compactor Feasibility Presentation**

50 Kiernan said compactors are large pieces of equipment that compress garbage so more
51 waste fits in each truck. Compactors improve both short and long haul efficiency. Half-
52 size compactors are not as efficient, so the division looked at the feasibility of installing
53 conventional compactors at the existing stations. The analysis was for retrofitting
54 compactors within the existing building footprint. Rebuilding was already addressed in
55 Report Two under the “Space to expand” criterion. The division also looked at other
56 jurisdictions’ experiences retrofitting compactors. Alternatives such as “walking floors”
57 and conveyor belts have been tried and abandoned in Snohomish and Thurston Counties.

58

59 Four of the five urban stations analyzed are direct-dump facilities with no intermediate
60 waste handling. Bow Lake is different. The four stations have two chutes under the
61 facilities. Trucks drive through the chutes, are filled directly by customers, then pull out
62 of the chute. A compactor would just barely fit in one of the chutes.

63

64 The division looked at the impacts of placing a compactor in one of the chutes on
65 operations; customer unloading and truck removal. Currently, customers dump directly
66 into a chute with an area of 456 square feet. The hopper of a compactor is too small to
67 dump directly into, so customers would have to dump onto the floor and have division
68 staff push waste into the hopper. Commercial customers would have to pull forward for a
69 distance of 55 feet while dumping to empty their much larger trucks. This means that
70 only one commercial customer or four self-haul customers could dump at one time. This
71 would significantly reduce station capacity.

72

73 In addition to the lost capacity, there is the question of how to load waste from the
74 compactor into the trailer. The trailer would have to pull through the open chute and then
75 back up to the compactor. This maneuver requires 200 feet of clearance.

76

77 Algona is between a steep hill and the West Valley Highway. To get 200 feet clearance,
78 a 40-70 foot high cut would have to be made in the hillside. This is not feasible.

79

80 Houghton does have the necessary clearance, but would lose 75% of its capacity if a
81 compactor was installed.

82

83 Factoria has a steep hill and wetlands in the way, but the key issue is that the Olympic
84 Pipeline is within 200 feet of the building. Compactor installation is not feasible.

85

86 Renton is within 200 feet of the property line, and if the land beyond the property line
87 was available, there would still be a steep drop that would require massive amounts of
88 fill. Compactor installation is not feasible at Renton.

89

90 Bow Lake has a different design, and previous analysis has already shown that expansion
91 is possible. Rebuilding the facility at Bow Lake is more practical than attempting to
92 retrofit an old building with a compactor.

93

94 In summary, it is not practical to change direct load facilities into compactor facilities. In
95 response to a question, Kiernan said that the actual size of a truck is not as important as
96 the amount of room that the truck needs to maneuver into position for dumping and
97 loading. Commercial collection trucks need 55 feet to pull forward to dump a load, while
98 hauling trailers need 200 feet to be able to back straight into the compactor. In addition
99 to these physical limitations, there is the issue of lost capacity. In response to another
100 question, Kiernan said commercial customers are affected as severely as self-haul
101 customers by reduced traffic capacity. Commercial capacity would be cut in half; only
102 one truck at a time could unload compared to two trucks at a time that can be served now.

103

104 Grigsby asked about the importance of compaction to the system. Kiernan replied that
105 there are two primary drivers for compaction. First, compacted loads are charged a lower
106 export price. Second, containers represent a large investment. They are expensive to buy
107 and to maintain. Compaction allows the system to operate with fewer containers.

108

109 Greenway added that there is an element of environmental stewardship as well. She said
110 uncompacted loads drip leachate while containers of compacted loads are sealed.

111 Kiernan agreed that compacted loads have better containment.

112

113 **Forecast Presentation**

114 Koppang introduced Solid Waste Division Economist Alexander Rist, who tracks
115 tonnage through the system and develops the tonnage forecast. She said Rist would talk
116 about the impact of recycling on the forecast.

117

118 Rist identified the variables that affect the forecast: population, jobs, household size, per
119 capita income, disposal fees, the CDL ban, and the percentage of households that have
120 curbside recycling service. He discussed historical trends. Disposal has grown at a
121 similar rate to population, with a slight dip when recycling was introduced. He pointed
122 out that per capita waste generation (recycling plus disposed waste) is increasing faster
123 than population growth.

124

125 Rist said the baseline forecast assumes the current recycling rate (41%) will continue
126 throughout the planning horizon. In this case, disposal will increase from 1 million to 1.5
127 million tons per year. Arbitrarily selecting a 50% recycling rate to show the potential
128 impact of improved recycling on disposal, Rist showed that disposal rates continue to
129 grow over the planning horizon. If additional recycling programs were able to achieve a
130 50% recycling rate in 2025, disposal would have grown from 1 million to 1.28 million
131 tons per year. Using a 60% recycling rate, which would require a massive effort to
132 achieve, Rist showed that disposal could remain constant at 1 million tons per year.

133

134 In response to a question, Rist said that per capita generation is increasing, in large part
135 due to increasing income and decreasing household size. He said that for every 100%
136 increase in income, disposal rates increase by 30%. In 25 years, with 2-3% income
137 growth each year, it is possible to increase income by 100%.

138

139 **Transfer System Options**

140 Garber said that MSWMAC will take action on the transfer system options at its
141 November meeting, so today is an opportunity to ask questions. Kiernan added that
142 division staff will visit jurisdictions to give briefings if requested.

143

144 Kiernan showed the diagram of current service areas and travel times from Report Two.
145 He said that design and siting of new transfer stations will not occur until after the Comp
146 Plan update, and commented that this analysis is still at the planning level. For planning
147 purposes, the division has identified geographic areas. Just as current service areas
148 overlap, the geographic area boundaries are not firm. Siting choices will affect them.

149

150 The division has begun to analyze costs, but will not present them today. In the context
151 of this presentation, "Option" is being used to discuss facilities within a geographic area.
152 The word "Package" will combine areas to discuss system-wide choices.

153

154

155

156 South County:

157 Currently served by Algona, the division has identified two options for this area. Algona
158 can be replaced with a new station at a new site, or two new stations can replace Algona
159 with one new station serving self-haul and one station serving commercial customers.

160 Rebuilding Algona on the same site is not being considered because the site is too
161 constrained. It is bordered on one side by a steep slope subject to landslides, so there is
162 no room to expand. The Algona site also faces serious traffic issues.

163

164 Central County:

165 Bow Lake has space to expand and is well located on I-5. Despite off-site traffic issues,
166 the division is recommending expansion on-site. Because the new Bow Lake will have
167 enough capacity, Renton could be closed or it could serve self-haul traffic only.

168

169 Northeast Lake Washington:

170 This area is currently served by Factoria and Houghton. Both of these facilities are
171 constrained and have no room to expand onsite. The division owns the Eastgate property
172 adjacent to Factoria, which could be used for expansion. The division identified three
173 options for Northeast Lake Washington.

- 174 1. Expand Factoria onto the Eastgate property. Close Houghton and build a new
175 facility at a new site.
- 176 2. Expand Factoria onto the Eastgate property. Make Houghton self-haul and build
177 a new commercial-only facility at a new site.
- 178 3. Expand Factoria onto the Eastgate property with a high-capacity station that
179 would handle all commercial waste from Northeast Lake Washington. Make
180 Houghton self haul only.

181 The City of Bellevue suggested a fourth option, which would make the current Factoria
182 and Houghton stations self haul only, and build a new high-capacity station at a new site
183 that would handle all commercial waste from Northeast Lake Washington.

184

185 North County:

186 The division already has a plan to rebuild First NE and will go out to bid in January.

187

188 Pelozo asked about Vashon Island. Kiernan replied that Vashon Island has a transfer
189 station that was built in 1999 with a compactor. Compacted loads are removed from the
190 island on the West Seattle ferry every other day.

191

192 Kiernan said the division identified options within each geographic area. He asked
193 MSWMAC for feedback on whether the division missed anything.

194

195 Spangler asked about the distribution of self-haul customers. Kiernan said the highest
196 self-haul rate is at First NE, which is the most urban service area. He commented that
197 Seattle has mandatory curbside collection but is building two new self-haul only stations.
198 He added that self-haul is not only residential customers. For example, the North Shore
199 School District hauls its own waste. In addition, citizens are strongly in favor of self-haul
200 service even though it is not the most efficient way to collect waste. Jennings added the
201 division has extensive data on self-haul service use.

202

203 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford said that most residential
204 self haul customers are bringing large loads rather than weekly household garbage.

205

206 Greenway commented that mandatory collection does not eliminate need for self haul.

207

208 Pelozo asked about Seattle's system. Kiernan replied that Seattle has mandatory service.
209 Collection in Seattle is divided North/South between two haulers. Seattle has a city
210 owned and operated transfer stations in Wallingford and South Park. Rabanco owns a
211 transfer station at 3rd & Lander. Seattle has issued an EIS for a co-located commercial
212 transfer and intermodal station. The two public transfer stations will become self-haul
213 only when that facility is completed.

214

215 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett asked about co-location as an option for the county.

216 Kiernan replied that co-location is not tied to the geographic areas, and the options
217 addressed so far are. Co-location will be addressed in the packages.

218

219 In response to a question, Kiernan said that siting will be discussed in the packages as
220 well. Intermodal is covered in the outline on page four.

221

222 Rivkin commented that the outline does not flesh out the discussion of Harbor Island
223 versus other sites.

224

225 Kiernan said rail lines are in a limited area so there are not many options for intermodal.
226 Siting is part of the process- it would be advantageous if a site could be found that would
227 serve transfer and intermodal needs. However, such a site may not exist.

228

229 In response to a question, Kiernan said the division wanted to be sure the list of options
230 was correct before delving into cost analysis. He said that once the list of options is
231 finalized, the division can do more detailed cost studies. Most other considerations, such
232 as travel time, will be considered much later as part of the siting process.

233

234 MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton asked about the process.

235

236 Kiernan said the division is seeking advice at this stage. Recommendations will be made
237 to the County Council and Regional Policy Committee, then folded into the Comp Plan.
238 The Comp Plan must be approved by cities. Then, when the plan is implemented, host
239 cities will be actively involved through permitting.

240

241 King County Council Staff Mike Huddleston said that cities get two chances to be
242 involved. First they get to help develop what the division proposed and then they give
243 approval during the Comp Plan process.

244

245 McGilton asked for a long range planning schedule on one sheet of paper to summarize
246 the steps from here to the Comp Plan.

247

248

249 **Outline**

250 Kiernan said division staff are available for city briefings. The division hopes
251 MSWMAC members will talk with their cities during the next month and provide
252 feedback at November's meeting.

253

- 254 • Chapter One covers background and process information.
- 255 • Chapter Two describes the system and revisits Report Two. It introduces the
256 concept of the geographic area and lays out specific options by facility and area.
257 Kiernan pointed out that option 3D was suggested by Bellevue. Number 4 is
258 direct to intermodal (co-locating transfer and intermodal facilities). Section D
259 covers the packages. The division really wants feedback on whether these
260 packages are reasonable. Package One is the baseline package. It is consistent
261 with the Comp Plan.

262

263 In response to a question Kiernan said the division wants to make sure that the cities'
264 interests are covered. The division does not expect every city to agree with every option,
265 but does want to make sure every city can find at least one that is palatable to them. The
266 division would like feedback in the form of suggested alternatives.

267

268 Package Two is also acceptable to the division. The underlined sections highlight where
269 this package is different from the first one. These first two packages come from the
270 division's analysis and the division is committed to analyzing them further. Package
271 Three is provided to show what is possible. If cities' provide other alternatives, this
272 package could be dropped to make room for them.

273

274 In response to a question, Kiernan said the feasibility of the packages has not been
275 analyzed yet. The packages have been designed so that cost analysis is modular, and
276 options can be rearranged into multiple packages. The division is receptive to analyzing
277 up to five packages, and wants feedback from the cities to make sure the packages reflect
278 the range of options correctly.

279

280 Jennings emphasized that the first two packages are the ones the division wants to put
281 forth, but the division is willing to analyze four or five packages. The division wants to
282 hear from the cities about which packages to study before the next meeting.

283

284 Continuing with the outline, Kiernan said

- 285 • Chapter Three is public versus private analysis. The packages talk about what to
286 provide, but not who should provide it. This chapter looks at options for who
287 could provide the services.
- 288 • Chapter Four, Landfill Capacity, looks at the benefits of extending Cedar Hills’
289 life and also considers using Cedar Hills for backup in an emergency. Landfills
290 available for export are those within a day’s rail.
- 291 • Chapter Five will cover the background on intermodal, will set level of service
292 standards and criteria for intermodal and will analyze public and private
293 ownership of the intermodal facility. MSWMAC will talk about long haul
294 transport at its November meeting.
- 295 • The sensitivity analysis has been moved from the addenda to Chapter Eight.

296

297 Kiernan said the division wants to hear if this outline addresses the scope of the cities’
298 interests and hopes to hear from MSWMAC about the alternatives during the next month.

299

300 Rivkin asked why the outline doesn’t include the Additional ITSG Issues. Garber said
301 SWD staff agreed to use the Additional Issues as a checklist, noting where in Report #4
302 each issue would be addressed. SWD staff confirmed they would do this.

303

304 Garber asked for a motion to approve the general content and order of the outline,
305 recognizing there will be editorial changes during writing, and changes resulting from
306 discussion in the next meeting.

307

308 Huddleston said council is interested in policy standards, for example, how important is it
309 that private companies meet public standards. He said this is missing.

310

311 Garber said the report will contain recommendations for the policy issues raised in the
312 Public/Private Characteristics matrix, which MSWMAC will take action on at the
313 November meeting. Kiernan said the Policy Framework section can be expanded.

314

315 Pelozo added that the outline is a guideline and not set in stone.

316

317 **Pelozo moved approval of the draft outline dated October 14.**

318

319 Bennett commented that the division should remain open to adding new ideas.

320

321 Jennings agreed, saying the division hopes to get 2 or 3 new packages from the cities.

322

323 Kiernan commented cities have networked outside of MSWMAC, resulting in useful
324 feedback to the division. He encouraged cities to continue generating this feedback.

325

326 MSWMAC member Linda Kochmar asked if the Algona site could be used for self-haul
327 only with a new commercial facility sited elsewhere.

328

329 Rivkin asked MSWMAC to wait to approve the outline, since there was a new option.

330

331 Greenway said she didn't see a conflict with adopting what was available so far, since
332 there is an understanding that MSWMAC can add to the outline.

333

334 Kiernan said the division would be more comfortable proceeding if MSWMAC could
335 approve what has been done so far.

336

337 Garber said the motion would remain on the table.

338

339 In response to a question, Kiernan said ITSG will meet to discuss the outline before
340 MSWMAC's next meeting, and added that the division would love for ITSG to bring
341 cities' comments to that meeting.

342

343 Grigsby commented the outline is very ambitious and asked who will perform the work.

344

345 Jennings replied division staff are doing most of the work, but the division has
346 consultants on board to assist in developing the report.

347

348 Jennings suggested that cities' send their suggestions and comments to Diane Yates and
349 include Chair Garber in the email.

350

351 *The motion to approve the outline passed unanimously.*

352

353 **Adjourn**

354 Garber commented that MSWMAC is scheduled to meet on December 6, which conflicts
355 with the National League of Cities meeting. She said December 12 and 14 are possible
356 alternatives. She added that she will be out of town for the January 13 meeting. She said
357 that her alternate can come in her place if necessary, but asked if MSWMAC would be
358 willing to reschedule the January meeting.

359

360 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said she would send an email to
361 finalize MSWMAC's schedule for December and January.

362

363 Jennings said that rescheduling these meetings will not conflict with process deadlines.

364

365 The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

366

367 Submitted by:

368 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

369

370

371