

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 18, 2006

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
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
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
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
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
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

Sandra Matteson, Solid Waste Division staff

Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff

Beth Mountsier, King County Council Staff

Mike Reed, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue

Chris Searcy, City of Enumclaw

1 **Call to Order**

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

3
4 **Approve December Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

5 **MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the December minutes.**

6
7 Greenway pointed out a typographical error on line 261.

8
9 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett said that lines 341 to 343 do not include her
10 comment that traffic analysis has not been done for the Eastgate site.

11
12 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

13
14 Chair Garber announced that the City of Lake Forest Park sent her a letter that said the
15 city council had voted unanimously to reappoint Carolyn Armanini as their representative
16 on MSWMAC.

17
18 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates asked members to let her know
19 whether they will attend each meeting. Many cities do not RSVP, so it is impossible to
20 know in advance whether a quorum will be present.

21
22 **SWD Update**

23 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that the bid for reconstructing
24 First NE Transfer Station will go out tomorrow and remain open for 6 weeks.

25 Compactors were bid separately. The division has received two responses to the
26 compactor RFB, which are being evaluated. First NE will close in May and is expected
27 to remain closed for approximately 18 months. During that time commercial customers
28 will be rerouted to Snohomish County's Southwest Transfer Station in Mountlake
29 Terrace. Self-haul customers can go to any King County transfer station, or may choose
30 to use the Mountlake Terrace Transfer Station.

32 The division's economist met with Jeff Morris, consultant to the City of Bellevue, to
33 discuss the economic analysis in Report Four. Several questions were raised, and the
34 division's response to those questions is available for anyone who is interested.

35

36 King County council staff Mike Huddleston distributed a new organizational chart for the
37 council. He said that while assignments on this chart will not change, additional
38 members may be added. Pete von Reichbauer will chair the Regional Policy Committee
39 (RPC), which will review the fourth report and the export plan. Jane Hague will be
40 policy chair on Natural Resources, Parks and Utilities issues that come before the Growth
41 Management and Natural Resources Committee (which replaced the Natural Resources
42 and Utilities Committee). The new committee will also review waste export planning
43 documents. Larry Phillips will continue as council chair in 2006.

44

45 **Nominations and Election of 2006 Chair and Vice Chair**

46 Garber asked Yates to conduct the nomination and election process for chair and vice
47 chair. Yates called for nominations for chair. She said nominations do not need a
48 second. She said she would do a role call vote and once a nominee received a majority of
49 votes, they would be declared chair.

50

51 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza nominated Jean Garber for chair.

52

53 Hearing no other nominations, Yates declared the nominations closed and called for the
54 votes. Having received six votes, Jean Garber was declared the chair for 2006.

55

56 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza nominated Joan McGilton for vice chair.

57

58 Hearing no other nominations, Yates declared the nominations closed and called for the
59 votes. Having received six votes, Joan McGilton was declared the vice chair for 2006.

60

61 **Draft Milestone Report 4 Discussion**

62 Garber said that MSWMAC would review the draft report chapter by chapter. Following
63 Robert's Rules of Order, she asked for a main motion to approve the report, which will

64 carry over into February's meeting. She said next month MSMWAC will approve the
65 report to forward to the RPC.

66

67 **Greenway moved approval of Milestone Report #4.**

68

69 Solid Waste Division Lead Planner Theresa Koppang gave a timeline for completing
70 Report 4. She said a draft Executive Summary will be available January 25. Comments
71 on the Executive Summary and the draft report are due in writing by January 31. The
72 division will distribute a completed draft of the report on February 3. MSWMAC will
73 vote on the report at its February 10 meeting.

74

75 Koppang said that MSWMAC members have received two documents. One is the
76 revised draft report, which, based on comments received, shows changes from the
77 December draft in red text. The other document is a responsiveness summary, which
78 includes all comments received, whether or not they resulted in text changes.

79

80 Greenway asked if the group could undo changes based on earlier comments.

81

82 Pelosa commented that any city concerned with a previous comment could bring that
83 issue before MSWMAC for a decision.

84

85 In response to a question, Koppang said that amendments made today will be
86 incorporated in the February 3 draft. After the vote in February's meeting, the division
87 will complete any final amendments and transmit the report to the Executive by February
88 28. The Executive will forward the report to council, where it will be reviewed by RPC
89 and the new Growth Management Committee before approval by the full council. The
90 division will begin work on the Waste Export System Plan, which will include
91 recommendations, in March.

92

93 Jennings said there will be presentations to and discussions with MSWMAC before the
94 division writes the Export System Plan. Just as MSWMAC members will receive

95 guidance from their cities' councils, the division will talk with the county Executive in
96 developing its recommendations.

97

98 Garber commented that the annotated outline of Report 4 was helpful and asked for an
99 annotated outline for the Export System Plan.

100

101 Huddleston commented that there are plans to brief the RPC in February so new members
102 will be familiar with the export system planning process before they see the report.

103

104 Chapter One:

105 Garber asked if there were any corrections to Chapter One, with the understanding that
106 comments can also be sent in writing next week.

107

108 There were no comments on Chapter One.

109

110 Chapter Two:

111 Bennett commented that the responsiveness summary should include page numbers.

112 Koppang replied that the final summary will include page numbers.

113

114 Bennett said the note on page 18 should say that Eastgate must be evaluated for all LOS
115 criteria, not just traffic. Jennings suggested adding the phrase "meets all LOS criteria"
116 and removing the word "traffic" before "studies."

117

118 Garber asked if there were any objections to this change.

119 *The change was approved by consensus.*

120

121 MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder said the same issue would apply to Bow Lake
122 Transfer Station on page 17.

123

124 Kiernan replied that the issue at Bow Lake is traffic spilling out onto Orillia Road on
125 weekends, as explained in the table footnote.

126

127 Garber asked if additional studies are needed. Kiernan replied there are two issues at
128 Bow Lake. First, facility traffic backs up onto Orillia Road. This can be addressed in the
129 new design. Second, there is a regional traffic issue on the arterial. He said the division
130 cannot commit to fixing a regional traffic issue, but would work with all stakeholders.

131

132 Schroeder agreed that the new facility could be designed to provide sufficient queuing
133 space but asked about access to the facility from the nearest intersection, which could
134 become even more difficult as facility traffic increases. He suggested language to the
135 effect that “during design, traffic studies will be conducted to analyze access to the
136 facility and propose improvements if necessary.”

137

138 Kiernan said the division certainly will evaluate access to the site and the feasibility of
139 making improvements.

140

141 Garber said the division will draft language for review at the next meeting.

142

143 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka said her earlier comment on the cost summary on
144 page 39 was rolled into the larger figure. She said the report needs to bring out how the
145 decision whether or not to compact at self-haul stations is being made.

146

147 Jennings confirmed her understanding of what Hlavka would like to see in the report. She
148 said the division will address how it was determined that waste at self-haul only stations
149 would not be compacted.

150

151 Garber said the division will draft language for review at the next meeting.

152

153 Bennett said that similar to her earlier comment, each package that includes developing
154 the Eastgate site should include language about the need for LOS studies. This would
155 change pages 24, 27, 29 and 32.

156

157 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked why Houghton would not have more self-haul
158 capacity with a compactor if commercial trucks were excluded, because self-haulers

159 could dump on both sides of the pit. Kiernan replied that the constraint at Houghton is on
160 weekends when self-haul is highest. On weekends self-haulers are already dumping on
161 both sides of the pit.

162

163 Spangler asked if removing commercial traffic doesn't increase self-haul capacity.

164 Kiernan replied that it does on weekdays, but does not make a difference on weekends
165 when self-haul traffic is highest.

166

167 Schroeder asked why it is important to separate self-haul from commercial. He
168 commented that there doesn't seem to be much of a conflict.

169

170 Jennings replied that on weekends there is not much conflict, but on weekdays both
171 customer types are present at the same time. Kiernan added that scalehouse queuing is an
172 issue because haulers lose time in line behind self-haulers.

173

174 Greenway commented that self-haul only facilities are not really efficient. She said a
175 modern, well-designed full service facility would be the most efficient transfer station.

176

177 Pelosa asked about restricting payment methods to speed self-haul queuing. Jennings
178 said the division has recently begun accepting credit cards, but that ultimately, whether
179 running a credit card transaction, writing a check or handling cash, self-haul transactions
180 take time. Commercial customers have swipe cards that allow them to pass the
181 scalehouse much more quickly and without interaction with staff.

182

183 Schroeder suggested that a new station could segregate self-haul and commercial lines.
184 He said good circulation design would be the most effective solution. Kiernan agreed.

185

186 Chapter Three:

187 Bellevue staff Susan Fife-Ferris commented that the responsiveness summary says text
188 was revised in response to a comment that two counties appear to be entirely private
189 systems.

190

191 Koppang replied that is an error, and will be corrected. She said a column was added to
192 the table, not to text, to show that each county retains planning authority. Jennings added
193 that the division continues to research conditions in other counties.

194

195 Koppang said three responses in the summary are either incorrect or incomplete. Fife-
196 Ferris pointed out the first one. On page 14, the response to the comment about
197 compaction at intermodal facilities should be “comment noted” because the issue is
198 discussed in a different chapter of the report. On page 19, the comment from Federal
199 Way required clarification. Federal Way has provided the clarification and the division is
200 working on a response.

201

202 In response to a question, Jennings said that at the last MSWMAC meeting, Hlavka asked
203 the haulers about cost differences, and they said there were none if the public and private
204 sectors are held to the same standards. Hardebeck of Waste Management said that a
205 metal box is the cheapest option for a transfer facility. That is true whether the public or
206 private sector builds it. Page 44 of the report says as much.

207

208 Bennett commented that this topic is a good one for the third party review, since the
209 division cannot provide any more information.

210

211 Jennings agreed that third party reviewers should address this question, saying the
212 division cannot obtain cost information for the private sector.

213

214 MSWMAC member Rob van Orsow commented that ITSG had discussed adding longer
215 term financial analysis to Table 2-5. Jennings said the current analysis goes to 2028. The
216 next draft will include analysis to 2038 and to 2048. She said that there will be analysis
217 of the cost of delay as well.

218

219 Chapter Four:

220 Pelozza asked if page 48 was left blank intentionally. Jennings said it was a formatting
221 issue and there is no missing text.

222

223 Chapter Five:

224 Spangler asked about the impacts of mudslides on rail hauling. Jennings replied that for
225 any cargo (not passengers) rail can move as soon as the mud is cleared from the tracks.

226

227 Spangler asked about Sound Transit's rail negotiations, which resulted in unexpectedly
228 high costs. He asked how confident the division is with its numbers for rail cost.

229

230 Jennings said that the division is not confident that the numbers available are predictive
231 of costs the division would incur. Rather, the cost information is useful for comparing
232 each transportation mode relative to the others.

233

234 Kiernan added that Sound Transit was constrained in negotiations because it needed
235 trains to run at specific times. The division has scheduling flexibility.

236

237 Council staff Beth Mountsier commented that a note should be added to the text saying
238 that costs are estimates based on current contracts, and actual costs will depend on bids at
239 the time of procurement.

240

241 Chapter Six:

242 Bennett asked for a footer that would give chapter and page numbers. Koppang agreed.

243

244 Spangler commented short haul to a Harbor Island intermodal facility could be more
245 problematic and costly than short haul to an intermodal facility in the south county.

246

247 Kiernan said BNSF serves the Eastside and UP doesn't. Sites that have access to both
248 rail lines are limited to the area between Harbor Island and the south county. He said this
249 is addressed in the site requirements on page 65.

250

251 Jennings commented that short haul through Maple Valley to Cedar Hills must stop at
252 5PM. If short haul goes to a more urban location, it will be possible to continue
253 operating later in the evening.

254

255 Garber said a siting study will come later. This report will not make any siting
256 recommendations.

257

258 Huddleston said that two intermodal facilities, each with access to one rail line, may be
259 less expensive than siting one facility with access to both. He said the document implies
260 that there will be only one facility, and suggested page 65 be changed to remove that
261 impression. Kiernan said the report could be edited to discuss capacity rather than sites.

262

263 Chapter Seven:

264 Jennings said that the division's responses to Jeff Morris' questions will be available
265 electronically by request, or in hard copy at the end of the meeting.

266

267 Bennett said members did not have time to absorb the information in the division's
268 response to Morris' questions today. She suggested discussion wait till the next meeting.

269

270 MSWMAC agreed to delay discussion of Chapter Seven by consensus.

271

272 Chapter Eight:

273 Garber asked whether siting decisions will be made in the Waste Export System Plan.

274 Jennings replied that siting criteria will be discussed in an appendix, but the Comp Plan
275 will develop a plan for siting.

276

277 In response to a question, Garber said the process for the Waste Export System Plan will
278 be the same as it has been for each of the milestone reports. She asked the division to
279 provide an outline and schedule to MSWMAC in February or March.

280

281 In response to a question, Jennings said Milestone Report 4 is a Solid Waste Division
282 document that includes comments from SWAC, MSWMAC, haulers and labor. The
283 Waste Export System Plan is the same. She added that each group has a different focus,
284 and so it is probable there will be differences of opinion. If there is need for a "minority
285 report" it will be apparent before the Waste Export System Plan is completed.

286

287 Schroeder asked how differences of opinion will be handled. Huddleston said the council
288 requires neutral reports from council central staff. The Executive makes
289 recommendations and council committees review them.

290

291 Jennings added that in the past, each group has made a motion or submitted a letter to
292 agree or disagree with the report written by staff. Sometimes haulers have presented
293 directly to council.

294

295 In response to a question, Jennings said that any red text (that is, text changed from the
296 December draft) that is unchallenged by the comment deadline will be accepted and
297 appear in black for the next draft. If a change is controversial, it will remain in red.

298

299 **Adjourn**

300 The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

301 Submitted by:

302 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff