

**KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**May 12, 2006**

**11:45 – 2:15 p.m.**

**King Street Center, 7<sup>th</sup> 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
Debbie Anspaugh	City of Bothell	Administrative Coordinator
Dan Bath	City of Burien	Capital Projects Manager/Engineer
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Staff
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Don Brocha	City of Woodinville	Councilmember
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, Solid Waste Division Director

Brad Bell, Disposal Operations Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Tom Karston, Economist

Theresa Koppang, Lead Planner

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Gemma Alexander, Staff

Josh Marx, Staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Sanders

Mike Huddleston

Mike Reed

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05. Everyone present  
3 introduced themselves.

4  
5 Garber said that she has worked for the division in the past as a consultant on siting and  
6 environmental review of solid waste facilities. Typically her role was as the project  
7 manager, who was responsible for assembling a team of consultants and writing reports  
8 based on their work. Garber has worked directly with Engineering Services Manager  
9 Kevin Kiernan in the past, but has not worked with the division during Theresa Jennings  
10 tenure as Director. Garber said she recognized that by agreeing to represent the City of  
11 Newcastle on MSWMAC she would be ethically barred from consulting for the division.  
12 This point has become moot since her decision to retire from consulting. Garber feels  
13 that there is no conflict of interest in her involvement in siting discussions at MSWMAC.

14  
15 **Approve April Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

16 **MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the April minutes.**

17  
18 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow asked about a comment made by MSWMAC  
19 member Nina Rivkin on lines 257-259. Because Rivkin was not present to confirm or  
20 correct the statement, approval of the minutes was deferred.

21  
22 **SWAC Update**

23 SWAC Chair and MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini reported that SWAC met on  
24 April 21 with a similar agenda to MSMWAC. SWAC looked at the Eastgate design  
25 concept, and viewed presentations on the Secure Your Load campaign and the historical  
26 siting process. SWAC was invited to participate in the third party review process.  
27 SWAC members discussed Waste To Energy (WTE), a term that Armanini dislikes.

28  
29 **SWD Update**

30 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings said the ordinance changing the due  
31 dates was transmitted last month. Council staff Peggy Sanders said the ordinance has not

32 been introduced yet. As discussed last month, staff are working on a new ordinance that  
33 will include additional deliverables requested by the Regional Policy Committee.

34

35 Armanini said that ITSG is starting the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) discussions. She  
36 asked what role MSWMAC has in that process and suggested that the upcoming  
37 legislation could be used to clarify that role.

38

39 Sanders said that MSWMAC is one of the groups ITSG will submit its report to.

40

41 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates read from Ordinance 14971:

42 The staff group shall provide a report of its findings and recommendations... to all cities  
43 participating in the county solid waste management system , the metropolitan solid waste  
44 management advisory committee, the King County Executive, King County Council, the  
45 solid waste advisory committee and the solid waste interlocal forum, or its successor.

46

47 Garber said the role of the solid waste interlocal forum is currently filled by the Regional  
48 Policy Committee (RPC).

49

50 Garber said she would like for ITSG to provide MSWMAC with progress updates so that  
51 MSWMAC could discuss and approve the report contents as they are completed.

52

53 Armanini suggested that ITSG updates should be part of MSWMAC's regular agenda.

54

55 For the benefit of new members, Garber explained that MSMWAC operates on a  
56 consensus basis when possible.

57

58 ***MSWMAC agreed by consensus that ITSG updates be added as a regular agenda item.***

59

60 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said those attending MSMWAC and ITSG need to be  
61 cognizant that only some of the cities attend these committees, although all of the cities  
62 are impacted by solid waste issues. In order to achieve consensus on ILA issues, it is  
63 important for the other cities to have input even if they don't attend committee meetings.

64

65 Garber suggested that the ITSG report be sent to all of the cities for review before being  
66 officially submitted.

67

68 Jennings reported that Milestone Report 4 was passed unanimously by the council on  
69 Monday. The remaining work products are due on September 28.

70

71 First NE Transfer Station closed on May 1. Demolition begins this week. The station  
72 will be closed for 18 months, and will reopen in November 2007. Waste Management  
73 and Allied collection trucks have been rerouted to Snohomish County's Southwest  
74 Recycling and Transfer Station (SWRTS) in Mountlake Terrace. Self-haul customers can  
75 use any King County transfer station or SWRTS.

76

77 The haulers have reached an agreement with labor and signed a new contract.

78

79 **Comp Plan Kickoff Meeting**

80 Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said that next month MSWMAC's regular meeting will  
81 be replaced by the Comp Plan kickoff meeting at the Mercer Island Community Center.  
82 The event is co-hosted by MSWMAC. The purpose of the kickoff meeting is to bring the  
83 cities together to begin the Comp Plan discussion, and identify issues for the Comp Plan.  
84 The division hopes that the event will encourage new cities to participate in MSWMAC.  
85 The division has worked with ITSG to develop the agenda. It will be a two-hour meeting  
86 followed by an optional one-hour open house. MSWMAC is welcome to comment on  
87 the agenda, which will be sent out with the invitation later today.

88

89 In response to a question, Koppang said the kickoff meeting will address both policy and  
90 technical issues. Ideally, policy staff and solid waste/recycling program staff will attend.

91

92 Greenway said that it is important for elected officials to attend. She said she has been  
93 reporting to her city's council but they would still benefit from attending. She suggested  
94 the division follow the invitation with phone calls to encourage elected officials to attend.

95

96 In response to a question, Koppang said that item five on the agenda is a presentation.  
97 The open house is intended to provide an opportunity for discussion.

98

99 Armanini commented that allowing questions to be asked in front of the whole group can  
100 stimulate thinking. She said she supports a combination of at least a short question and  
101 answer period followed by the open house.

102

103 Koppang said the division received feedback from ITSG that the meeting would be too  
104 long if time was reserved for questions. ITSG suggested the open house as a way to  
105 allow attendees to have their questions answered without lengthening the meeting. In  
106 response to Armanini's request, Koppang said the division would build more time into  
107 item #5, the general issues presentation to allow at least some time for questions.

108

#### 109 **Siting Plan**

110 Kiernan began by stating that the draft plan is based on the siting plan included in the  
111 1989 Comp Plan that has successfully been used to site facilities in the past. References  
112 to landfill siting have been removed. Waste To Energy siting is addressed separately  
113 while transfer and intermodal facilities are addressed together.

114

115 The draft plan recognizes the issue of equitable distribution of solid waste facilities. Page  
116 14 references King County Code addressing that issue.

117

118 The siting criteria identified in the draft plan are consistent with State Environmental  
119 Protection Act (SEPA) categories. Criteria are not weighted in the plan. The criteria are  
120 weighted by Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) during the siting process

121

122 The process outlined in the plan calls for a general screening of potential sites followed  
123 by progressively rigorous analysis as the number of potential sites is reduced. The final  
124 site alternatives are subject to environmental review, which may include an  
125 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

126

127 Garber said MSWMAC is scheduled to take action on the plan today and asked how  
128 members wanted to proceed.

129

130 Greenway said she only had one question. In the land use section, she asked whether  
131 there should be a specific numerical distance required between solid waste facilities and  
132 residences. There is a 1,000 foot requirement for parks.

133

134 Huddleston said he is concerned that could result in requiring the purchase of additional  
135 property to create a bigger buffer, thus adding cost and removing housing stock.

136

137 Kiernan said the report identifies residential as the least compatible surrounding land use.  
138 Impacts to residences can be affected by many factors, for example the distance between  
139 the property line and the actual activity area. That's why, although the division  
140 recognizes the importance of the criterion, it is leery of attaching it to a fixed number that  
141 may not be universally meaningful.

142

143 Greenway suggested addition of a sentence to pages 10 and 13 that would clarify that  
144 sites closer to these types of uses would be less desirable.

145

146 Garber said some sites may be further from residences and yet have greater impacts.  
147 Sites that are separated from residences by a berm or highway may not have the same  
148 impacts on nearby residences even if they are separated from those residences by fewer  
149 feet in distance. State law recognizes this and has eliminated the numeric buffer  
150 requirement in favor of performance standards. She suggested that language emphasizing  
151 effective mitigation might be appropriate.

152

153 In response to a question, Kiernan said the CAC weighs and applies the criteria. The  
154 CAC's knowledge of the sites and local values are used to screen the sites. He suggested  
155 the proposed sentence could read "potential sites which would impact these uses would  
156 be less desirable."

157

158 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza questioned the value of adding language on this issue.  
159 He pointed out language on page 5 that he felt covered the question sufficiently.

160

161 Huddleston said the new sentence adds nuance with qualifying language focusing on  
162 impacts.

163

164 Armanini commented that while the CAC process worked in a small area such as  
165 Enumclaw, she questioned its effectiveness in siting when the siting area is as broad as  
166 Northeast King County.

167

168 Kiernan replied that the Factoria siting process began with an area covering North Bend  
169 to Kirkland. He said as options are narrowed, CAC membership changes. The CAC is  
170 flexible through the process. He added that although it is called a “Citizens” committee,  
171 it is very broad. In practice, no interested person is turned away. The division actively  
172 solicits members from the haulers, recyclers, and school districts as well as staff and  
173 citizens of cities in the search area. The county council also nominates members.

174

175 Garber called for a vote to decide whether to leave the plan unchanged, trusting the CAC  
176 to apply the criteria, or to add the suggested language.

177

178 **Greenway moved to add the sentence, “Potential sites that impact these uses would**  
179 **be less desirable.”**

180

181 *The motion carried in a roll call vote with 7 yes votes, 4 no votes and 2 abstentions.*

182

183 In response to a question, Kiernan said that the Siting Plan will be included as an  
184 appendix to the Waste Export System Plan. Because all of the packages in Milestone  
185 Report 4 include siting new facilities, the final export plan will call for facility siting. He  
186 said that the Siting Plan will not be affected by deferred approval, but if approval is  
187 deferred, it would take time away from other topics at the next meeting.

188

189 **Armanini moved that MSWMAC defer action on the Draft Siting Plan to its July**  
190 **meeting.**

191

192 Garber commented that an approved Siting Plan would be useful in developing the draft  
193 EIS, which is due in June.

194

195 Pelozza said that MSWMAC should take action today. He added that changes can be  
196 made to the plan later if necessary.

197

198 *The motion failed in a voice vote.*

199

200 **Greenway moved approval of the Draft Siting Plan.**

201

202 MSWMAC member Don Brocha suggested adding recycling facilities to the list on page  
203 15.

204

205 Garber commented that the term ‘recycling facility’ includes many types of facility that  
206 are unobjectionable.

207

208 Brocha suggested the term used on the map; ‘CDL transfer station,’ instead.

209

210 Kiernan replied that the Woodinville recycling facility is permitted as a solid waste  
211 handling facility, which is included in the list.

212

213 Brocha said that although it is technically in Snohomish County, Brightwater is a King  
214 County facility and should be included in the map.

215

216 Brocha pointed out that on page 17 the draft plan says only that CACs have been used in  
217 the past, but does not say that they will be used in future siting processes.

218

219 *MSWMAC approved the change to page 17 by consensus.*

220

221 MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder asked why Waste To Energy is included in the draft  
222 Siting Plan.

223

224 Kiernan replied that if WTE is not addressed in the Siting Plan, it could be problematic in  
225 another venue. He said it is important at this stage to neither endorse nor foreclose the  
226 possibility of WTE. The division must be open and fully explore the option.

227

228 In response to a question, Kiernan said the paragraph dealing with siting constraints on  
229 page 15 falls under the “Equitable Distribution of Facilities” heading, which is not part of  
230 the WTE siting section. He said that ITSG also provided feedback that the headings are  
231 confusing. The document will be reformatted to clarify the heading hierarchy.

232

233 Garber said that on page 13 and throughout the document, environmental review is  
234 referred to as ‘EIS.’ However, it is possible that a site could undergo environmental  
235 review with requiring an EIS, as happened at Enumclaw. She recommended the division  
236 use the term ‘environmental review’ consistently throughout the document.

237

238 *MSWMAC approved the Draft Siting Plan as amended by consensus.*

239

240 MSWMAC member Don Henning asked the division to distribute the revised plan with  
241 tracked changes.

242

### 243 **Third Party Review**

244 Kiernan said that ITSG wanted MSWMAC to know that the list of suggested questions  
245 represents the results of brainstorming and is not a final consensus product.

246

247 Armanini asked that the list be sent to SWAC for its next meeting.

248

249 Huddleston said that if the Third Party Review is to be completed by September 28, the  
250 list of questions needs to be finalized by mid-July. The goal is to have 6-10 broad,  
251 thematic questions. He said that MSWMAC can take action to approve a list of questions

252 at its July 14 meeting at the latest. MSWMAC can also empower a delegation to work  
253 with the RPC during the third party review.

254

255 Garber commented that the questions asked will determine the type of expertise required  
256 on the panel, and called for members' suggested additions to the list of questions.

257

258 Greenway said she was not sure whether it was an appropriate question for the third party  
259 review, but suggested, "What is better for the system as a whole for ratepayers –  
260 retrofitted self-haul only transfer stations or newly constructed full service stations?"

261

262 Huddleston replied it is an excellent topic, but commented that the answer is generally  
263 known. Both the haulers and the division have stated that self-haul service is expensive.  
264 The question becomes one of policy: should the service be provided, and if so, what  
265 should the charge be for that service? This question is included in ITSG's list.

266

267 Greenway said there is no real question self-haul service will be provided.

268

269 Jennings said that there are questions associated with the level of self-haul service and  
270 with the charge for self-haul service.

271

272 Henning commented that King County policy prohibits WTE, so its analysis is outside  
273 the realm of MSWMAC.

274

275 Huddleston said that was an excellent point and agreed that there is an inconsistency in  
276 analyzing WTE as part of the Waste Export System Plan. He said the value in doing the  
277 analysis results from the fact King County has been approached by firms that want to  
278 revive the discussion of WTE. Many people who are currently discussing WTE assume  
279 that it would eliminate the need for the transfer system. He said people need to  
280 understand that transfer stations are necessary with or without WTE. If the possibility of  
281 WTE is not addressed in the export plan, the division could be asked to repeat its work.

282

283 Huddleston added that the discussion of WTE so far assumes the half billion dollar  
284 facility will handle Seattle's waste as well as King County's. It has not been made clear

285 that this capital cost is in addition to the transfer system investment. The technology is  
286 relatively uncommon in the Pacific Northwest, so the question of WTE is appropriate for  
287 third party review. Outside expert review could be particularly valuable on this topic.

288

289 Garber asked if MSWMAC should prioritize the questions.

290

291 Huddleston replied that council staff are prepared to reframe and streamline the  
292 questions, but commented it would be helpful for the questions to be clearly articulated.

293

294 Garber said members should review the questions carefully. At the next meeting  
295 members should be prepared to boil their questions down to an official list for the review.

296

297 Van Orsow said that council staff has developed its own list of questions that has not  
298 been distributed to MSMWAC yet, and commented that list would be useful as well.

299

300 Huddleston agreed and said the division has not distributed those questions because it is  
301 appropriately trying to remain uninvolved in the third party review. He said that he  
302 would get the e-mail distribution list from the division and send the list to MSMWAC.

303

304 Henning said he maintains his position that WTE questions should be removed because  
305 WTE is against county policy and because WTE is not a part of the Waste Export System  
306 Plan under review.

307

308 Huddleston said he would not object to that but commented that one third of the county  
309 council is intrigued by the concept of WTE, so it will need to be addressed. WTE will  
310 likely be part of the third party review in any case. If MSWMAC removes the question,  
311 council will ask it. He suggested that MSMWAC should take advantage of the  
312 opportunity to nuance the questions asked, for example, "Would WTE cancel the need  
313 for the transfer station packages?" If not, it would be giving others a tool to allow  
314 stoppage of the work on the transfer system.

315

316 Garber commented that siting could be affected. A WTE facility could eliminate one  
317 transfer station.

318

319 Huddleston said that some people claim WTE would eliminate the need for an intermodal  
320 facility, but jurisdictions that use WTE use an intermodal facility to export ash.

321

322 Garber said that she could see both sides of the question whether to include WTE  
323 questions in the third party review. She suggested discussing at the next meeting whether  
324 MSWAC wants to propose the question.

325

326 **Recycling Goals**

327 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford said that ITSG spent half  
328 an hour discussing recycling goals. Noting the time, he suggested that four minutes may  
329 not be sufficient for MSWAC to address the topic.

330

331 In response to a question, Gaisford said the presentation is not directly linked to the June  
332 kickoff meeting, but does provide background information for the Comp Plan. He  
333 suggested members review the handouts and bring questions to their next meeting.

334

335 **Adjourn**

336 Garber said that MSWAC members need to commit to attendance at this summer's  
337 meetings in order to maintain a quorum and get through the scheduled work.

338

339 Kiernan suggested that if members cannot attend meetings their cities should name  
340 alternates who will attend in their representative's place.

341

342 Garber asked Yates to send an email polling members on their availability during July,  
343 August and September, and asked that everyone please respond to that email.

344

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

346

347 Submitted by:

348 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff