KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 3, 2006
11:45 – 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**
Bill Peloza	**City of Auburn**	**Councilmember**
Doug Jacobson	**City of Bothell**	**Public Works Director**
Debbie Anspaugh	**City of Bothell**	**Public Works Admin Coordinator**
Alison Bennett	**City of Bellevue**	**Utilities Policy Advisor**
Joan McGilton	**City of Burien**	**Mayor**
Rob Van Orsow	**City of Federal Way**	**Solid Waste and Recycling Coordinator**
Carolyn Armanini	**City of Lake Forest Park**	**City Representative**
David Baker	**City of Kenmore**	**Deputy Mayor**
Jessica Greenway	**City of Kirkland**	**Councilmember**
Elaine Borjeson	**City of Kirkland**	**Solid Waste Coordinator**
Jean Garber	**City of Newcastle**	**Mayor**
Nina Rivkin	**City of Redmond**	**Senior Policy Analyst**
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**
Valerie Jarvi	**City of Woodinville**	**Public Works Maintenance Supervisor**

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Solid Waste Division Director
Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager
Mark Buscher, Lead Planner
Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison
Jane Gateley, Staff
Kathy Hashagen, Staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston

Guests

Amy Ensminger, City of Woodinville

Call to Order

MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:07. Everyone present introduced themselves.

Approve October Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda

The October minutes were unanimously approved.

MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber mentioned that other topics listed on the agenda today are not urgent and if necessary can be completed at a later date. She acknowledged that the discussion of ILA/Governance listed first on the agenda may require more time than scheduled in order to complete. She also stated her appreciation for the document prepared by ITSG.

Garber mentioned there had been discussion about asking SWD staff to leave the room during the ILA/Governance discussion. Because SWD staff had been briefed on the content of the presentation earlier in the week and because other County staff would be present during the discussion, she suggested that SWD staff remain in the room.

MSWMAC approved the suggestion by consensus.

ITSG Update

MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin directed the attention of MSWMAC members to the ITSG information emailed to members and distributed at the meeting.

MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini asked how the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) would be involved. Rivkin responded that she was looking for input on that question from Armanini who is the Chair of SWAC.

MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow presented information regarding the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum (SWIF) and Solid Waste Interlocal Agreements (ILA). Van Orsow mentioned that the ILA for the City of Kent differs slightly from the ILAs for other participating cities. Lead Planner Mark Buscher said that the City of Kent was part of the

City of Seattle Solid Waste System until the closure of the Kent Highlands Landfill. The City of Kent then became part of the King County Solid Waste System and signed an ILA a few years before the rest of the cities were asked to sign the ILAs. The format of the agreements was refined during the intervening period of time.

In response to a suggestion that MSWMAC approve the direction of the report presented at the meeting, Council staff Mike Huddleston suggested that the decision be deferred until discussions with Solid Waste Division staff have been completed. Rivkin agreed with this response and asked instead for input to guide the final report.

Armanini expressed concern that the direction presented by ITSG would not allow representation by unincorporated areas on SWIF. Greenway agreed that representation of unincorporated areas appears problematic.

Solid Waste Division Director, Theresa Jennings and Engineering Services Manager, Kevin Kiernan said that there are six unincorporated area councils that meet together quarterly. In addition SWD has a long standing working relationships with the Vashon Island and Maple Valley unincorporated area councils. Van Orsow suggested that King County Councilmembers could represent unincorporated areas at Regional Policy Committee (RPC) meetings.

Armanini suggested that the final ILA/Governance report fully represent the pros and cons of each option. Rivkin acknowledged the comment and said that the document before MSWMAC is not a draft of the report.

MSWMAC member Jacobsen asked if the Suburban Cities Association had reviewed the suggested direction. Rivkin responded that MSWMAC and SWD staff were the first to receive the presentation. She suggested members review the list of other proposed briefings.

Rivkin suggested that the RPC could see the proposed change in their role as positive – stating that the new configuration would allow the RPC to focus exclusively on policy

direction as opposed to requiring them to function in dual roles. In addition, ITSG recommends a direct connection between MSWMAC and the RPC.

MSWMAC member Alison Bennett discussed the proposed dispute resolution process. Armanini stated concerns about process 2. She referenced the possibility of individual cities making agreements with the Solid Waste Division without the knowledge of MSWMAC. Huddleston commented that informing others avoids the possibility of two parties making choices that may affect other cities.

Greenway remarked that it is valuable to have a dispute resolution process institutionalized so there is an established recourse. Kiernan asked that language be added to process number 5 acknowledging the existing site selection process.

Van Orsow discussed financial policies. He commented that it appears some of the existing financial policies need further development to prepare the Division for its more sophisticated future and to improve suburban cities' confidence that projects have appropriate financing.

Armanini remarked that the charge in ordinance 14971 is to develop a framework of policies. The examples of policies in the document appear to be more detailed than the charge. Rivkin stated the policies were included only as examples to assist readers in understanding what was meant by the suggestion to create more sophisticated financial policies. These policies are not intended to be the final policies. Armanini suggested that that point be made clear in the report. One method may be to put the example policies in an appendix. Huddleston remarked that the discussion of financial policies addresses the core issue of the original dispute.

Rivkin asked MSWMAC members to provide suggestions of other models of financial policies that should be reviewed. Rivkin suggested that transit policies should also be considered when looking for model financial policies. Jennings reminded attendees that there may be King County bond covenants that could influence financial policy requirements, for example, Wastewater bonds.

The four categories for financial policies are

- Financial Forecast and budget policies
- Debt Financing and borrowing policies
- Rate and charge policies
- Grant program policies (i.e. recycling program grants)

MSWMAC approved the four categories of financial policies by consensus.

Huddleston remarked that the next steps include the adoption of the Waste Export and Transfer System Plan (the Plan) by the King County Council. It is possible that the ordinance adopting the Plan could include a work plan for 2007 providing direction about the framework presented in the ILA/Governance report.

Bennett discussed host city mitigation and said the challenge is to strike a balance between mitigating the impacts of a transfer station and the benefits of being a host city.

Armanini recommended looking for models that could be considered in addition to King County Wastewater Treatment Division for the second option (base policies on similar language developed for the wastewater program). Bennett responded that the example used was the most current found by ITSG. Jennings remarked that Wastewater policies regarding host city mitigation appear consistent with what SWD has historically done.

Greenway remarked that it would be valuable to continue discussing the third option (establish a host city fee) even though it would require a change in state law. Huddleston remarked that that type of change has been made before in state law with respect to how and where capacity charges are being paid. He recognized that an impact of the Growth Management Act is that fewer large parcels are available for commercial development. Dedicating a large piece of land for a public facility takes that parcel off the tax roles and results in loss of business or property taxes for the city. Greenway suggested that kind of change may result in other facilities requesting similar changes, which would impact state

funding. Huddleston remarked that if applied statewide it would result in an approximately $10 million impact to the Washington State's budget.

Peloza mentioned that longer term bonds should be considered. A twenty year period may not be long enough. Huddleston stated that idea had been considered. However, King County is constrained by the twenty years remaining on the term of the ILAs. He has suggested to the King County Council that if there is not an extension of the contracts it may be prudent to sell the entire $200 million of bonds now and raise the rates to cover the costs. That will insure the bonds are paid before the end of the ILAs when some cities could choose to leave the system. Rivkin remarked that it may be the appropriate time to begin discussions about the length of the ILAs.

The next step in the ILA/Governance issue is to write the report. Rivkin requested input regarding how SWAC should be involved and asked MSWMAC to review other potential briefings listed on the front of the document. Huddleston remarked that the King County Council subcommittee would like the report to have been reviewed and accepted by the advisory groups before it is sent to the subcommittee.

Armanini, who is also the Chair of SWAC, responded that historically SWAC has not discussed SWIF or Host City Mitigation. MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton mentioned that SWAC focuses on implementation more than governance. Jennings reminded MSWMAC that some subjects may create a conflict of interest when shared with SWAC because of committee membership. Armanini said that Financial Policies and Dispute Resolution Processes would be more effectively discussed with SWAC in 2007 after a general presentation about ITSG.

Rivkin concluded the discussion by sharing her hope that the ILA/Governance report will be sent to Council in December via a transmittal letter from of both ITSG and MSWMAC. Rivkin will draft a letter and bring it to the December meeting.

McGilton asked how the ILA/Governance information would be shared with the Suburban Cities Association. Garber said she would share the information with the Association's Executive Director.

Garber stated her appreciation of the work and time invested by ITSG in creating the document presented to MSWMAC. Rivkin asked that a review of the ILA/Governance report be added as the first item on the December MSWMAC meeting agenda.

Adjourn

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

Submitted by:
Kathy Hashagen, SWD Staff