

Legislation requesting authorization for SWD to enter into a contract for construction of a new Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station and a related supplemental budget were introduced at Council on Apr. 28 and referred to committee. The current procurement schedule anticipates signing a contract with PCL Construction before July 31.

On Apr. 23, 22 people attended a Cedar Hills community meeting; Deputy Executive Fred Jarrett attended as an observer. SWD provided landfill neighbors with updates on routine environmental monitoring and construction activities and provided an update on the landfill gas pipeline break that occurred on Dec. 7, 2013. Most questions centered on the initial response to the pipeline break, landfill gas monitoring practices, and response to odor complaints.

While sorting wood for recycling, a Transfer Station Operator found pipe with insulation that she suspected contained asbestos. The pipe was isolated in an area away from customers and samples were tested and confirmed to contain asbestos. A King County Facilities hazardous materials abatement crew collected and properly disposed of the material.

After considering various recommendations, the division will begin to use the following method to communicate meeting dates and distribute materials for upcoming MSWMAC meetings.

- Once a year the division will send a meeting request for the year. This will allow outlook users to put this standing meeting on their calendars.
- Before each meeting the division will email an agenda with links to materials to MSWMAC members.

After the discussion, MSWMAC members appeared to agree with this process which is similar to the one used by the Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee (MWPAAC).

SWAC

SWAC and MSWMAC Liaison Stacia Jenkins gave the SWAC update. SWAC received a presentation about the Klickitat County PUD landfill gas to energy facility at the Roosevelt Landfill. At that facility, landfill gas is changed to electricity rather than natural gas as is done at the BioEnergy Washington facility at the Cedar Hills Landfill. This interesting presentation was suggested by a SWAC member.

SWAC provided feedback on the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Plan (SSWMP.)

Green Fence Issue

MSWMAC requested that the green fence issue be added to their workplan. Because the topic includes the collection, processing and marketing of materials the division suggested that it be discussed at a joint meeting with SWAC. SWAC has agreed with that idea. After discussion, MSWMAC also agreed. The groups will have a joint meeting on July 11, on MSWMACs normal meeting day and time. If needed, SWD will consider other agenda items of mutual interest for that meeting.

Facility Tour

MSWMAC agreed with the proposed destination of the Facility Tour offered in 2014. Because there are so many new members, MSWMAC agreed that a tour of the Cedar Hills Landfill and Cedar Grove Composting would be useful. A joint tour with SWAC will be arranged on July 18 which is SWAC's normal meeting day. Transportation will be available from the King Street Center or participants may drive directly to the Cedar Hills Landfill. Yates will email details.

Transfer Plan Review Report

Chair Eggen noted that the King County Council is expected to take action on the Transfer Plan Review Report before the next MSWMAC meeting. He moved the [Proposed Motion re: Transfer Plan Review Report and Recommendations](#). Goss seconded the motion.

MacGillivray moved for an amendment of the motion, adding "and results in closure of the Houghton Transfer Station by 2021" to the end of the final bullet. Goss seconded the motion

Knight moved a friendly amendment to MacGillivray's amendment saying that rather than adding the language above, a fifth bullet be added to the motion as follows.

- The Houghton, Renton and Algona Transfer stations should close not later than 2021, 2018, and 2020 respectively.

MacGillivray agreed. The amendment was changed to reflect the language above. Knight seconded the amended motion.

Comments included:

- I don't feel comfortable voting on a motion until I can take it to my City Council.
- Putting in dates may give people a reason to game the system and may be contra-indicated. Don't require the County to close on specific dates when they may not make sense under changed circumstances. It may be costly and inefficient.
- The issue has been before MSWMAC for some time and it is likely that Council will take action before the next MSWMAC meeting.
- Rivkin distributed copies of a [letter](#) signed by the mayors of Kirkland, Mercer Island, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, Shoreline, and Woodinville. The letter supports proceeding with construction of a new Factoria transfer station, siting a new South King County transfer station and not building a new Northeast transfer station. It also supports the identification of potential future transfer system capital improvements for review, including a Northeast transfer station. It also includes specific closure dates for facilities. She noted that more cities are anticipated to sign the letter.
- Bellevue noted that they opposed the motion on the floor. They will be moving a substitute motion that includes information in the final bullet about what analysis would occur in the future. Pinning the closure down to a specific year does not appear to be prudent.
- Others opposed the specific dates in the amended motion.

- Kiernan noted that though analysis has been done, more work is needed regarding dates.
- Consider preceding the language in the third bullet by “Pending environmental review.”

The group voted on the amendment to the motion which passed as follows.

Yay – 13, Nay – 5, Abstain - 1

Bellevue moved a [substitute motion](#) which was seconded by Goss. Bellevue spoke to their motion noting the differences from the original motion.

- First bullet – deleted the language about minor modifications to retain flexibility
- Second bullet – removed “affected city concerns” because the concerns of all cities should be considered
- Third bullet – added, “consistent with Table 1” at the end of the bullet.
- Added a new bullet as follows. “Revise the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan and the pending Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan to address the transfer station network to include a new northeast transfer station as a potential future facility to retain flexibility in the system, consistent with Table 2, and
- Last bullet – added language about impacts of strategies to cities and deleted the last portion because it was not consistent with tables 1 and 2.

Comments included

- The 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan and draft Comprehensive Solid Waste Management plan include a new facility in northeast county.
- I don’t think including closure dates is in conflict with the substitute motion. The expressed intent is that a northeast station continues to be considered.

MacGillivray moved an amendment to the substitute motion that the bullet added to the previous motion be added to the substitute motion. Roberts seconded the motion. The referenced bullet follows.

- The Houghton, Renton and Algona Transfer stations should close not later than 2021, 2018, and 2020 respectively.

Comments included:

- I support the cities that want specific dates for closure but I believe the language in the substitute motion would accomplish that closure. No one can predict that things will happen in a specific way. Recognize that we have a regional system and we could be adding additional costs if the division is required to meet those specific dates.
- Including the specific dates holds all of us accountable to move the process forward. It combats inertia that also drives costs.
- I agree with not including specific dates.
- A member reminded the group that MSWMAC is an advisory committee that can make recommendations which provide guidelines for Council consideration.
- It’s important to be concise in the language. I support the intention but not the specific dates.

- Kiernan noted that it is important to recognize that revisions to the Transfer and Waste Management Plan will require an environmental review.
- Bellevue noted that changes to the plan for a Factoria Transfer station may impact the permits and could incur the need for an additional environmental analysis.
- Nichols proposed an amendment to the substitute motion, adding “Pending environmental review” to the beginning of the third bullet.

There was a voice vote on MacGillivray’s amendment which added a bullet to the substitute motion. The amendment passed.

Discussion of the substitute motion continued.

- Council staff used division information to develop tables 1 and 2.
- Bennett said that the substitute motion is intended to be consistent with table 1 and 2.
- Rivkin said the substitute motion is different from the original motion in that it requires a northeast station be included in the transfer plan.

Rivkin moved in the third bullet to correct the name of the plan to Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and in the fourth bullet after northeast transfer station add, “or other transfer stations or drop boxes in unincorporated areas” and change grammar as necessary. Her motion was seconded.

Discussion continued as follows:

- Many things could happen between now and 2018. Including a schedule that ties our hands. We need something that considers feasibility.
- Others noted that MSWMAC is an advisory committee and this is an advisory motion. Including dates does not necessarily mean that is what will happen. We recognize that things could change.
- Bellevue thanked attendees for taking the substitute motion seriously and said that they would vote in favor of the substitute motion as revised despite their concerns about including dates.

Beginning with the revised motion, the division added the suggested changes from the discussion during the lunch break and brought a [revised version of the substitute motion](#) back to the group.

There was a vote on the substitute motion. Yay – 16, Nay - 2, abstain 1

There was a voice vote on the substitute motion as amended. The motion passed.

Budget Proviso

Ordinance 17677 asked the signatories to the amended and restated interlocal agreement to engage in further discussions to address four topics which may result in amendments to those agreements. The four topics for discussion are:

1. Latecomer provisions
2. Changes to the disposal rates charged based on the number of parties to the ILA
3. Potential alternative financing mechanisms for future capital investments in solid waste facilities; and
4. Clarification of solid waste management planning responsibilities for cities that are not committed to the system after 2028.

In previous discussions, MSWMAC agreed that the first three items were appropriately the work of MSWMAC's Financial Policies subcommittee. During those meetings and the progress reviews at MSWMAC, the division has not received requests for changes to the interlocal agreements. A copy of the fourteen financial policies that have been agreed to by the committee and presented to MSWMAC will be included in the body of the Financial Policy Subcommittee meeting notes which will be distributed to MSWMAC with the materials for their June meeting. The clarification of planning responsibilities mentioned in the fourth item is made clear in the comp plan. Cities not having an ILA with the County for solid waste services, including development of a comprehensive plan, would need to prepare their own plans.

Financial Policies

The discussion referenced the [notes from meeting number eight of the Financial Policies Subcommittee](#). Comments included:

- The subcommittee was charged with discussing Financial Policies. RTS-8 is a transfer policy and is not within the charge of the subcommittee.
- MSWMAC advised the County on financial policies. It is not necessary for the committee to take official action.
- The subcommittee discusses any comments provided by MSWMAC.

Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study

MSWMAC received a [draft summary of an implementation plan](#) for the best practices that we evaluated in the Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study. Severn noted that MSWMAC members participating in the small group on this topic advised that distributing the detailed information discussed at that meeting would not be useful at this time. The draft report will be ready in June. Comments included:

- It seems premature to discuss the implementation plan. There appears to be a gap because we don't have all the information. Members were invited to email Severn if they would like the more detailed information.
- The information is not detailed enough. I would have preferred to have the division present about five options, one at each of five consecutive meetings. It seems that the work is heavily weighting the private sector.

- The criteria used were previously reviewed by MSWMAC. Additionally, options were evaluated based on the availability of resources.
- The timeline appears to be ambitious.
- We haven't seen information on the cost impacts of each of these options. That information is important before making a decision.
- A member noted that it was at MSWMAC's direction that a subcommittee was formed to work with the division on the level of detail to present to the full committee. The division provided information consistent with the subcommittee's suggestions.

Public Comment

John Brekke provided the following public comment.

My name is John Brekke and I'm part of a coalition which represents numerous businesses along with commercial and residential property owners in South King County.

The Fiscally Responsible Option: Algona Transfer Station Improvement, Expansion or Rebuild the South County Transfer Station site which is the most viable alternative for King County, the community and for fiscal responsibility is the current Algona Transfer Station. Here's why:

- In 2012, King County Solid Waste purchased 16 acres of undeveloped land adjacent to the current Algona Transfer Station which could accommodate future needs without an additional land purchase;
- The current Algona Transfer Station is not adjacent to existing residential neighborhoods and is already zoned for this use;
- Improving, expanding or rebuilding the current Algona Transfer Station is fiscally responsible and would save millions of dollars.

Continue to Focus on Collaboration and Negotiations with Algona

Our South King County Business and Citizen Coalition on Transfer Stations appreciate the efforts of King County Solid Waste on focusing on the merits of a future Algona Transfer Station. We encourage continued collaboration and good faith negotiations with the City of Algona. Arriving at a solution in Algona is the best and most fiscally responsible solution for King County.