

## Technical Subcommittee Meeting Notes

**DRAFT**

**February 9, 2005 / King Street Center**

### Meeting Attendees:

#### City Staff:

Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland  
Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Linda Knight – City of Renton  
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac  
Rick Watson – City of Bellevue

#### Consultant:

Deborah Chase, HDR  
Torsten Lienau, HDR  
Ron Owes, HDR

#### County Staff:

Peggy Dorothy – Council Staff  
Neil Fujii – Solid Waste Division  
Jeff Gaisford – Solid Waste Division  
Kevin Kiernan – Solid Waste Division  
Mike Long – Solid Waste Division  
Josh Marx – Solid Waste Division  
CJ Sprague – Solid Waste Division  
Diane Yates – Solid Waste Division  
Dave White – Dept. of Natural Resources & Parks

### SWD Updates

Dave White went over the future meeting schedule and said the March 9<sup>th</sup> ITSG meeting would be for review of the second report before it is transmitted to the Executive in mid-March.

White asked that technical subcommittee members give Diane Yates or Dave White feedback on these monthly meetings.

White went over the hiring process for the technical writer and the planner IV position.

Kevin Kiernan gave an update on the lawsuit. The judge has decided that there won't be a jury trial so the judge will be the decision maker. There were seven causes of action in the lawsuit. Some have been dismissed, including the issues regarding due process, notice and the Comprehensive Plan.

On the flow control issue, which is related to state law regarding G certificates, the judge ruled in the county's favor and the haulers decided to appeal. The appeal was agreed to by both parties and has moved forward. Rent and the regional direct fee are two of the remaining issues. The trial is set for March 7<sup>th</sup>.

Bids for the reconstruction of the 1<sup>st</sup> NE Transfer/Recycling Station will be issued in March. The station will be closed for one year beginning July 1, 2005. Diane Yates has met with the four affected northend cities to brief them on the project and construction schedule.

Kiernan and Theresa Jennings met with the haulers this week to discuss a number of issues including 1<sup>st</sup> NE closure. The haulers will be directed to the Bow Lake Transfer

Station during construction. The division is discussing cost mitigation with the haulers for potential additional costs associated with the longer driving distance to Bow Lake. While the cost mitigation will be based on the extra haul distance to Bow Lake the haulers could choose to go to Factoria. There would be no cost mitigation if the haulers take their loads to the Houghton Transfer Station.

Kiernan said that the division is also talking to the haulers about the division's proposed changes in the waste acceptance policies.

Jeff Gaisford discussed the division's policy direction on waste reduction and recycling, stating that the goal is to have zero waste of resources by 2030, which means that nothing of value be disposed of in the waste stream.

The curbside recycling rate currently is 50 percent; the overall rate is 37 percent. Need to rethink strategies in order to increase waste diversion. Gaisford provided a chart showing the components of the waste stream and discussed the need to focus on food, yard waste, paper, wood, metals, and electronics/small appliances.

Strategies to meet the zero waste of resources goal could include education, additional collection opportunities and regulatory measures, such as Seattle's ban on recyclables in the garbage. Different strategies could be used for different materials.

Plastics and glass are not targeted because they are not as large a component of the waste stream.

Recycling policies will not significantly impact the waste export system plan or the need for overall facility improvements. However, a decision to collect more materials for recycling at the transfer stations could affect design and capital costs. The zero waste of resources goal will be fully discussed in the next update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

The zero waste of resources goal will be fully discussed in the next update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, **as it affects a variety of county policies and programs affecting recycling and waste reduction**

### **Criteria**

Dave White said that the second report that is due by April 15<sup>th</sup> will identify how each of the five stations being evaluated meets the criteria. The report won't contain recommendations, but will include observations and next steps.

Neil Fujii went over the results of the remaining criteria.

### *Criteria number 13: Noise.*

Background noise could not be distinguished from onsite noise. It was noted that most facilities are impacted by freeway noise. Result was based on measurement or calculated

value as appropriate to use considering all test factors. It was noted that the evaluation document suggested going with calculated values and needs to be changed.

Consultants took additional readings. The results show that Factoria, Bow Lake and Houghton do not meet the standard. Bow Lake, however, has no residential neighbors and complies with Tukwila's nuisance noise requirements.

Factoria didn't meet 65 dBA at property line but development around station is light industrial; there are no residences nearby. It is questionable whether station noise impacts any neighboring businesses. It will be noted whether or not local standard is met and then asterisked if station is in industrial area.

Based on both measured and calculated value, Houghton was rated no. Both values exceed 60 dBA at the property line.

*Criteria number 14: Odor.*

All stations meet the criteria. There was one complaint at Houghton, which did not result in a citation. Puget Sound Clean Air Authority (PSCAA) notifies us of any complaints. This complaint was during 90 degree weather when many of the loads coming in were smelly.

*Criteria number 10: Safety.*

Based on input from the ITSG, the division developed fourteen safety factors for evaluating customer and employee safety. A table was distributed that depicted which criteria were and weren't met for each of the five stations. Because more criteria were not met than were met, a 'no' was entered for each station.

Additional information on accidents was provided, which supported the analysis. While the division's goal is zero accidents, the standard selected is four or fewer accidents per month. This includes downtown as well as out in the field.

There were 59 accidents over the last 36 months, which is 23 accidents over the standard.

*Criteria number 15: Off-site traffic impacts and queuing.*

Used transportation Level of Service (LOS) standards for all sites, although not all host cities use LOS standard. Renton uses travel time instead of LOS.

Growth rate was based on a number of factors including employment. It was suggested that growth rate and recycling assumptions be footnoted.

*Criteria number 5: Vehicle Capacity.*

*Criteria number 6: Tonnage Capacity.*

The result on these criteria will be a combination of weekdays/weekend data. It was suggested that breaking out weekdays and weekends would provide more information for decisions on alternatives to mitigate impacts.

The distribution of vehicles can impact how many tons a station can handle.  
The change in the regional direct rate resulted in a change in tonnage and vehicle distribution at the stations.

The capacity of a station is determined by certain ‘chokepoints.’ In a direct dump facility, a chokepoint occurs when a full trailer is removed and an empty one is brought in. Other chokepoints include the in-bound scale, tip floor and outbound scale.

Using LOS standards, even when a facility is at an LOS E, it is still able to process all waste coming in. However, this level cannot be sustained over time. It can lead to safety and other problems.

*Criteria number 11: Ability to accommodate waste export:*

It was noted that the stations can handle 132 tons/hour from commercial haulers but only nine tons/hour from self-haulers. This comparison is based on handling one type of customer only and would represent the extremes of each. The City of Seattle has mandatory collection yet they are converting their two transfer stations to accommodate only self haulers and building a new facility for commercial haulers.

Cost effective waste export requires compaction. In most cases that means compacting on site at a transfer station. It is technically possible to have an intermodal/reload facility where waste is brought in uncompacted, put through compactors and then loaded onto trains. However, this is an expensive option since the waste is handled twice. You can also export some uncompacted waste, but that is also a more expensive alternative. For this reason, existing transfer stations cannot accommodate waste export. Need to analyze cost questions such as, how cost prohibitive is it to export uncompacted waste?

It is an odd criteria to measure existing facilities against because clearly these stations are not export ready and were not built to accommodate waste export.

There will be compaction at First Northeast. If waste going to Bow Lake is compacted, a large percentage of the system waste will be compacted. Then the rest of the stations can be made export ready over time.

**Next Steps:**

One observation in next report will be that moving to waste export is not as simple as installing compactors due to all the deficiencies that exist with the current stations.

The division will be working with the haulers on the third report, as well as with ITSG, SWAC, and MSWMAC. The goal is to have the third report completed by May 15<sup>th</sup>, with submittal to the county council by June 15th. Haulers feel that is too ambitious a timeline.

Peggy Dorothy said she would like to have a conversation soon about the independent review that is required by Ordinance 14971.

*Note: These notes are intended to give a sense of the presentation and discussion at the meeting. It is not intended to be a verbatim transcription of the four hour technical discussion.*