

Technical Subcommittee Meeting Notes
DRAFT
September 22, 2004 / King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Linda Knight – City of Renton
Rob VanOrsow – City of Federal Way

County Staff:

Neil Fujii – Solid Waste Division
Jane Gateley – Solid Waste Division
Kevin Kiernan - Solid Waste Division
Diane Yates – Solid Waste Division
Dave White – Dept. of Natural Resources & Parks

Discussion of DRAFT Transfer Station LOS Report

Kevin Kiernan reviewed the deliverables required by adopted Ordinance No. 14971.

Four of the deliverables are major milestones that will inform the development of the Waste Export System Plan.

1. Transfer station level of service standards and criteria (due Oct. 15, 2004)
2. Analysis of system needs and capacity (due by May15, 2005*)
3. Analysis of options for public and private ownership (due date to be determined)
4. Preliminary transfer and waste export facility recommendations, and estimated system costs, rate impacts and financial policy assumptions (due date to be determined).

* The legislation provides that each motion for approving these major milestone reports will include the timeline for submittal of future milestone reports. The division has set May 15th as the date by which the Analysis of System Needs and Capacity will be submitted to council

Two of the deliverables determine the timeline for long term planning:

1. Waste Export System Plan (due Dec. 15, 2005)
2. Comp Plan update (to begin Dec. 1, 2005 and anticipated to be completed by Dec. 2007).

One deliverable addresses the creation of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC):

1. The Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group will provide a report of its findings and recommendations on the structure, function and responsibilities of the MSWMAC (due by Dec. 31, 2004)

The technical subcommittee was tasked with developing the first deliverable on the transfer station level of service standards and criteria.

MSWMAC will be in place to weigh in on all future deliverables, with the exception of the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group's report on MSWMAC.

The group began its review of the draft report and table by considering comments received from subcommittee members who were unable to attend the meeting (Shoreline, Bellevue and council staff)

The revised map showing approximate travel times and distances to King County disposal facilities was distributed.

Shoreline's comments:

Report Text:

Page 1, paragraph 2, last sentence: the group agreed to change the text from, "the criteria are generally based on..." to, "the criteria generally fall into the following categories..."

Page 2, paragraph 4, first sentence: the group agreed to change the text from, "This evaluation process, which leads to development of the comprehensive plan..." to, "This evaluation process, which will inform the next update of the comprehensive plan..."

Page 3, Paragraph 4, last sentence: the group agreed to change the text from, "As the facilities age and the need for services increase, planning for the long-term future of the system may require more significant upgrades..." to "As the facilities age and the needs for solid waste and recycling services change, planning for the long-term future of the system may require more significant upgrades..."

Bellevue's comments:

In the document entitled "Transfer System Level of Service Evaluation Criteria and Standards":

Responses and clarifications based on Sept. 22 Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group Meeting

- The document repeats in paragraphs number 4, 12, 15 the statement that there are no established guidelines for evaluating existing transfer stations. Suggest that this statement be made in one place only.

Response: Agreed. Next draft will consolidate references

- Is it the intent of the last sentence on paragraph 16 that the conclusion resulting from these standards will not be determined by one factor alone?

Response: That is correct. Next draft points out after standards are developed and applied the SWD will work with the ITSG and MSWMAC to determine how they will be used

- Paragraph 16 indicates input from the private solid waste management companies was obtained. Did these companies agree with the proposed maximum travel time and maximum queuing time recommendations?

Response: Specific approval was obtained from Waste Management. Criteria were sent to Rabanco, and were distributed to their operations staff, but no response has been received yet.

The next comments apply to Table 1-Solid Waste Transfer Facility Evaluation Criteria and Standards

- 2a,b,c : Maximum queuing time- concur with the county's recommendation for total time including time to unload is good for commercial vehicles but I don't believe it's a good idea for residential self haulers. As I understood from discussions at previous meetings the residential self haulers time varies drastically. Is it the county's recommendation that the standard for residential self haulers for total time be set at 60 minutes?

Response: This is the County's recommendation. It admittedly depends on user behavior which is beyond the division's direct control, but it also measures congestion.

- 6 a, b: Average daily handling capacity-the description should be clarified to indicate that this standard will be measured over one hour, two hours or 24-hour periods as discussed at the previous meeting.

- **Response:** It will be during the operating hours of each day.

- 7 a, b: Is it intended that the space for three days of solid waste storage during emergency is for average daily handling capacity?

Response: Yes

- 12: Should the description acknowledge that retrofitting over time due to either structural integrity or code changes is required? I would hope that others on the committee agree that facilities age over time and need maintenance or retrofitting.

Response: After some discussion, the group agreed this should be assumed, and not explicit. Recommend an additional evaluation criteria for sensitive areas buffers-sensitive areas to include: wetlands, floodplains, riparian corridors, steep slopes. The response is yes or no. See below.

- 16: Meets all standards for significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts-not clear if I understand this description. Does the description apply when a facility is not undergoing a development review or a retrofit for a permit or does this criteria only apply for a retrofit or a new facility? My understanding is SEPA is only required when a development action is pending.

Response: After some discussion these two concepts are to be moved to a "subjective considerations" category, which while important, are not objectively quantified. They will be referred to MSWMAC which is to give policy input.

- 17a: recommend 17a to be modified to read as follows: "Additional traffic meets the local traffic criteria level of service standard as defined in the *American Association*

of State Transportation Officials Manual". The AASHTO manual does not define the appropriate level of service standard (A, B, etc).

Response: Good catch. We are incorporating

- 19: this is a more general comment that applies to other criteria. But in particular number 19. While the intent of the evaluation criteria is to be objective, a criteria should not be excluded because it is subjective.

Response: The subjective criteria can be discussed by the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee. This will also be in the "subjective considerations" area referred to MSWMAC.

- 23: Recommend that this criteria be discussed by the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee. This is more a policy than criterion.

Response: We agree it should be discussed by MSWMAC.

Council staff comments:

- Suggested moving paragraph five on page one up so it would come after paragraph one.

Response: The group agreed with the suggestion.

- Suggested moving paragraph four on page one to come directly under the heading "Evaluation Criteria and Standards."

Response: The group decided to keep the paragraph where it was so that it would come after the paragraph on page one that begins, "The next step...."

Next Steps

- Revised draft to Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group by Friday, 9/24.
- Staff Group meeting at division offices on Wednesday, 9/29.
- Final draft report to Executive about 10/1.
- Update RPC on 10/6.
- Report transmitted to council by 10/15.
- Governance Subcommittee to start meeting in October.