

## Technical Subcommittee Meeting Notes

**DRAFT**

**December 8, 2004 / King Street Center**

### Meeting Attendees:

#### City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila  
Erin Leonhart – City of Kirkland  
Linda Knight – City of Renton  
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way  
Rick Watson – City of Bellevue

#### County Staff:

Peggy Dorothy – Council Staff  
Neil Fujii – Solid Waste Division  
Jane Gateley – Solid Waste Division  
Kevin Kiernan - Solid Waste Division  
Mike Long – Solid Waste Division  
Josh Marx – Solid Waste Division  
Diane Yates – Solid Waste Division  
Dave White – Dept. of Natural Resources & Parks

### **SWD Updates**

The motion approving the Transfer System Level of Service report and due date for the next report on the Analysis of System Needs and Capacity was approved by the county council at its December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

There's a meeting of the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group scheduled for Friday, December 17<sup>th</sup>. At that meeting the group will review both the Governance and Technical Subcommittees' work.

An e-mail has gone out to all cities' representatives and alternates to MSWMAC to determine the first meeting date for the advisory committee. As of today, Friday, January 14<sup>th</sup> is the date selected by those who have responded to the e-mail.

Repairs to the roofs at Houghton and Factoria are underway. The work will be completed this week. Damage has occurred over the last several months. In fact, as late as last Wednesday, December 1<sup>st</sup>, the roof at Houghton was hit by a commercial hauler. The division's emergency procedures are to inspect the roofs if there's 3 inches of snow and to close both stations in the event of the accumulation of 6 or more inches of snow.

*Note: These notes are not intended to be complete or a word for word transcription of the four hour technical discussion.*

### **Transfer System LOS Criteria and Project Timeline**

Dave White said it's important to start thinking about next deliverable per Ordinance 14971, which is the report on Analysis of System Needs and Capacity. A draft outline for the report was distributed. The report is due April 15, 2005.

That means it has to be completed and transmitted by mid-March. The report is mostly data gathering - applying criteria to each of the five urban transfer stations, including Algona, Bow Lake, Factoria, Houghton, and Renton. This report will not contain recommendations, but an assessment of problems the individual stations have with meeting the criteria and, consequently, system needs. We will need to identify what 'not meeting' a specific criteria means. The question that will need to be answered for each of the criteria is can we mitigate for it, or do we need to renovate an existing facility, build a new facility or close an existing facility? The last section of the report will be next steps, including the timing of the 3<sup>rd</sup> report required by the ordinance.

The group discussed a future meeting schedule and agreed to meet every four weeks for ½ day. The group agreed to meet on Wednesday, January 12<sup>th</sup>, Wednesday, February 9<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday, March 9<sup>th</sup>. Each meeting will be from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at King Street Center.

Discussion followed about when potential costs of recommendations will be addressed. For example, a recommendation to replace all transfer stations needs to be balanced against potential costs of doing so. But it's also important to see range of alternatives first. The process is still in the data gathering stage. It was clarified that costs are vitally important, but will come into play when developing and evaluating alternatives for the fourth report in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2005.

Division staff said they may look at some preliminary costs. It's important that any proposed rate be supported by the cities. It's also important that MSWMAC have an opportunity to provide input into recommendations and potential costs.

### **Criteria Review**

The table of criteria methodology was reviewed.

#### *Criteria 1 - Maximum travel time:*

The division applied GIS methods to estimate both travel time and distance in a transfer station's service area. Posted speed limits were used to estimate travel time. A transfer station's service area is estimated by customer transaction and survey data.

Distinction is made between customer classes even though travel time is the same for each of them. This distinction was included because there has been discussion about designating services at transfer stations based on customer class. For example, there could be a decision to designate a station for residential self haulers only or for commercial haulers only.

The group agreed to change Criteria 1 to 30 minute maximum.

It was suggested that the methodology be clarified to indicate that posted speed limits were used to determine travel time and that peak travel times affect all customer classes equally. It was also suggested that the outliers in the non-contiguous urban growth areas be explained.

*Criteria 2 - Time on site:*

To measure time on site, transaction data were graphed by weekday and weekend for a 1 year period for each station evaluated.

Sixteen minutes on site was Waste Management's request. Rabanco suggested five minutes for the criteria. These times do not include time to tip their loads.

The division suggested changes to this criteria including:

1. change the wording on this criterion in order to clarify the meaning and accentuate the positive. Rather than saying the criteria is not met ten percent of the time, say that the criteria (time on site) is met 90 percent of total trips.
2. amend the standards for business and residential self haulers from 60 minutes to 30 minutes. This change is based on review of actual transaction data and feedback from the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group, Solid Waste Advisory Committee and the Regional Policy Committee.

Time on site is impacted by a number of factors both in and out of the division's control. For example, customers sometimes take breaks/talk to other customers at the transfer station, taking more time than necessary.

One way to address time on site is to add a second outbound scale, which was done at the Algona Transfer station along with raising the roof.

Discussion followed that not all standards are equal and that it may never be possible to meet a 'gold' standard for each transfer station. The standard may not necessarily be an ideal level of service but level beyond which it's necessary to think about doing something drastic at a station.

It was suggested that the analysis indicate why 16 minutes at each station can't be met and to include operational observations.

It was agreed that changing criteria to 30 minutes for both classes of self haulers is reasonable.

It was suggested that weights need to be assigned to each criteria. The group notes that when developing transfer station alternatives, not all criteria will be of equal importance. In some instances, non-capital intensive measures could be taken,

such as congestion pricing. We may find when applying the criteria, that some criteria does not have as much weight as others.

The 4<sup>th</sup> report will include discussion of options, and an application of the criteria to those options.

### *Criteria 3- Facility Hours Meet User Demand*

This criterion is being evaluated by a number of factors. The division reviewed such variables as tons per hour, which shows when different classes of customers use a facility; as well as average transactions per hour. The division also looked to see if there are spikes at opening or closing hours. Additional data is also being gathered.

The group discussed the tons and transactions per hour at various stations.

Bellevue staff commented that the city allows commercially-zoned areas picked up 24 hours/day

Not meeting this criterion may not trigger building a new station, but changing hours at existing stations.

There were a number of questions about this criteria including:

Q. Will recommendations be by facility or by system?

A. That hasn't been determined yet. Still at stage of applying criteria.

Q. How will you evaluate yes or no?

A. We'll explain reasons why demand is not being met. Both qualitative and quantitative information will be used.

Q. How do you define demand?

A. No hard and fast answer. We also need to look at current patterns of use to see what may be needed. We will need to look at haulers' requests.

Solid Waste Operations staff and WM operations staff sat down and discussed operational needs within existing constraints – can't open Houghton and 1<sup>st</sup> NE at night. Rabanco has asked for service 24 hrs/day at each station.

The division also looked at services offered – Yard waste at Factoria from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. on days Cedar Falls Drop Box is closed is very busy.

There's no way to separate out the yard waste on those days. So, hours at one site may affect services at another site.

Also looked at documented complaints received as a result of hour changes. In sum, need to describe what's happening in addition to showing data – it's not strict quantitative exercise. Results will be a station-by-station assessment of how well stations are meeting demand.

*Criteria 4 - WRR Policies:*

Only included WRR policies specific to transfer stations in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. None of the five urban stations meet this criterion. Recycling services provided at the stations are primarily intended for residential customers, though business customers also use the service. Businesses using the free recycling facilities fill containers quickly, so the division does not promote the service to businesses.

The group agreed to modify the criteria to state: recycling services provided at the transfer stations meet the waste reduction recycling policies in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

*Following criteria are being evaluated by consultants:*

*Criteria 5 – Vehicle Capacity*

*Criteria 6 - Average daily handling capacity*

*Criteria 11- Ability to accommodate waste export*

*Criteria 15 – Traffic impact on local streets*

Consultants for Criteria 5, 6, and 15 will look at how traffic flows through station at different times of day and how transfer trailers move through. Consultant will develop a model to show how vehicles move through site. The traffic model will depict peak hour queues. The consultants will have number of vehicles and average transaction time. The consultant will look at most immediate intersections. The division will need local traffic data.

This kind of model has never been done before for transfer station analysis. They may evaluate system in workshop format of 1-2 days. Technical Subcommittee members are welcome to attend. Workshop will be 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> week of January 2005.

Consultants will attend next Technical Subcommittee meeting to discuss what they're doing. Work needs to be done by late February. We may have two meetings to look at consultant's work. Consultant's scope of work is available if anyone would like it.

*Criteria 7 – 3 Days Storage Space*

The division can't guarantee that empty trailers will be on-site at time of an emergency at 4 of the 5 stations. The pit at Bow Lake does have a 506 ton capacity.

There may be enough trailer capacity at the other four stations for a couple of hours. After that, the division would have to ask the haulers not to bring any more loads to the stations. Are they empty? Can you say not enough capacity at any station.

In the event of a major earthquake there are plans for storage at other public facilities such as parks, old missile silos, etc. These are for temporary storage of disaster debris. This is considered in the county's Emergency Management Plan.

Emergency storage really comes into play once we move to waste export. Excess export container capacity will be important then.

It was suggested that this might not be an appropriate criteria since the county's Emergency Management Plan already addresses it. They decided to leave the criteria in for now, while acknowledging the overlap with emergency management planning.

*Criteria 8 – Space Exists for Station Expansion:*

SWD suggested rewording this criterion to state that, "space exists for expansion of active area defined as the paved area inside the fence line.

Aerial photos of each station taken in October 2003 were reviewed.

Discussion followed about whether the area within the fence line is always active area. Buffers can extend into adjacent property and 100' buffer can change over time.

The consensus was to use the property line as the active area boundary.

*Criteria 9 – Minimum Roof Clearance of 25 feet:*

Photographs of commercial haulers tipping their loads at Houghton were displayed.

Commercial trucks have gotten longer, which has resulted in their inability to fully tip their loads because they can't fully extend. This results in more trips through neighborhoods. Rabanco has said that they pack their loads two tons less than their trucks' capacity in order to fully tip.

The division does have length restrictions – no trucks longer than 30 feet (depending on time of day). If a truck is over 45 feet, it will only be accepted at Enumclaw and Bow Lake.

One city commented that it was interesting to learn of the complexity of solid waste operations. Can see that sometimes the commercial haulers' business decisions are not in sync with the division's ability to accommodate them.

*Criteria 10 – Meets Requirements for Customer and Employee Safety:*

The group looked at statistics on accidents resulting from physical site elements. The data indicated that there were 61 injuries in the last four years at six of the stations. The division included the Enumclaw Transfer Station in its compilation of accident data to compare what occurs at an older station versus a newer station that does not have the physical site constraints.

The division will also get customer data and roof accident data.

Discussion followed about what defines an acceptable number of accidents and whether there is some maximum number of accidents beyond which a station is not meeting this criterion. Division staff indicated that they will work to get this information.

*Criteria 17b – Aesthetics:*

The division said that it is compiling some information for MSWMAC's discussion of this criterion. The division will not be applying this criterion. A consultant is compiling examples of how other communities have tried to blend transfer stations into neighborhoods.

Comment was made that this is a good exercise. McDonalds Restaurants is doing it too.