

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group
Meeting Summary
August 17, 2005
Bellevue**

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Susan Fife-Ferris – City of Bellevue
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston -County Council Staff
Kevin Kiernan - SWD
Theresa Koppang - SWD
Diane Yates – SWD
Bert Tarrant - SWD
Gemma Alexander - SWD

I. SWD Updates

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported that King County Council has delayed action on Report Three to next Monday.

II. Report Four Assumptions

Changes to Waste Stream Assumptions

#1. The system currently handles approximately one million tons of waste annually, which is forecast to increase to approximately 1.5 million tons per year by the end of the twenty year planning horizon. The division will develop annual tonnage forecasts for disposal and recycling streams through the 20 year planning horizon based on forecasts of population growth, annexations, regional economy and recycling rates.

#2. Waste reduction and recycling will continue to be the top strategies for managing solid waste per the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and state law. The private sector currently has and will continue to have primary responsibility for capital investment and operating expenses related to waste reduction and recycling. Where there is need for additional capacity, that capacity will be provided by the private sector.

#3-#5 will be renumbered as 3a through 3c. Numbers 6 & 7 will become 4 & 5.

#4 (formerly 6) regarding vector waste will include an explanation of how the material is currently handled.

A new assumption will be added as #6 that deals with adaptive management and innovations in capital investments in order to meet both immediate needs and long-range planning goals.

Changes to Landfill Capacity Assumptions

#5 was moved to the bucket.

#6 was preserved as-is and moved to the bucket.

#7. The timing of Cedar Hills' closure determines the cost for system improvements.

Changes to Planning Assumptions

#1 becomes #4.

#2 becomes #3, "The waste export system plan will address the transfer and disposal system in King County."

#3 becomes #5.

#4 becomes #6.

#5 becomes #7.

#6 becomes #1.

#7, #10 and #11 are merged to read, "8. The waste export plan will be the foundation for the update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The Comp Plan will be updated beginning in December 2005 and will address solid waste management, CDL and recycling waste streams, including toxics reduction."

#8 and #9 are deleted.

A new assumption is added as #2 reading, "The Comp Plan guides development and operation of waste reduction, recycling and solid waste management activities."

Changes to Transport Assumptions

ITSG did not complete discussion of Transport Assumptions. King County Council staff Mike Huddleston suggested that #1 and #2 be merged and moved further down the list, and that #6 be moved to a new category for Waste Export Assumptions.

Other Assumptions Discussion

Nina Rivkin of Redmond presented her suggestion to separate transfer and transport assumptions. She provided some suggestions for Transfer Assumptions. These suggestions were briefly discussed but were not finalized. ITSG agreed that transfer assumptions should be listed before transport assumptions.

ITSG discussed the concerns voiced at last week's MSWMAC meeting regarding assumptions about landfilling as the preferred method of disposal. ITSG confirmed the importance of the "bucket list" created in July, which was intended to capture topics requiring further discussion. ITSG agreed the list should be forwarded to MSWMAC attached to the end of the assumptions document. In addition to changes listed above, this item was added to the bucket list, "To what extent is King County willing to aggressively pursue additional capacity at Cedar Hills, considering the existing permit, legal settlement, publicly perceived/assumed closure date and insurance issues?"

III. Early Export Model

Solid Waste Division Lead Planner Theresa Koppang distributed the Scenario Template for Early Waste Export Modeling Assumptions. ITSG members are welcome to fill out the template with the assumptions they would like the division to model. The question this model is answering is ‘What are the cost impacts of early waste export, given these set of assumptions.’ The template is for the division’s old model which is designed to analyze early waste export. The new rates analyst will develop a new model. ITSG asked that Total Forecast Tonnage be added to the template.

Tonnage to be Exported

This section can be filled out with percentages or actual tonnages, but the total must add up to either the total tonnage or 100%.

Compacted or Not Compacted

Input Y for each station in each year that station is equipped with a compactor.

Cedar Hills Closure

Enter a suggested date, or choose “when full.” For the second option, the model will be run for several different likely “fill dates.”

Intermodal Location/Short Haul Destination

Enter either sites such as 3rd & Lander, Northwest Containers, and Harbor Island, or enter any site in King County along the railway corridor.

Price

Choose the actual price of a nearby jurisdiction that currently exports waste.

IV. Next Steps

ITSG asked for a copy of King County’s solid waste rate breakdown.

ITSG agreed that Diane Yates would send out an email polling ITSG members about meeting again on Wednesday, August 24 and/or Wednesday, August 31st in order to complete the assumptions.