

**Revised Draft**  
**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**August 24, 2005**  
**King Street Center**

**Meeting Attendees:**

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue  
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way  
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland  
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond  
Linda Knight – City of Renton  
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston -County Council Staff  
Beth Mountsier – County Council Staff  
Theresa Jennings – SWD  
Geraldine Cole - SWD  
Kevin Kiernan - SWD  
Theresa Koppang - SWD  
Diane Yates – SWD  
Gemma Alexander - SWD

**I. Report Four Assumptions**

Assistant Division Director Geraldine Cole attended the meeting to review the reason for developing and reviewing ‘assumptions’ for Report #4. Cole explained the purpose of assumptions and provided the definition of assumption as it pertains to the planning process for Report #4. An assumption is “the supposition that something is true, advanced as fact or can be taken for granted.” After review by SWD analysts, Cole said that the draft assumptions document contained many statements that were not assumptions, but were policies or other pieces of information not applicable to the planning for Report #4. The division reviewed the most recent ‘assumptions’ document and produced three handouts that were provided at the meeting:

1. A revised, one-page list of Assumptions (drawn from existing documents) that the division recommends forwarding to MSWMAC.
2. The most recent draft of the assumptions overlaid with comments from the division’s analysts that reflect the division’s suggested categories for each statement. The categories being:

**Assumption:** The supposition that something is true, advanced as fact or can be taken for granted.

**Policy:** A definite course or method of action selected from alternatives and options

**Direction:** Per ordinance 14971 and/or council direction

**Information:** Background information that will be used for planning or analysis.

**Not Material:** Data that is related to solid waste planning, but not directly applicable to Report Four Assumptions.

**Not Known:** Incorrectly assumed or missing data.

**Repetition:** Addresses an issue that has been previously identified in the assumptions.

3. Categorized “bucket” lists of all other statements from the first document sorted into the suggested categories listed above.

Division Staff emphasized the intent was to keep all the information from previous documents and prior meetings and organize them in a manner that differentiated assumptions from policies, information, etc...The division recommended that this document accompany the list of assumptions when transmitted to MSWMAC so that they will be aware of all the discussion surrounding the creation of the assumptions. The details of ITSG discussions would be preserved and transmitted, while also culling out the planning assumptions for Report #4.

Some ITSG members, including Auburn, Renton and SeaTac, stated that they were prepared to accept the direction being proposed by the division and that it was time to finalize the assumptions document and move forward with other topics related to report #4 planning. Other ITSG members, in particular Bellevue and Redmond expressed a desire to continue working on review of the older version of the assumptions at the meeting. These cities did not want to use the division's reformatted assumptions and buckets list and were concerned that they had not been given time prior to the meeting to review the division's proposed changes. The division said its proposed changes were begun after the previous meeting and only completed this morning, so it was not possible to make the revisions available before the meeting. They emphasized that the revised list of assumptions did not include any new information, but was only a reformatted list of existing material that differentiated planning assumptions from policy issues, etc....

Division staff expressed concern that given the required timeline for report #4, it was time to move the process forward so that MSWMAC could have assumptions to review at their next meeting, and receive a presentation on compaction at transfer stations. In order to meet the deadline for sending out materials for the upcoming MSWMAC meeting, the assumptions would need to be finalized and the compactor presentation would need to be completed at the August 31 ITSG meeting. Division staff as well as some of the cities voiced concern that other work on report #4 would be held up by delays in completing the assumptions, or that there would not be sufficient time left for cities' input on other issues deeper in the report.

There was discussion of how the division edited the first assumption relating to tonnage forecasts, particularly what role forecasts play in planning and whether numbers should be included in the assumption. ITSG further discussed the appropriate level of detail for planning assumptions as well as the purpose of the assumptions and whether they represented a stand alone document or whether they are a tool for development of that document. Division staff said that the assumptions document is a building block for report four and they did not intend for it to be a stand alone document.

The cities decided to break in order to caucus and determine amongst themselves how to proceed with the assumptions document.

After the break, county staff returned to the meeting and county council staff Mike Huddleston said MSWMAC had commented that the preliminary version of the assumptions they got at their last meeting could be streamlined. The division was trying

to be responsive to that comment in the short time frame before their deadline to provide MSWMAC's September meeting materials.

ITSG accepted the submission of the division's proposed changes for inclusion in the review. ITSG reviewed the strike-through formatted document from the point where last week's meeting left off, and reconciled its contents with the newer documents, verifying that none of the earlier material was lost. ITSG agreed that definitions of the terms "transfer station" and "intermodal facility" and an explanation of the concept of "co-location" should be included in the information section. ITSG agreed the assumption categories should be reviewed again before final approval, and that the bucket lists should be part of the same document as the assumptions.

There was discussion of the assumption relating to a federated system of 37 cities. Several of the cities, including Bellevue, wanted to eliminate the assumption entirely. Language from Report Three was cited as direction from MSWMAC contrary to this assumption. It was suggested that the assumption could be kept but reworded, or that it could be moved to the Direction or Analysis buckets. The division agreed to reference the language from report three as a new item (#3) in the Direction bucket, but maintained that the assumption of 37 cities should remain unchanged because binding contractual agreements make the assumption an explicit requirement for system planning and analysis. Consensus was not reached and the issue was carried over to the agenda for the next meeting.

## **II. Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 31 at King Street Center in order to complete the assumptions. ITSG agreed to review a revised Assumptions/Bucket document by email before then. The completed document will go to MSWMAC late next week.

The division identified the following upcoming work items:

- Siting Criteria Identification
- Compaction Options at Existing Transfer Stations
- Tonnage Forecasting
- Finalization of the Public/Private Characteristics Matrix
- Defining System Options
- Landfill Capacity Evaluation
- Defining Intermodal Options
- Recommendations and Costs