

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group  
Meeting Summary  
October 5, 2005  
King Street Center**

**Meeting Attendees:**

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Susan Fife-Ferris – City of Bellevue  
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way  
Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland  
Linda Knight – City of Renton  
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac  
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila

County Staff:

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

**I. Review Agenda**

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates reported that after last month's meeting, MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber requested preparatory meetings with the division in advance of future MSWMAC meetings. The first of these meetings resulted in the Garber's suggestion to remove Policy Assumption #3, which was in conflict with #2, and the addition of introductory paragraphs drafted by Garber. Garber hopes that ITSG can make a recommendation to MSWMAC on whether to approve the latest version of the assumptions. Garber suggested a different approach to finalizing the Public/Private Characteristics Matrix, so the matrix has been moved to the November agenda to allow time to complete that work.

Yates clarified that because ITSG members only received the 4<sup>th</sup> Milestone Report Outline today, the division does not expect ITSG to act on the outline at this meeting. Garber would like to receive comments on the outline at the MSWMAC meeting next week, and the division welcomes comments by email until then.

Yates said the forecast presentation today is informational. Because MSWMAC has such a full agenda for October, they will not see the presentation, but will be given hardcopies of the slides and accompanying methodology handout.

**II. September 14 Minutes**

ITSG approved by consensus the suggested changes to the minutes emailed by Redmond on October 4. ITSG approved by consensus the minutes as amended.

**III. Planning Assumptions Paragraph**

ITSG reviewed the introductory paragraphs submitted by Garber. ITSG agreed to defer Redmond's formatting suggestion to MSWMAC. Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue suggested that Nina Rivkin of Redmond and Jean Garber should discuss the proposed changes in advance of next week's meeting. ITSG approved by consensus the Assumptions and Issues document as submitted by Garber.

#### **IV. Forecasts**

Solid Waste Division Economist Alexander Rist gave a presentation on the tonnage forecast. He identified the variables that inform the forecast. Historically, disposal rates have mirrored population growth. Recycling rates increased dramatically in the 90's in response to government actions, and plateaued after 2001. Total generation, which includes recycling and disposal, has increased faster than population. In other words, per capita waste generation has increased. Economic development and smaller household size are contributing factors to the increase in per capita waste generation.

Using the current estimated recycling rate of 41%, the baseline tonnage forecast is for 1.5 million tons of waste for disposal in 2025. Council staff Mike Huddleston commented that is the same amount of waste the county handled when Seattle was briefly a part of the system, except that at that time, Seattle had its own transfer facilities. He said that highlights the importance of transfer system improvements to meet projected needs.

Rist continued with a sample forecast for a 50% recycling goal. He said 50% was somewhat arbitrarily selected simply to show how an increase in recycling might affect disposal. In this scenario, disposal rates continue to grow. Rist showed a forecast for a 60% recycling goal, which would require major programmatic changes to achieve. In this case, the disposal curve flattens out, but still does not drop.

Kiernan added that achieving higher recycling rates would require policy and program changes, but the forecasts do not identify what those changes would be. He said if transfer stations were part of those programs, then recycling capacity would be added to station capacity needs.

ITSG discussed the accuracy of recycling data. Because recyclers are not required to report data, it is challenging to calculate recycling rates. Multifamily data are rolled into commercial recycling rates, which come from the Department of Ecology. The division works with consultants to improve the accuracy of recycling rates.

Rist explained that unexpected or short-term events like hours' changes or station closures will affect the budget forecast but not the long-term forecast. If a change is sustained, the long-term forecast is adjusted in response.

#### **V. Fourth Milestone Report Options**

Kiernan said the options grew out of the work that has been done on level of service criteria and the recent compaction study. Public or private sector implementation is not identified for any given option yet.

Recognizing that current service areas are a result of the placement of current transfer facilities, the division looked at geographic areas of the county instead of service areas. The geographic areas tend to follow transportation corridors, but their boundaries are not well defined, because the boundaries may shift as a result of siting any new stations. For each option in each geographic area the division will identify capital costs and rate impacts as part of the analysis for report four.

#### North County Geographic Planning Area

The North Geographic Planning Area is essentially the current First NE service area. A facility master plan is in place, and improvements have been budgeted and permitted.

#### South County Geographic Planning Area

The South County Geographic Planning Area is currently served by Algona Transfer Station. Algona cannot expand or be rebuilt to address all of the “No’s” identified in the second milestone report.

Option SC-1 is to build a new station that would serve self-haul and commercial customers at a new site.

Option SC-2 would build two new stations. One station would only serve self-haul customers and the other would only serve commercial customers. The Algona site may or may not be feasible for siting one of the stations under Option SC-2.

#### Central County Geographic Planning Area

The division identified four options for the Central County Geographic Planning Area, which is currently served by the Bow Lake and Renton Transfer Stations. The first two address Bow Lake and the second two address Renton.

Option C-1 would reuse the Bow Lake site to build a new transfer station serving both self-haul and commercial customers. There is state-owned property directly north of the Bow Lake site that may be available for development of a bigger transfer station.

Option C-2 would build a new station serving both self-haul and commercial customers at an entirely new site. ITSG discussed the fact that although there are significant traffic concerns at the Bow Lake site, the site is generally a compatible land use. There is not a lot of controversy over the Bow Lake site. Based on current circumstances and information available, the division is moving forward with development of the Bow Lake Master Facility Plan. C-2 was recommended by a local developer, and will be considered if a new site becomes available, but the option does not block progress on C-1. ITSG agreed that Option C-2 should be removed. It was suggested that a global footnote be added stating that the options are identified according to existing conditions and can be revised if situations change.

Option C-3 is to close Renton while C-4 would limit service at Renton to self-haul only.

#### Northeast Lake Washington Geographic Planning Area

The Northeast Lake Washington Geographic Planning Area is currently served by Houghton and Factoria Transfer Stations. Previous analysis has shown that Houghton cannot be expanded. The division owns the Eastgate property adjacent to Factoria. This property has been permitted and is available for development as a transfer station. Fife-Ferris said the division should develop options that do not develop Eastgate, as the area

around that property has changed since it was originally permitted and building a transfer station there may no longer be feasible.

Option NE-1 would replace Factoria with a new station serving self-haul and commercial customers on the combined Factoria/Eastgate property. It would close Houghton and build a new station, also serving self-haul and commercial customers at a new site.

Option NE-2 would also develop a new station at the Factoria/Eastgate site, but it would be sized to handle all commercial waste from Northeast Lake Washington, as well as serving self-haul customers. Houghton would remain open as a self-haul only facility.

Option NE-3 would develop a new transfer station on the combined Factoria/Eastgate property that would serve self-haul and commercial customers. Houghton would remain open as a self-haul only facility and a new commercial only transfer station would be built at a new site.

Fife-Ferris said there should be an NE-4 option that does not utilize the Eastgate property. She suggested self-haul only at Factoria and Houghton with a new station on a new site as one possibility. Another option might be to close Houghton, maintain Factoria as a self-haul only facility and site a new commercial only station at a new site.

ITSG discussed whether compaction at all facilities was necessary. While in general it is much cheaper to export compacted waste, it may be more cost effective to export small quantities of uncompacted waste than to install compactors at every facility. Another possibility is compacting at a reload facility rather than at transfer stations, although the absence of examples in the industry implies that it may not be cost effective.

ITSG discussed whether it is feasible for the county to implement a mandatory collection policy, and what impacts such a policy may have, particularly for self-haulers. Yates commented that self-haul includes more than residential customers, such as landscaping businesses that do not have a curbside at which to set out waste.

Huddleston commented that there are three possible approaches to export planning:

1. get transfer stations ready for waste export
2. export uncompacted waste
3. build a reload facility

The first one is most effective and flexible, and is the approach the division is taking.

ITSG discussed the feasibility and cost of siting new stations. The division has verified that industrial-zoned properties of sufficient size are available in the county. A site survey is included in the MSWMAC notebook, but siting a new station involves much more than technical criteria. The division will examine the possibility of siting new stations through contracts with the private sector. Kiernan drew a diagram of “Rod Hansen’s Wedge” illustrating how the division has built up sufficient reserves to pay for First NE and Bow Lake improvements without raising rates.

Desmond Machuca of SeaTac said the phrase “Replace Factoria” on the Northeast Lake Washington options was confusing, and suggested more clear language be used.

The division emphasized that at this stage, the options are choices rather than recommendations. The division will recommend option packages after input and further analysis. These maps do not reflect where customers actually go now. The actual current service areas overlap and change daily in response to traffic and other issues. Future service areas will be different depending on where new stations are sited, so the division decided to use the term ‘geographic areas’ for planning.

In response to a question, Kiernan said these options are the ones the division recommends for consideration in the Fourth Milestone Report. All of the options will require further analysis. Next week at MSWMAC, the division will listen to comments and consider suggestions for other options. The division does not expect MSWMAC to accept these options by motion at its meeting next week because it is not fair to ask them to act when they have not had sufficient time to study the options. The division would like feedback on whether these options represent a reasonable range and whether any feasible options have been missed.

#### **VI. Fourth Milestone Report Outline**

The division is developing a schedule to accompany the outline. Kiernan pointed out that C.1 on the outline will examine direct-to-intermodal generally, without linking the option to any particular planning area. Section 2.D will compile system packages. Underlined text in this section highlights where each package differs from the baseline package, which is similar to the 1992 Comp Plan. Section 3 looks at public and private options for implementing the system. The next section discusses extension of Cedar Hills’ useful life and landfill capacity. The sensitivity analysis will be included in the addenda.

In response to a question, Kiernan said that where an option is to build a new station on an existing site (as in Option C-1) it may mean tearing down the existing station or reusing some elements of the existing station in a mostly new building.

Kiernan said that he will meet again with each of the private companies as part of the background for public/private analysis.

The division said that the outline is a general framework for the report. The division wants feedback to make sure that there are no major omissions. The intent today was to introduce the outline and the options to ITSG, not to get a formal approval.

#### **VII. Next Steps**

Comments on both the outline and the options can be submitted to the division by email before next Friday, October 14 or can be brought up at the MSWMAC meeting on October 14. Yates will email ITSG to schedule its next meeting.