

**Solid Waste Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Work Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**May 10, 2006**  
**King Street Center**

**Meeting Attendees:**

City Staff:

Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn  
Alison Bennett – City of Bellevue  
Tom Spille – City of Bellevue  
Rob Van Orsow – City of Federal Way  
Nina Rivkin – City of Redmond  
Linda Knight – City of Renton  
Desmond Machuca – City of SeaTac  
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline  
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila  
Amy Ensminger – City of Woodinville  
Valarie Jarvi – City of Woodinville

County Staff:

Mike Huddleston – Council Staff  
Beth Mountsier – Council Staff  
Mike Reed – Council Staff  
Jeff Gaisford - SWD  
Josh Marx – SWD  
Kevin Kiernan - SWD  
Diane Yates - SWD  
Theresa Koppang - SWD  
Gemma Alexander - SWD

**I. Comp Plan Kickoff**

The purpose of the kickoff meeting is to start the conversation about the Comp Plan update. It is an opportunity to bring cities that have not participated in MSWMAC into the planning process. The agenda for the kickoff meeting has changed little since the last ITSG meeting. The City of Shoreline has agreed to present its accomplishments under the agenda item “Current Comp Plan Recycling Accomplishments.” MSWMAC is co-hosting the meeting, and will review and approve the agenda at its Friday meeting. The invitation and agenda will be sent out after MSWMAC on Friday.

Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford presented a number of handouts that the division would like to make available at the kickoff meeting. ITSG members identified a number of corrections and footnotes needed for the “2005 Single-Family Curbside Recycling” table. The division will send a revised copy for further review.

**II. Approve April 26 Minutes**

Nina Rivkin of Redmond suggested a number of changes and additions. The minutes were approved as amended.

**III. Work Schedule**

ITSG reviewed the revised work schedule. Council staff Mike Reed suggested briefings to the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee be added to the schedule.

Noting that MSWMAC will have only July and August to review the Waste Export System Plan, ITSG asked the division to poll MSWMAC members to make sure there will be a quorum for those meetings.

ITSG discussed how the ILA/Governance discussions should fit into the schedule. Rivkin suggested that ITSG should meet twice in June, dedicating one of the meetings to governance issues. Rob Van Orsow of Federal Way volunteered to be partially

responsible for writing ITSG's report on governance issues. The division will send an email to schedule the first ILA discussion. In advance of that meeting, Van Orsow will email an existing four page summary of issues previously identified for discussion by the cities. The division will send an email identifying any issues that it would like to discuss. Linda Knight of Renton commented that the cities do not all have the same issues, and everyone should be clear about that during discussions.

ITSG discussed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the Waste Export System Plan. The EIS process has a well defined construct in regulation that provides an opportunity for cities to comment. Comments become part of the final record. There is a comment period during scoping, which has already been completed. The draft EIS will be available June 16, followed by the second 30 day comment period. A responsiveness summary will be included in the final EIS, which will become part of the Waste Export System Plan. SWAC has received briefings on past EIS processes. ITSG and MSWAC can request briefings as well.

Rivkin commented that the Waste Export System Plan needs to identify changes to the Comp Plan that would be necessary to implement the export plan. The financial and practical impacts of not making those changes should also be addressed in the Waste Export System Plan.

#### **IV. Third Party Review**

ITSG reviewed a summary of the questions developed at the last meeting. Sharon Hlavka of Auburn and Van Orsow each submitted additional questions for review.

Huddleston commented that transfer system upgrades are needed because

1. the stations are antiquated
2. compaction is important with or without waste export
3. the stations are not export ready

He said elected officials need to understand these points. The question "Does the transfer system still need compactors in the case of Waste to Energy (WTE)?" is good for third party review because some people think WTE eliminates transfer needs. Others think that recycling could eliminate the need for transfer stations. He suggested that Alexander Rist's earlier presentation about how recycling impacts the forecast should be redistributed. [That presentation is available online at

[http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/RecyclingfortheFuture\\_Oct\\_10\\_05.ppt](http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/RecyclingfortheFuture_Oct_10_05.ppt)]

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan said transfer stations are customer service facilities. For commercial customers, convenient transfer stations translate to reasonable curbside rates. Fourteen curbside collection trucks are consolidated to one hauling truck at transfer stations. Kiernan drew a diagram on the whiteboard showing that Waste to Energy takes place downstream from the transfer process. He added that while it will take years to move from the current transfer system to an improved transfer system, moving from Cedar Hills Landfill to waste export with or without Waste To Energy will take about 18 months for contracting.

Rivkin suggested that at some point the Committee of the Whole needs a briefing on this topic. Huddleston agreed that people need to understand the relationship between the planning assumptions about recycling and the transfer system needs.

ITSG asked the division to incorporate the questions submitted by Hlavka and Van Orsow to the matrix of questions and send the matrix to ITSG for review before the MSWMAC meeting. Huddleston asked Yates to send ITSG the list of questions that council staff developed. Rika Cecil of Shoreline said it is important to let MSWMAC know on Friday that the list is the result of ITSG brainstorming, and is not a final consensus product.

Huddleston indicated that the third party review panel would likely begin meeting in mid to late August. Questions for the panel need to be finalized in early July.

Valarie Jarvi of Woodinville asked if ITSG had any changes to make to the Siting Plan before MSWMAC views it on Friday. ITSG discussed including all essential public facilities in the consideration of the issue of equitable distribution. It was confirmed that the division is subject to King County policy to that effect. A formatting error involving page numbers was identified.

## **V. Recycling**

Gaisford presented a four page white paper on recycling. He described historic and current recycling goals and said the next step is determining the goals for the next Comp Plan.

Several ITSG members elected to remain after twelve o'clock to review the white paper in depth. Extensive changes were suggested to improve the flow of information and emphasize and clarify key points. The division will incorporate these changes for MSWMAC's meeting on Friday.