

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 11, 2005

12:00 – 2:00 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Rich Wagner	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Steve Clark	City of Burien	Public Works Director
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Councilmember
Glenn Boettcher	City of Mercer Island	Maintenance Director
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Lys Hornsby	City of Renton	Utilities Director
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Paul Haines	City of Shoreline	Public Works Director
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Director
Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager
Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Manager
Diane Yates, MSWMAC Staff Liaison
Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff
Roxanne Malatesta, Solid Waste Division staff
Bert Tarrant, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Dorothy, King County Council Staff
Mike Reed, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Elaine Borjeson, City of Kirkland

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber could not attend due to a family emergency. MSWMAC Vice-
3 Chair Joan McGilton was also absent. At Garber's request, MSWMAC member Carolyn
4 Armanini chaired the meeting and called it to order at 12:10.

5

6 **Introductions**

7 Those in attendance introduced themselves.

8

9 **Approve February Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

10 MSWMAC member Rich Wagner moved that the February minutes be amended at page
11 4, line 124, by adding “and unfair. All represented cities should have one vote.” after the
12 word cumbersome.

13

14 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

15

16 King County MSWMAC Staff Liaison Diane Yates said that Chair Garber had asked her to let
17 members know that the handout on Objective Criteria for Evaluating Subjective Considerations
18 under Criterion Seventeen is a preliminary draft intended to begin the discussion of Criterion 17.
19 Garber would like the opportunity to be involved in the continuation of that discussion in April.

20

21 Acting Chair Armanini said that the agenda was very ambitious and that MSWMAC must
22 complete item 6 during this meeting in order meet ordinance deadlines.

23

24 **SWAC Update**

25 Yates said that SWAC has received a presentation on the criteria. SWAC is interested in
26 ranking the criteria and is submitting its rankings via e-mail. In response to a question from
27 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway, Armanini said that SWAC felt the criteria were not all
28 equally important and intended to categorize them as High, Medium or Low priorities.
29 SWAC’s report to Council is separate from MSWMAC.

30

31 **SWD Update**

32 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that on February 14 the Court of
33 Appeals upheld the Superior Court’s decision in favor of flow control.

34

35 The 1st NE Transfer Station will close in July and remain closed for approximately one year for
36 reconstruction. Self haulers from Seattle will be sent to the North Seattle Transfer Station and
37 self haulers from King County may go to other King County stations or to the Snohomish
38 County transfer station.

39

40 Area Six at Cedar Hills is almost ready and will begin accepting waste this summer. Area Six
41 is expected to be open for four to five years before Area Seven, the final area at Cedar Hills
42 Landfill, will be needed.

43

44 Transfer station hours will change on May 9. Host cities have already been notified of the
45 changes and public notification will begin in approximately two weeks. Bow Lake will be open
46 24 hours per day on weekdays from Monday at 12:00 am to Saturday at 7:00 am. Factoria
47 currently closes at 7:30 pm and will now remain open until 11:30 pm. Factoria will no longer
48 accept yard waste for recycling due to lack of space resulting from increased tonnage. People
49 wishing to recycle yard waste are being directed to private recyclers located within 5 miles of
50 the Factoria Transfer Station.

51

52 In response to a question from MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder, Jennings said that Bow
53 Lake has been open 22 hours per day, with a 2 hour closure for equipment maintenance.

54 Customers have asked for more hours, and the need to close the station for 2 hours per day for

55 maintenance is not necessary as this function can occur while the station is operating, so the
56 station is moving to round-the-clock operation on weekdays.

57
58 MSWMAC member Paul Haines asked how the additional hours will be paid for. Jennings
59 responded that additional tonnage will pay for operations during the additional hours.

60
61 **Analysis of Transfer Station Needs and Analysis Report- Discussion & Recommendations**

62 Solid Waste Division Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan said that Criterion 17 will
63 be addressed as an addendum to the second report. Criteria 18 and 19 are cost related and
64 cannot be addressed until alternatives are identified. The report does not include
65 recommendations. ITSG felt there was not enough clarity about how this report fits into the
66 decision making process, so the Division will attempt to address that in the final draft. Some
67 changes have been made to the table on page 4 from what MSWMAC saw before, and these
68 changes will be addressed in turn. ITSG also had comments on report scheduling, and those
69 concerns are on the agenda as well.

70
71 Armanini said copies of the comments from ITSG and from MSWMAC Chair Garber are
72 available as handouts and will be considered in today's discussion.

73
74 Greenway asked when Criterion 17 would be addressed. Kiernan replied that Criterion 17 is not
75 in the second report because MSWMAC will not have an opportunity to provide input before
76 the report deadline.

77
78 Greenway asked about the deadlines for reports 3 and 4. Kiernan said that each report is to be
79 accompanied by a motion defining the deadline for the next report, but that the final waste
80 export system plan deadline is set at December 15 by the ordinance.

81
82 Jennings said that these initial reports are part of the data collection stage, and that alternatives
83 will be included in report 4.

84
85 Armanini asked whether there was any substantive issue with Criterion 17 being addressed as an
86 addendum rather than as part of the report. Kiernan confirmed there is not, as long as all the
87 data is in before the December 15 deadline.

88
89 Greenway suggested that a statement be added to the end of page 43 indicating an addendum
90 will address Criterion 17.

91
92 Armanini called for comments on pages 1-5.

93
94 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked why three transfer stations were not included in the
95 analysis. He said data about these could influence others. For example, after reconstruction 1st
96 NE could have capacity to handle some of Houghton's extra tonnage.

97
98 Kiernan said Enumclaw and Vashon were excluded because they are new and 1st NE because it
99 will be rebuilt this year. He said some service areas do overlap, and changes at one station
100 could impact others. The three newer stations will be considered as part of the analysis of the
101 King County solid waste management system.

102
103 Kiernan noted that on page 5, the footnote will be moved up under the table addressing the
104 criterion. Kiernan noted other formatting changes that will be made.

106 *Criterion 1: Maximum Travel Time to a Transfer Facility*
107 Kiernan said ITSG recommended asterisking Table One for Houghton and Factoria because
108 they do not meet the criterion if the urban islands outside of the contiguous growth boundary are
109 included. Renton has been changed to a ‘yes’ because it meets the standard for 99% of
110 transactions. Chair Garber’s comments recommend a footnote be added clarifying this criterion
111 measures travel time based on posted speed limits. Kiernan said this methodology is standard.
112

113 Greenway said the standard should be changed to include the entire service area. Kiernan
114 replied that transfer stations are an urban service and different service levels are expected
115 between urban and rural areas. Armanini said this is why SWAC wanted to rank the criteria –
116 although this criterion is intended to create a sense of the general level of service throughout the
117 region, it may not be as important as other criteria. Jennings said that the result of changing the
118 standard would be Factoria and Houghton changing from ‘yes’ to a ‘no’ with an asterisk
119 explaining that the criteria is not met if you include the urban islands outside of the contiguous
120 urban growth boundary.
121

122 **Greenway moved that the standard for Criterion One be changed from the Urban Growth**
123 **Boundary to the entire service area.**
124

125 MSWMAC member Steve Clark said that volume is relevant to the question of travel time.
126 Kiernan replied that volume has not been analyzed for this report due to time constraints. The
127 adopted 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan does look at generation zones.
128 Kiernan acknowledged the importance of this question.
129

130 Haines said the standard should either include the entire service area or be weighted to account
131 for the actual distance most customers travel. Jennings said the Division could look at that data.
132

133 Clark asked what is the value of a criterion if all stations achieve a ‘yes’ rating. Kiernan replied
134 the Division did not know what the ratings would be when the criteria were developed, but
135 travel time seemed to be important to measure. Since the answer is uniform, the criterion may
136 not be ranked as important as others.
137

138 Greenway said that changing the standard to include the entire service area would be clearer for
139 readers who are not familiar with solid waste issues.
140

141 Schroeder asked how many people in the rural area are impacted. He said that if the volume is
142 low, including that data could skew the results.
143

144 Kiernan said the Division has data from customer surveys identifying source locations.
145

146 MSWMAC member Lys Hornsby said she would like to see that data before voting.
147

148 **Wagner moved a friendly amendment to change the standard for Criterion One to read**
149 **“The standard for maximum travel time to a facility is 30 minutes for areas within the**
150 **service area for 90% of transactions.”**
151

152 ***The motion was unanimously approved as amended.***
153

154 *Criterion 2: Time on Site Meets the Standard for 90% of Total Trips*
155 No comments.
156

157 *Criterion 3: Facility Hours Meet User Demand*

158 Kiernan said the Division will add the effective dates to the table of station hours. Armanini
159 recommended that the words “are expected to meet” replace “are meeting,” since the hours are
160 not in effect yet.

161

162 *Criterion 4: Recycling Services Provided at the Transfer Stations Meet the Waste Reduction and*
163 *Recycling Policies in the Comprehensive Waste Management Plan*

164 Kiernan pointed out some grammatical corrections that will be made.

165

166 Spangler asked what “not feasible” means in Table 5. Kiernan said it referred to the policy
167 caveat in the text of WRR-37. The five sites do not have space to meet the standard.

168

169 Armanini recommended adding the phrase “due to space constraints in their current
170 configurations.”

171

172 *Criterion 5: Vehicle Capacity Meets Current and 20 Year Forecasted Needs*

173 No comments.

174

175 *Criterion 6: Tonnage Capacity Meets Current and 20 Year Forecasted Needs*

176 No comments.

177

178 *Criterion 7: Space for 3 Days Storage*

179 No comments.

180

181 *Criterion 8: Space Exists for Station Expansion*

182 Kiernan said Table 11 will be changed per ITSG’s comments, and references to feasibility will
183 be removed. Renton is changed from a ‘no’ to a ‘yes.’

184

185 Greenway said the phrase “space must meet applicable state codes” should be added to the
186 standard. Greenway said Houghton is affected by state codes WAC 173-304 and 130J requiring
187 1000 foot buffers from state and national parks and 250 feet from residential property lines, and
188 that the Department of Health and Human Services also recommends against building over old
189 landfill space.

190

191 Kiernan said that the landfill cap issue can be addressed. Changes and improvements to landfill
192 caps can be made, as at 1st NE. WAC 304 has been superseded by 173-350 and 351, which
193 deleted the buffer requirement entirely.

194

195 Armanini said that any action must be in compliance with state and federal law, and additional
196 language is not needed to address it.

197

198 **Greenway moved to add the phrase “station expansion must meet state codes” to the**
199 **Criteria 8 standard.**

200

201 *Motion died for lack of second.*

202

203 *Criterion 9: Roof Clearance*

204 No comment.

205

206

207

208 *Criterion 10: Safety*

209 Kiernan said that ITSG was concerned that the bolded underlined statement may reduce concern
210 over safety issues, and discussed the importance of correctly characterizing safety issues. The
211 Division is looking at the second paragraph to make sure it is clear the Division operates safely
212 but at the expense of efficiency.

213

214 Armanini said readers will not see beyond the part in bold, so “reduced efficiency” should be
215 added to that statement.

216

217 *Criterion 11: Ability to Accommodate Waste Export*

218 Kiernan said there was tremendous discussion by ITSG of this criterion. The criteria were
219 generated ahead of time without knowing how they would be applied. In applying Criterion 11
220 the Division had to draw a lot of premature conclusions concerning waste export. ITSG
221 determined that a better criterion at this time was really identifying the presence or absence of
222 compaction at the stations. Compaction has important impacts on efficiency in any transfer
223 system.

224

225 **Wagner moved that a third bullet be added with the language “on completion of export
226 analysis all stations will be reevaluated against the initial criteria.”**

227

228 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett said that was good language but more properly belongs at
229 the beginning of the document.

230

231 Armanini said the suggested language could be placed in the second bullet on page 2 of the
232 report.

233

234 Kiernan agreed that a number of things could be reevaluated when more is known about system
235 alternatives, as is consistent with the fact that this is an iterative process.

236

237 Schroeder said the criterion name should be changed to reflect the change in scope. Kiernan
238 replied that ITSG also suggested a name change, and it makes sense to do so. The criterion then
239 becomes Ability to Compact Waste, and the answer is ‘no.’ Further, preliminary data indicate
240 the feasibility of adding compaction to the stations in their current configuration is low.

241

242 *Criterion 12: Meets Goals for Level of Structural Integrity*

243 Kiernan said the criterion is confusing as written. The applicable building standards are those in
244 place when the structures were built. The stations were built to meet those standards and are
245 grandfathered in. The second standard includes both the current International Building Code
246 (IBC) standards and the emergency Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
247 Immediate Occupancy Standards. Three of the stations do not meet these. The Division will
248 clarify what the columns in Table 14 actually mean. Garber’s comments on this criterion are
249 editorial, and probably stem from the confusion in the table.

250

251 *Criterion 13: Noise*

252 No comments.

253

254 *Criterion 14: Odor*

255 Kiernan said Garber’s comment was appropriate, and the Division will identify that 2 years of
256 data was used. The description of this criterion uses the term ‘verified complaint’ for the
257 standard while the application section uses ‘citation.’ ITSG recommended changing the
258 standard in the application to “verifiable complaints in last two years.” This will change

259 Houghton to a ‘no’ with an asterisk which explains that Houghton had one verifiable complaint
260 in the last two years.

261

262 *Criterion 15: Traffic Impacts on Local Streets*

263 Kiernan said ITSG’s comment regards a typographical error.

264

265 Clark said considering the weight and volume of commercial hauling vehicles, pavement
266 structure impacts should also be considered.

267

268 Wagner said he would add to subcriterion a “and other local city codes.” He said that Auburn
269 has mitigation requirements for road impacts. Kiernan replied that all five transfer stations are
270 located on arterials, and that the 2001 adopted Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan
271 includes language about mitigation for host cities.

272

273 Haines said it is good to be thorough, and if the issue is addressed elsewhere, it should be
274 possible to track that from the report.

275

276 Jennings said this report is to grade the stations, and should not address mitigation issues, which
277 belong in next steps.

278

279 Armanini said the report should mention that there may be pavement impacts, but should not
280 refer to Comp Plan language.

281

282 Greenway asked how pavement impacts can be quantified. Kiernan said there are established
283 standards for measuring pavement impacts.

284

285 *Criterion 16: 100 Buffer Between Facility and Nearest Residence*

286 Kiernan said Garber’s comments point out an inconsistency between the text and Table 1, which
287 the Division will correct.

288

289 Clark asked why the standard is a 100 foot buffer. Kiernan replied that it was agreed upon by
290 the staff group and is double the 50 foot standard that was once required by the state. Current
291 state Minimum Functional Standards do not mention buffers.

292

293 Armanini said that the formatting should be changed to create a break between criterion 16 and
294 the paragraph transitioning to the unevaluated criteria. Greenway suggested removing the
295 paragraph altogether. Kiernan noted that the paragraph may be better at the front of the report,
296 and MSWMAC concurred.

297

298 *Criteria 17: Subjective Criteria*

299 Armanini said the report should keep the descriptions of Criteria 18 and 19, but for 17 only
300 mention that the addendum will follow the report.

301

302 Greenway said 17 should not be called Subjective Criteria, because MSWMAC is making the
303 criteria more objective. Kiernan replied that in the first report this group of criteria was
304 categorized as Local and Regional Effects.

305

306 Armanini said that since all of the criteria measure local and regional effects, Criterion 17
307 should be called Other Local and Regional Considerations.

308

309 Armanini said the footnote on page 45 includes redundant language and should be rewritten.

310

311 **Next Steps**

312 Spangler said other information may be necessary before decisions can be made, since the
313 decision making process is still unclear. Kiernan replied language from the first report could be
314 repeated in the second report clarifying that this is an iterative process, and at each step it may
315 be necessary to review previous work.

316

317 Armanini said 20 minutes were left and asked if MSWMAC would like to begin discussion of
318 17 and complete the discussion in April, or wait until the April meeting to begin discussion.
319 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said it makes sense to wait for the April meeting.

320

321 Greenway said that Garber's Preliminary Objective Criteria for Evaluating Subjective
322 Considerations is very good and should be used as the basis for discussion in April.

323

324 **Discussion of Due Date for 3rd Milestone Report**

325 Kiernan said the ordinance established a due date of December 15, 2005 for the waste export
326 system plan. Four milestone reports were specified without due dates. The deadline for the
327 next report was to be established by motion at the time each report was completed. The King
328 County Council adjourns for the year on December 16, and so will not address the waste export
329 system plan until after the first of the year. The Solid Waste Division prepares its budget in
330 May. In the context of these schedules, it would appear that changing the report due date from
331 December 15, 2005 to April 30, 2006, would provide more opportunities for meaningful input
332 from the cities.

333

334 Kiernan said ITSG recommends an April 30, 2006 due date for the waste export system plan.
335 Originally the 3rd report was scheduled for June 15, 2005, but ITSG recommends changing the
336 due date to June 30, 2005, which would allow for one more MSWMAC meeting to review the
337 draft report. The 3rd report will present a menu of options, but no recommendations on those
338 options. The 4th report will contain recommendations so more time may be needed for that
339 report.

340

341 **Greenway moved that MSWMAC recommend the county council amend Ordinance 14971**
342 **and change the December 15, 2005 due date for the waste export system plan to April 30,**
343 **2006.**

344

345 *The motion passed unanimously.*

346

347

348

349 **Proposed Agenda Items**

350 Yates said Criterion 17 will be on the April agenda. The Division will also begin talking about
351 the 3rd report. Yates asked if MSWMAC wanted to prioritize criteria as SWAC is doing.

352

353 In response to a question, Yates said that SWAC's prioritization of the criteria will be provided
354 to MSWMAC.

355

356 Bennett said that to be meaningful, criteria ranking should follow report three.

357

358 Armanini said that Criteria 17 discussion should take most of MSWMAC's next meeting.

359

360 Kiernan said the public/private options for transfer and intermodal facilities discussion will also
361 be time consuming.

362

363 Jennings thanked members of the ITSG for their considerable contribution of time. ITSG has
364 had many meetings, some of them four hours long and their efforts are very much appreciated
365 by the Division.

366

367 **Adjournment**

368 The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

369

370 Submitted by:

371 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff