

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 12, 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
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Councilmember
Don Henning	City of Covington	Councilmember
Linda Kochmar	City of Federal Way	Deputy Mayor
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Elaine Borjeson	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Councilmember
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Councilmember
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Director
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director
Mick Monken	City of Woodinville	Public Works Director
Valarie Jarvi	City of Woodinville	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Theresa Jennings, Director

Theresa Koppang, Lead Planner

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Staff Liaison

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Brad Bell, Landfill Operations Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager

Gemma Alexander, Solid Waste Division staff

Bert Tarrant, Solid Waste Division staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Dorothy, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue

Mike Mactutis, City of Kent

Elaine Borjeson, City of Kirkland

Sarah Ruether, City of Woodinville

Karen Goroski, Suburban Cities Association

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:15.

3

4 **Introductions**

5 Those in attendance introduced themselves.

6

7 **Approve June Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

8 **MSWMAC Vice-Chair Joan McGilton moved approval of the July minutes.**

9

10 *The motion passed unanimously.*

11

12 Garber said item #5: Solid Waste Division 2006 Budget Preview would not be on the agenda
13 because Solid Waste Division Finance and Administration Services Manager Ann Shigeta was
14 unable to attend. She said the budget preview would be rescheduled for a later date.

15

16 Garber suggested adding “Review and approve text for Criterion 17” to agenda item #6.

17

18 **SWAC Update**

19 SWAC Vice-Chair Carolyn Armanini reported SWAC viewed the 2006 budget preview
20 presentation and continues to raise the issue of the back rent. SWAC received a recycling
21 workshop update highlighting the need for dedicated recycling space at transfer stations.
22 SWAC reviewed the draft assumptions for Report Four, making several additions and revisions.

23

24 **SWD Update**

25 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported the division has hired a new
26 economist, Tom Karston. Karston has a Ph.D. in economics, and has taught Economics and
27 Public Finance at several universities. He also worked for the British Columbia Ministry of
28 Finance and First Interstate Bank of Washington. The division is very pleased to have found
29 someone of his caliber.

30

31 Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan stated that implementation of the Bow Lake
32 Master Plan, which was on hold pending council approval of Report Two, has been restarted.
33 The division is looking into the potential for expansion at the Bow Lake site.

34

35 Kiernan announced the division's long-standing request to use transit-dedicated I-5 ramps at
36 First NE has been authorized by Federal legislation.

37

38 Kiernan said that Area Six at Cedar Hills Landfill is now open and accepting waste. This is a
39 big milestone for the division, as there is only one more cell left at Cedar Hills after this one.
40 Area Six cost \$25 million dollars to build, and has about five years' capacity.

41

42 Kiernan added the New York Times ran an article on landfill capacity, stating that there is no
43 shortage of landfill capacity in the U.S. According to the article, industry-wide capacity
44 forecasts have doubled in recent years, helping to keep disposal costs low. This article also
45 indicated other jurisdictions have had the same experience as King County with landfill capacity
46 estimates. Apparently refuse settling is providing more disposal capacity than initial forecasts,
47 extending the lives of landfills across the country. Contrary to popular belief, transfer and
48 transport is the problematic and expensive step in solid waste management. Kiernan said the
49 division would email the article to committee members.

50

51 MSWMAC member Don Henning asked how many trucks travel from transfer stations to Cedar
52 Hills daily. Transfer and Transport Operations Manager Thea Severn replied with the following
53 approximate weekday figures:

54	Bow Lake	60	Houghton	30
55	Factoria	30	Algona	30
56	Renton	12	First NE	10

57

58 Jennings added that the number of truckloads would be reduced by about one third if the
59 stations were outfitted with compacters.

60

61 **Criterion Seventeen**

62 Garber said all that remained of Criterion Seventeen was to reach a conclusion on land use
63 compatibility.

64

65 Kiernan said the division has talked with the only direct neighbor of Bow Lake. The landowner
66 does not currently see any impacts from Bow Lake. Kiernan said the traffic impacts from Bow
67 Lake are negligible relative to existing traffic. Consistent with the email message sent to

68 MSWMAC by Dale Schroeder, City of SeaTac Public Works Director, the division
69 recommends that Bow Lake be rated compatible with surrounding land use.

70

71 **MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza moved that MSWMAC rate Bow Lake Transfer Station**
72 **compatible with surrounding land use.**

73

74 In response to a question, Kiernan said the division looked at the number of vehicles traveling to
75 the station in comparison to the total number of vehicles at nearby intersections, and found the
76 station-bound vehicles were not a significant proportion of the traffic. He added that although
77 the transfer station does not currently impact traffic conditions, there are significant traffic
78 concerns that will need to be addressed if any changes are made to the station, or if the
79 surrounding area is developed.

80

81 *The motion passed unanimously.*

82

83 For the benefit of new members, Garber reminded MSWMAC that the committee operates on a
84 consensus model. No vote is taken unless opposition to the motion is expressed.

85

86 In response to a question, Kiernan confirmed that the issues raised in Schroeder's message will
87 be addressed as part of the Bow Lake master planning process.

88

89 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett pointed out that the Criterion Seventeen application table
90 was missing footnotes that were agreed to at the July meeting.

91

92 **McGilton moved to approve the draft Criterion Seventeen Addendum text.**

93

94 Armanini said the references to Bow Lake in the text will need to be updated now that the
95 criterion has been applied to that station.

96

97 Garber suggested the figure showing transfer station locations should accompany the
98 distribution tables, and references to Table 2 should be changed to Tables 2a and 2b.

99

100 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin said that the text should refer to the dates council approved
101 earlier reports rather than the dates on which the reports were submitted.

102

103 *The motion to approve Criterion Seventeen Addendum text as amended passed unanimously.*

104

105 Garber said this completes Report Two. She added that Report Three was submitted with a
106 draft matrix that will be finalized as part of Report Four.

107

108 In response to a question, Kiernan said that Criteria 18 & 19 address costs of alternatives that
109 can't be addressed until the alternatives are fully developed. These criteria will be addressed in
110 Report Four.

111

112 King County Council Staff Peggy Dorothy said Report Three will go before Council on
113 Monday, with one technical change. The report is expected to go through council quickly.

114

115 **Woodinville Discussion**

116 MSWMAC member Mick Monken said that Woodinville is concerned about four issues.

- 117 1. New solid waste facilities should be subject to the same siting criteria whether they are
118 public or private.
- 119 2. Cities need to be kept informed as changes are made in the transfer system.
- 120 3. Cities need to understand how recycling facilities fit into the system.
- 121 4. If some stations are privatized, will system efficiency be sacrificed by competitors
122 avoiding each others' facilities?

123 Garber said the current Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan) does not
124 include process and siting criteria for new solid waste facilities, although the previous plan did.
125 State law says that the owner/operator of all solid waste facilities shall conform to the approved
126 local solid waste management plan. She said this would seem to mean that recycling facilities,
127 materials recovery facilities (MRFs) and transfer stations should be subject to the Comp Plan.
128 She added that MRFs are not required to have a solid waste handling permit unless they have a
129 residual rate greater than 5% by weight annually or greater than 10% in any load. Under WAC
130 173-350-040, all solid waste and recycling facilities must meet the same minimum performance
131 standards.

132

133 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said cities need to consider their responsibility to re-educate
134 the public about single-stream recycling practices if they are concerned about residual rates at
135 MRFs and recycling facilities.

136

137 Garber commented that cities also permit facilities. Recycling facilities may be considered
138 essential public facilities, in which case cities could not bar or unduly interfere with their siting,
139 but they can attach conditions to mitigate impacts. These could potentially include limits on
140 tonnage or traffic, and a requirement for additional permitting and environmental review if those
141 limits are exceeded by a specified amount. In cases where recycling facilities are permitted
142 outright, cities could make them a conditional use.

143

144 Jennings added that it is important to be careful with language. Despite its name, the Cascade
145 Recycling Center is an Intermediate Solid Waste Handling Facility. She said the Woodinville
146 facility has a building permit from the city of Woodinville for a recycling facility., but was
147 permitted by Public Health-Seattle and King County as an Intermediate Solid Waste Handling
148 Facility. Compliance with the King County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan is a
149 condition of their permit.

150

151 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford commented that there are many
152 types of recycling facilities. Total Reclaim and Cedar Grove are both recycling facilities. It is
153 important to remember these differences because some recycling facilities look more like
154 regular businesses than transfer stations.

155

156 Garber added that state law (WAC 173-350) does provide definitions that clarify those
157 differences. She said it is important that cities know what terminology to use in their codes.

158

159 Armanini asked whether privately owned facilities could be classified as essential public
160 facilities. Garber responded that the city attorney for Newcastle says they may because they are
161 essential to the operation of the solid waste system, despite their ownership.

162

163 Garber said that Waste Management pays the Woodinville utilities tax on their curbside
164 collections in Woodinville, but not on curbside collected materials brought to the facility from
165 other cities. Monken added it might be possible to tax residuals.

166

167 Rivkin commented that work will be done on the recycling issue before the completion of the
168 fourth report. The recycling workshop addressed this issue because tonnage forecasts and
169 facilities plans are affected by recycling. She said she hopes that MSWMAC can get definitions

170 of the different types of facilities and a map of recycling facilities in King County from the
171 division. Rivkin suggested cities form a staff work group to look at codes.

172

173 In response to a question, Garber said there is a need for recycling facilities in the county, and
174 private companies could site new facilities before jurisdictions could develop new siting criteria.

175

176 Armanini suggested developing a model ordinance. Garber agreed that was a good idea, and
177 added that SEPA and conditional use permits could be used to work out details.

178

179 Rivkin suggested the monthly meeting of planning directors as the place to begin.

180

181 Garber asked about Woodinville's second issue, the "logistics of transition." Kiernan responded
182 that the division has experience closing stations. Algona closed for 12 weeks for roof
183 replacement, as did Renton. Bow Lake has been closed for floor work. In all cases, the division
184 contacted the host jurisdiction, the haulers and customers, and worked to redirect waste. The
185 First NE closure was planned for a longer period of time. The division contacted all of the
186 jurisdictions that deliver waste to First NE and negotiated mitigation. Funding was offered to
187 the cities for mitigation projects such as additional special recycling events (SREs) and the
188 division negotiated access for the haulers to the transfer station in Mountlake Terrace. Kiernan
189 said that the division will not close more than one station at a time.

190

191 Jennings added that the division's goal when closing a station is to have minimal impact on
192 traffic and rates.

193

194 Garber asked about Woodinville's final issue; whether private companies would use their
195 competitor's transfer stations. Kiernan replied that Waste Management currently uses
196 Rabanco's transfer station for Seattle's waste.

197

198 Armanini commented that private sector dynamics could change at any time.

199

200 Jennings said that historically, when there is a surge, Waste Management and Rabanco have
201 used the closest station. Kiernan added that in the waste management industry, the bottom line
202 is managed by the local collection company rather than at the national corporate level, so local
203 haulers aim for the most efficient local operation.

204

205 In response to a question, Kiernan said the county’s stations are not earthquake proof. Most
206 stations predate seismic codes. Several of them might not be able to withstand six or more
207 inches of wet snow. This is why Report Two concluded that upgrades are critical.

208

209 Garber thanked Woodinville for providing the basis for a good discussion. She said her
210 observation is that the Cascade Recycling Center is run as well as such a facility could be.
211 Cities should expect the outside of these facilities to be neat, nearby roads to stay clean and to
212 receive some money for road impacts. She voiced support for Rivkin’s idea of developing
213 model codes and encouraged the cities to action as soon as possible.

214

215 MSWMAC agreed that after the city planning directors discuss the issue, it should be presented
216 to the Suburban Cities Association to help keep smaller cities in the loop. Rivkin offered to
217 have Redmond bring the issue to the planning directors.

218

219 Armanini commented that similar to MSWMAC, where cities of different size and geography
220 learn about commonalities, cooperation in the development of model ordinances on a variety of
221 common regional issues could be useful to the cities.

222

223 **Report Four Assumptions**

224 Koppang provided a review of the traditional planning process, which involves six steps.

- 225 1. Data Gathering – Reports 1 through 3
- 226 2. Define Assumptions – Current task
- 227 3. Data Analysis
- 228 4. Definition of Options
- 229 5. Policy Decisions – King County Council
- 230 6. Implementation

231 In the context of the planning process, “assumption” has a specialized meaning. Assumptions
232 are presumed as fact and are used as the foundation for planning efforts. Assumptions are often
233 the conclusions from previous analysis.

234

235 Koppang referred to the assumptions handout, explaining that only the categories ITSG has
236 already reviewed are presented for MSWMAC’s discussion. She added that some of the
237 assumptions are more correctly identified as policy goals.

238

239 In response to a question, Kiernan said the division has talked with Snohomish County and the
240 City of Seattle about potential partnerships. The King County Council has discussed the
241 possibility extensively. However, all three jurisdictions are on different timelines for system
242 developments and contract changes, so collaboration may be impractical.

243

244 Rivkin added that Ordinance 14971 identifies this as one of the options to examine, so it is on
245 the work plan.

246

247 In response to a question, Jennings said one of the outcomes of this planning process is to
248 determine Cedar Hills' closure date and develop a timeline to prepare for closure and export.

249 Kiernan added that the division initially developed such a timeline, but abandoned it in favor of
250 the current cooperative process.

251

252 McGilton asked why the cities wanted this process. Kiernan replied that he was hesitant to
253 speak for the cities, but he believed the division got too far ahead of the cities in planning.

254

255 Armanini commented that some of the assumptions seemed to be prejudging an outcome, for
256 example, Landfill Capacity Assumptions #1 and #3. She said it is too soon to assume
257 landfilling will be the disposal method.

258

259 Garber replied that she understood the ordinance identifies landfilling as the county's chosen
260 disposal method.

261

262 ITSG member Susan Fife-Ferris said ITSG had the same discussion and made a "bucket list" of
263 policy questions to be addressed later. She said ITSG found its development of assumptions
264 was confined by existing policies.

265

266 Armanini suggested adding a footnote to the assumptions stating that the issue should be
267 reconsidered in the next Comp Plan update.

268

269 Jennings said she is indifferent to which method of waste disposal is used unless there is a
270 Comp Plan policy against it. She said the division's concern is transport costs.

271

272 Armanini suggested removal of assumptions related to landfilling.

273

274 Kiernan commented that for planning, it is known that Cedar Hills will close, and that waste
275 will then leave the county. The division's responsibility is to get the waste out of the county.

276

277 Garber suggested MSWMAC should wait until it has reviewed all of the assumptions before
278 approving any of them. She asked MSWMAC members to submit comments on the
279 assumptions presented so far to Diane Yates by email.

280

281 **Adjournment**

282 The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

283

284 Submitted by:

285 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff