

**KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**September 9, 2005**

**12:00 – 2:00 p.m.**

**King Street Center, 8<sup>th</sup> 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
Brad Miyake	City of Bellevue	Utilities Director
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
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
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
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
Paul Haines	City of Shoreline	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 Relations 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

King County Council Staff

Peggy Dorothy, King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston, King County Council Staff

Beth Mountsier, King County Council Staff

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue

Sarah Ruether, City of Woodinville

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:13.

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 *The motion passed unanimously.*

10  
11 **SWD Update**

12 Solid Waste Division Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported on King County's  
13 emergency preparedness. He identified the two phases of an emergency as response and  
14 recovery. While some division staff have response responsibilities, the division is primarily  
15 involved in recovery. The division uses an 800 MHz radio for emergency communications.  
16 This system is checked every Wednesday morning. Some of the cities have this system as well.

17  
18 The division's role in recovery is debris management. The division has plans for emergency  
19 storage of debris. All of the division's heavy equipment is catalogued at the emergency center  
20 in Renton, and is available for on-call use *in an emergency*. The shop at Cedar Hills Landfill is  
21 equipped to be operable in an emergency.

22  
23 The transfer stations are the weak link in the division's emergency preparedness. As Report  
24 Two showed, not all of the stations meet the FEMA standard for immediate occupancy.

25  
26 In response to a question, Chair Garber said that all elected officials have been invited to an  
27 emergency preparedness roundtable sponsored by King County. Theresa Jennings added that  
28 the emergency center offers training on a regular basis and suggested that anyone who is  
29 interested call them for a schedule.

30  
31 MSWMAC member Linda Kochmar recommended that elected officials tour the King County  
32 emergency center and become familiar with the smaller, local centers in their area.

33 In response to a question, Kiernan said that the stations have been retrofitted for safety as much  
34 as possible.

35

36 **Report Four Work Schedule**

37 Solid Waste Division Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said the council deadline for Report Four  
38 is January 31, 2006, which means that the report must be completed by the end of December,  
39 2005. The actual Export System Plan must be completed by March 31, 2006 in order to meet its  
40 deadline of April 30, 2006.

41

42 In order to meet the deadlines, it is important for MSWMAC to approve the planning  
43 assumptions today and hear the presentation on the results of the compactor feasibility analysis.

44

45 Koppang went over the remaining work schedule for MSWMAC on the 4<sup>th</sup> milestone report.

- 46 • October: Review and approve siting criteria for new facilities; begin to identify station  
47 options and complete the public vs. private characteristics matrix. This last task is  
48 critical and is one where the division particularly needs input from MSWMAC.
- 49 • November: Complete discussion of transfer and intermodal options and landfill capacity  
50 analysis.
- 51 • December: Review and approve preliminary recommendations and costs.

52

53 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin asked if MSWMAC would review the fourth milestone report.

54 Koppang replied MSWMAC would have the opportunity to review the final report. Kiernan  
55 added that the final recommendations and costs are really what the whole report is about.

56

57 Garber commented that the schedule is very tight, and depends on MSWMAC's approval of the  
58 assumptions at today's meeting.

59

60 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said she was concerned about leaving recommendations and  
61 costs until December, because there would be no time for MSWMAC members to discuss the  
62 material with their cities before approval at the MSWMAC meeting.

63

64 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett concurred, saying she would have to show her city council  
65 the material before approving it at MSWMAC.

66

67 Kiernan replied that ITSG is scheduled to discuss each of the topics one month before  
68 MSWMAC, in order for cities to have the opportunity to review material in advance of  
69 MSWMAC's meetings.

70

71 Garber asked if cost analysis includes rates analysis. Kiernan said it would.

72

73 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings clarified that the fourth milestone report will  
74 evaluate multiple options, not develop a single plan. It will make only preliminary  
75 recommendations, not decisions. The Waste Export System Plan, which is due in March, will  
76 determine which options move forward into the Comp Plan.

77

78 In response to a question from Vice-Chair McGilton, Jennings explained that the decision of  
79 which option to follow will be the same process used in the Comp Plan. There may be one clear  
80 choice, or a number of closely competing choices that will move forward to the policy makers.  
81 Kiernan added that the recommended options will be folded into the Comp Plan process, which  
82 has very specific requirements for approval by cities and the Department of Ecology.

83

84 McGilton asked the division to provide a written summary of the process so that MSWMAC  
85 would have something to refer to instead of repeatedly asking the question about process. The  
86 division agreed.

87

88 Jennings said the fourth milestone report will identify several options that the division and  
89 MSWMAC recommend policy makers consider.

90

91 Rivkin said options and recommendations are not the same thing.

92

93 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates read from the ordinance, which states that the  
94 4<sup>th</sup> report will include, "preliminary transfer and waste export facility recommendations, and  
95 estimated system costs, rate impacts and financial policy assumptions."

96

97 Jennings said that the 4<sup>th</sup> milestone report is not the final report. It identifies options and their  
98 characteristics. After the 4<sup>th</sup> milestone report is transmitted, the cities can discuss the options,  
99 MSWMAC will have three more meetings, and a plan will be included in the final report in  
100 March, 2006. She commented that this discussion of what is included in the remaining two

101 reports is beneficial, because it has not happened before, and everyone should be aware and  
102 agree about what the final reports will include.

103

104 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway commented that Jennings' summary of the final reports  
105 is not what she had expected, but she is more comfortable with it because it allows more than  
106 one option to be presented to policy makers. In this way the minority opinion can still be heard.

107

108 Kiernan commented that the Solid Waste Comp Plan is a policy document subject to EIS  
109 requirements with a full round of public review.

110

111 Rivkin said that comment minimizes the export system plan, which is the basis of expenditures  
112 prior to development of the Comp Plan. She said budget appropriations will be made based on  
113 the export system plan.

114

115 Kiernan replied that can only be to the extent that they are consistent with current policies.

116

117 Jennings said that, historically, preparing the Comp Plan has been a lengthy process. The export  
118 plan is a part of the Comp Plan, which will save time when the Comp Plan process begins.

119

120 **Milestone Report Four Planning Assumptions and Issues**

121 Koppang said the division has developed a two-part document with ITSG. The first part  
122 contains planning assumptions for report four and the second part contains other issues that  
123 ITSG identified. They are transmitted together so that MSWMAC can see everything that ITSG  
124 has been working on. Today the division needs to get MSWMAC's approval of the first page,  
125 the planning assumptions for report four.

126

127 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked whether this was one document or two. Koppang  
128 answered that it is a compilation of all the discussions that ITSG had over a number of  
129 meetings. The first page brings together the specific items the division needs in order to move  
130 forward with the report. The remainder of the document categorizes all of the other equally  
131 import issues so that they are not lost, but what the division needs right now is the assumptions.

132

133 Garber said the additional categories will be addressed in report four, but not today.

134

135 Jennings commented that there are a total of 30-40 items. She said an assumption is a  
136 specifically defined term in professional planning. The rest of the items capture great ideas  
137 directing the division, addressing policy and so forth, but they are not assumptions.

138

139 MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini noted that some items in the categories pages are also on  
140 the assumptions page. She said most of the document looked like it contained explanations of  
141 the items on the first page, such as the statement that exported waste will be landfilled.

142

143 Jennings replied that some of the items are subsets of others. Another example is the  
144 assumption that the division will develop an annual forecast, which is matched by statements  
145 later in the document about each of the waste streams.

146

147 Referring to the third bullet under Waste Stream Assumptions, Armanini said that it could  
148 inadvertently close the door on examining other choices in the Comp Plan.

149

150 Jennings agreed. She said it was good that MSWMAC was evaluating the document because it  
151 could improve the quality of the assumptions.

152

153 MSWMAC member Dale Schroeder asked about the Policy category. Kiernan replied that they  
154 are taken from existing policies adopted by Council, and are intended to identify key policies  
155 the division should highlight for policy makers' attention in the report.

156

157 Jennings added that they will form the basis for the division's analysis and provide background  
158 information in the evaluation of options. For example, Policy Issues #3 and #6 will be used for  
159 some analysis.

160

161 Rivkin asked if the division will analyze the results of policy change. She asked what the  
162 results would be if the life of Cedar Hills is extended. She said it is important that people  
163 understand what is meant by having items in other categories, that the work will be done and  
164 taken to council.

165

166 Jennings confirmed that the other items are part of the work program for the division. She said  
167 she thought people may be getting caught up on the name "assumptions," which refers to a  
168 specific planning exercise. For example, the Landfill Capacity Assumption, "A new solid waste

169 landfill will not be sited by King County,” is used as a basis for planning. Although it is  
170 assumed at the beginning of the planning process, an outcome of the planning exercise could be  
171 that the county reconsiders siting a landfill. She said although ITSG’s suggestions were placed  
172 in categories for clarification, the categories may have caused more confusion.

173

174 Kiernan pointed to the first assumption, that the division will develop forecasts. He said that  
175 further into the document there are several statements that affect the forecast, such as those  
176 relating to sensitivity analysis, yard waste, food waste and White Center. These additional  
177 items inform the assumptions.

178

179 Garber commented that some of the assumptions are identical to other items in the document.  
180 For example, Jennings’ example is also a policy and its repetition makes sense.

181

182 Spangler suggested that all the items be put back together, instead of categorized.

183

184 Jennings asked if the concern was that the content under the other categories would be lost.

185

186 Rivkin suggested that the topical categories for the assumptions – waste stream, landfill  
187 capacity, etc. – be used to organize the entire document. Each statement could then be labeled  
188 as an assumption, direction, etc.

189

190 Jennings said that her interest was that assumptions should be clearly identified.

191

192 City of Bellevue staff member Susan Fife-Ferris suggested an alternative outline. She suggested  
193 that each assumption be numbered, and related items from the other categories be listed  
194 underneath each assumption.

195

196 Rivkin said the assumptions should be arranged by topical area.

197

198 Armanini asked about the generation of the second Transfer Assumption calling for additional  
199 capacity in south King County.

200

201 Kiernan replied that it was based on the results of the second milestone report, which concluded  
202 that Algona Transfer Station was not capable of meeting present and forecast tonnage needs,  
203 and is unable to expand to meet those needs.

204

205 **McGilton moved approval of the planning assumptions for the 4<sup>th</sup> milestone report.**

206

207 **Spangler moved to amend the assumptions by consolidating the four pages under topical**  
208 **areas with each assumption numbered and other items moved underneath its related**  
209 **assumption, and each item labeled as an assumption, direction, policy, etc.**

210

211 MSWMAC member Mick Monken said he preferred the existing presentation. He said the  
212 assumptions should be on one page. He added that as one reads through the rest of the  
213 document, the other information does not necessarily tie to a single assumption, because they  
214 are all interrelated. He said that the current presentation will be easier for staff to use for  
215 analysis, while the suggested reorganization would be convoluted and difficult to use.

216

217 Monken said that it is important to discuss the assumptions first before considering the other  
218 information. Using the landfill siting example, he said that it is already a policy, so analysts  
219 don't anticipate a new landfill in King County. He said the point of the exercise is to ask the  
220 question, "Are these the points that we use for evaluation, and are these others in support of  
221 them?" If the answer is no, then the assumptions should be changed.

222

223 **Armanini moved a friendly amendment to the amendment with addition of a cover sheet**  
224 **containing the assumptions, followed by the reorganized document described in the**  
225 **previous amendment.**

226

227 Jennings asked for confirmation that Armanini meant to keep the existing first page with  
228 references to the reorganized back pages.

229

230 Rivkin said the issues in the Policy category are not meant to restate existing policy but are  
231 meant to raise questions for officials about what policy changes could mean.

232

233 Monken agreed, but stated that purpose of today's discussion was the assumptions.

234

235 Jennings added that the division needs to do analysis, which depends on planning assumptions.  
236 She said people are afraid that the division won't use the information in the other categories, and  
237 that is not true. Planners use a lot of information, but they don't do analysis with more than ten  
238 assumptions. Assumptions are a defined term, and it is important that they are correct, but they  
239 do not constitute the whole report.

240

241 Garber stated that there is a motion on the table to reorganize the Assumptions and Issues  
242 document, and an amendment to the motion to add a cover sheet with assumptions. She called  
243 for a vote on the amendment first.

244

245 *The motion failed. Federal Way, Lake Forest Park, Renton, and Woodinville voted in favor.*

246

247 Garber called for a vote on the motion to amend the assumptions by reorganization.

248

249 *The motion failed 7:6 with Burien, Federal Way, Lake Forest Park, Newcastle, Renton,*  
250 *SeaTac and Woodinville opposed, and Auburn, Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond and Shoreline*  
251 *in favor.*

252

253 Garber stated that she favors a one-page list of assumptions with the other three pages arranged  
254 under topical categories.

255

256 **Monken moved to amend the Assumptions and Issues document by maintaining the first**  
257 **page as-is and adding a paragraph characterizing the remaining items as supporting**  
258 **information on page two.**

259

260 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza commented that the motion essentially keeps the document the  
261 same as it was presented. Monken agreed.

262

263 Armanini suggested the new paragraph be placed on the first page, after the title.

264

265 **Monken altered the motion to locate the new paragraph under the title on the first page.**

266

267 Garber called for a vote on the motion to add a paragraph under the title that refers readers to the  
268 following pages of information supportive to the assumptions.

269

270 *The motion passed 10:3 with Bellevue, Kirkland and Redmond opposed.*

271

272 Armanini said she would like to make a change to the third Waste Stream assumption. She  
273 suggested removing “and will continue to be disposed by landfilling after Cedar Hills closes.”

274

275 Kiernan asked that the deleted language be replaced by “until it reaches capacity.”

276

277 In response to a question, Jennings replied that current county council policy is not to site  
278 another landfill in King County. The policy does not state that waste must be disposed by  
279 landfilling. The Comp Plan does state that landfilling is the current preferred alternative.

280

281 **Armanini moved that the third Waste Stream Assumption be changed to read, “All mixed**  
282 **municipal solid waste (MMSW) generated in King County outside the boundaries of the**  
283 **Cities of Seattle and Milton currently is disposed at Cedar Hills Landfill, and will continue**  
284 **to be until it reaches capacity.”**

285

286 In response to a question, Kiernan said that King County will not site its own landfill in King  
287 County or outside of it after Cedar Hills closes.

288

289 MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza said the assumption should say that.

290

291 Kiernan replied that the next assumption does say so.

292

293 Armanini said any reasonable option that meets environmental and fiscal policies must be  
294 explored.

295

296 Jennings said the county council has rejected incineration in King County.

297

298 Bennett suggested modeling a scenario where some waste is exported early. She said this  
299 assumption would preclude that.

300

301 Jennings replied that the division has already committed to doing a sensitivity analysis.

302

303 Bennett said that someone outside of the group looking at the document wouldn't understand  
304 that the commitment has been made.

305

306 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said assumptions do not preclude analysis of other options.

307

308 Jennings pointed out that the third item under Direction, which is a direct quote from the 3<sup>rd</sup>  
309 milestone report, and item #15 under Information, both state a commitment to analyze early  
310 export.

311

312 Rivkin said ITSG talked about concurrently updating the Comp Plan, and the resolution was that  
313 the group was bound by the current Comp Plan but that the Export System Plan can make a  
314 recommendation that opposes the current Comp Plan and recommend policy be changed to  
315 allow the plan.

316

317 MSWMAC member Don Henning said that the 4<sup>th</sup> milestone report should be consistent with  
318 the 3<sup>rd</sup> milestone report.

319

320 Garber asked how analysis would change if the disposal method changed.

321

322 Jennings replied that it would, but added that waste export will probably begin ten years from  
323 now. No one knows what disposal technologies will be available then. At this point, landfills  
324 are the only option available for comparison.

325

326 Greenway said the assumptions must be absolutely correct. She suggested that if there is any  
327 way to change the language to allow for possible changes, it should be done.

328

329 Knight said she understood the assumptions to be setting a baseline against which other options  
330 will be compared. She said the assumptions set up a likely scenario based on the current  
331 situation, while other options, such as early export or others that have not yet been identified,  
332 are still unclear. She suggested that rather than rework the assumptions, it is important to treat  
333 them as the foundation for other work.

334

335 Jennings agreed, stating that the division will look at other things as options to compare to the  
336 baseline created by the assumptions.

337

338 Rivkin said the assumptions and options will be analyzed. She said the division should develop  
339 a parallel list of options because this document does not supply them.

340

341 Jennings replied that the division's starting point is Ordinance 14971. Originally, the division  
342 intended to follow the ordinance strictly. Then this group suggested early export and sensitivity  
343 analysis. So that is what the division is going to look at. If there are other possibilities that the  
344 division should analyze, she asked MSWMAC to identify them.

345

346 Rivkin said that the division must look at the policy issues surrounding the Cedar Hills closure  
347 date and analyze the impact of extending the life of Cedar Hills.

348

349 Jennings replied that that analysis is already required by the ordinance.

350

351 Rivkin said the division should make a list of analyses that will be done because some of them  
352 are getting lost.

353

354 Jennings said the analyses required by the ordinance, as well as the requested sensitivity  
355 analysis and early export analysis will be conducted. The outcomes of these analyses are not  
356 known.

357

358 Kiernan added that the division has been unable to move forward with these analyses because it  
359 has been unable to get a baseline to compare options against.

360

361 ***The motion passed 9:2 with Bellevue and Redmond opposed.***

362

363 In response to a question Kiernan said the division does a forecast for each year of the planning  
364 horizon, and updates the forecast each year.

365

366 Garber said the introductory paragraph to the assumptions can explain that they provide a  
367 baseline for comparison and can list the options that will be analyzed.

368

369 MSWMAC member Brad Miyake asked about the Financial Assumption of a federated system.

370

371 Garber responded that unless cities declare they want out of the system, the division can only  
372 look at a general tonnage decrease, which is not a very useful analysis. If cities declare intent to  
373 leave the system, the division may be able to analyze other configurations.

374

375 Bennett suggested that ITSG could look at alternatives in general areas.

376

377 Garber said the new introduction will say analysis of areas.

378

379 Kiernan added that general planning areas could be analyzed, but specific areas can not. He  
380 said this is consistent with Direction #3.

381

382 Garber said it is understood and part of the record that this analysis will be done. She said the  
383 assumption must be for a federated system because the division is legally obligated per existing  
384 contracts to 2028 to plan for a federated system.

385

386 **Bennett moved to add the language from Direction #3 to the Financial assumption.**

387 *The motion passed unanimously by those cities remaining in the room.*

388

389 **Feasibility of Installing Compactors at Existing Transfer Stations**

390 Kiernan said that compactors do not fit in any of the five urban stations being evaluated, except  
391 for Houghton. At Houghton, installation of a compactor would reduce capacity by 60%. He  
392 said there are handouts that explain the technical details for those who are interested, but  
393 compactors cannot be retrofitted into the existing stations.

394

395 **Adjournment**

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

397

398 Submitted by:

399 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff