

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 10, 2006

11:45 – 2:15 p.m.

King Street Center, 7th Floor Conference Center

Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Craig Violante	City of Auburn	Fiscal Services Manager
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Jack Dovey	City of Federal Way	Councilmember
Rob Van Orsow	City of Federal Way	Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator
Elaine Borjeson	City of Kirkland	Solid Waste Coordinator
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Daryl Grigsby	City of Kirkland	Public Works Director
Carolyn Armanini	City of Lake Forest Park	Staff
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	Public Works Director
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, Solid Waste Division Director

Theresa Koppang, Lead Planner

Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Tom Karston, Finance and Rates Analyst

Gemma Alexander, Staff

Josh Marx, Staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Sanders

Mike Huddleston

City Staff

Susan Fife-Ferris, City of Bellevue

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 11:50.

3
4 **Approve January Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

5 **MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the January minutes.**

6
7 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

8
9 Chair Garber said that copies of a letter have been provided for agenda item six. The
10 presentation will explain the contents of the letter, which the division would like
11 MSWMAC to approve and send. Garber said she thinks it is a good idea.

12
13 Lead Planner Theresa Koppang said the Cost of Delay presentation under agenda item
14 seven is not complete yet. The division will present it at the next ITSG meeting and at
15 the March MSWMAC meeting.

16
17 **SWAC Update**

18 SWAC Chair and MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini said SWAC is pursuing a
19 process in parallel with MSWMAC, providing a different viewpoint on waste export
20 system planning. SWAC membership is not jurisdiction based. It consists of citizens
21 labor, haulers, elected officials, business and marketing interests.

22
23 Armanini said that SWAC had a very productive meeting in January and provided input
24 on the fourth report to the division. SWAC will meet on February 17 and will take action
25 on the final draft of the report.

26
27 **SWD Update**

28 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings announced the division is beginning a
29 “Secure Your Load” campaign that will run from February to May. Many accidents have
30 been caused by debris from unsecured loads. State troopers will ticket drivers with
31 unsecured loads. The fine is \$194. The division charges a fee of between \$3 and \$10
32 depending on vehicle weight at transfer stations for self haul loads that are brought in

33 unsecured. The county is planning to initiate a pre-trip inspection procedure like the one
34 used by the Solid Waste Division for its vehicles.

35

36 Garber said there used to be a hotline to report unsecured loads, and asked if it still exists.

37 Kiernan said Ecology manages that hotline, and the division will give the number to

38 MSWMAC members. [1-866-LITTER-1 or online <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/litter/>].

39

40 Armanini asked if raising the transfer station fee had been considered. She said relative

41 to \$194, the transfer station fee doesn't seem very significant. Jennings said that the fee

42 has not been enforced in the past, so regular enforcement is a necessary first step.

43

44 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway said public education is key, because most people

45 don't know the difference between covering and securing a load. She said most people

46 will comply when they understand the rule. Jennings agreed.

47

48 **Comp Plan Update**

49 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said that the division would like to

50 begin the Comp Plan process with a kick-off meeting for all of the cities co-hosted by

51 MSWMAC. She suggested that the meeting could replace MSWMAC's May meeting,

52 and may need to be moved to a larger venue.

53

54 In response to a question, Yates said the meeting would be an opportunity to get cities

55 that have not participated in MSWMAC up to speed on solid waste issues so that

56 everyone can enter the Comp Plan process with a shared information base.

57

58 Greenway suggested that an evening or afternoon meeting would be accessible to more

59 people. MSWMAC member Mick Monken asked if it would be possible to telecast the

60 meeting. MSWMAC member Bill Pelozza said daytime meetings are more appropriate to

61 allow city staff to attend.

62

63 Garber asked if MSWMAC agreed that Yates should work with ITSG to begin planning
64 an all-cities meeting to be co-hosted by the division and MSMWAC. MSWMAC agreed
65 by consensus that Yates should move forward.

66

67 **Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF) Study**

68 Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford said the division is
69 beginning studies that will inform the Comp Plan. Nationally, recycling has undergone
70 changes in recent years; international markets and the introduction of single stream
71 recycling are thought to have impacted capacity and product quality. However, overall,
72 recycling levels have increased. There is not a lot of reliable data on the impacts of
73 changes in the recycling industry. The division is trying to develop real numbers to
74 determine whether there are problems that need to be addressed. To this end, the division
75 would like to study the four major MRFs in Western Washington. Gaisford said the
76 division is working in cooperation with the City of Seattle.

77

78 Gaisford presented a proposed draft letter from MSWMAC that would let operators know
79 of the cities' interest in the study.

80

81 In response to a question, Yates said that, per Ordinance 14971, MSWMAC is intended
82 to continue in its capacity as an advisory body on solid waste management issues after
83 completion of the Waste Export System Plan.

84

85 Pelozza suggested that the letter should identify Chair Garber as the Mayor of Newcastle,
86 and should be directly addressed to each of the haulers.

87

88 Garber asked if there were any further questions or comments. MSWMAC agreed by
89 consensus that Chair Garber sign the letter.

90

91 Gaisford said some studies are already underway. One of these is a recycled materials
92 marketing study and another is assessing the recycling potential of waste that is currently
93 being disposed. Also, the division's transfer station customer survey is being expanded
94 to include recycling customers.

95

96 In response to a question, Gaisford said the current overall recycling rate is 41%, based
97 on 2004 data. The residential per capita waste disposal goal has been met, but the goal
98 for employee waste generation has not. A major discussion for the Comp Plan update
99 will be deciding what the new goals will be.

100

101 MSWMAC member Jon Spangler asked if recycling data is available for single family,
102 multifamily and commercial generators. Gaisford said that they are, but data is not
103 uniformly reliable across the categories.

104

105 In response to a question, Gaisford said most materials have good markets, especially
106 paper. Some materials are still problematic. Although markets exist, it is questionable
107 whether they provide the best use for the material. An example is wood, which is
108 recycled at a high rate but is not being recycled into new wood products.

109

110 **Draft Milestone Report 4 Discussion**

111 Garber said that some of the comments already received are more appropriate to the
112 Waste Export System Plan, but she encouraged members to stay focused on the task of
113 approving report four today in order to move through the entire report at this meeting.

114

115 Koppang said that the division's economist, Tom Karston, will present new material that
116 has been added to the draft report at ITSG's request, which analyzes a longer term
117 financial outlook. She said most of Karston's presentation is included in Appendix H but
118 would be posted online for members to download.

119

120 Karston presented the long term costs of options at individual stations, long term package
121 costs, the effects of inflation on staffing costs over time and the tradeoff between upfront
122 capital costs and long term operating costs. Packages One and Four represent two
123 extremes; Package One involves the highest capital costs and lowest operating costs
124 while Package Four involves the lowest capital costs and the highest long term operating
125 costs. Increased upfront capital spending reduces the risk from inflation over time.

126

127 Monken asked if staffing models would change with different inflation rates. Karston
128 said that was possible, but was not included in the analysis.

129

130 MSWMAC member Alison Bennett asked Karston to include present value calculations
131 in the Appendix.

132

133 Garber said there is a motion on the table from last month's meeting to approve
134 Milestone Report Four. She asked for comments on the report.

135

136 In response to a question, Yates said all cities' comments received by the deadline are
137 included in the responsiveness summary.

138

139 MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin suggested the responsiveness summary be attached to
140 the report to document the level of input from the cities.

141

142 The division agreed to add the responsiveness summary as an appendix to the report. She
143 said comments received after the deadline from Auburn and Federal Way would be added
144 to the final responsiveness summary.

145

146 Bennett said that she assumed where the responsiveness summary says "Comment
147 Noted" the division does not want cities to raise those issues again today. Garber replied
148 that the responsiveness summary provides a record that those issues were raised by the
149 cities. However, she encouraged the cities to bring up any of their previous comments if
150 they have not been addressed.

151

152 Rivkin said that if a city has raised substantive issues and is not satisfied with the
153 response in the summary, the city should bring up those issues as MSWMAC moves
154 through the report chapter by chapter.

155

156 Jennings said that consensus may not be reached on some analyses and encouraged the
157 cities to identify those issues so that they can be included in the third party review.

158

159 Executive Summary:

160 Pelozo asked why transfer station recommendations will be made but intermodal
161 recommendations will not. Garber said it is explained in the Next Steps section. Kiernan
162 added that the division strongly recommends station upgrades because there are
163 immediate needs in the system as identified in Report 2. That report demonstrated that
164 independent of any decisions on export, there are pressing transfer system needs right
165 now. Regional experience suggests that siting new transfer facilities can be quite time
166 consuming, so it is imperative we start as soon as possible to address those needs. The
167 development of intermodal capacity is a discrete project that does not have the same time
168 constraints.

169

170 Chapter One:

171 Spangler commented that the synopses in every other chapter comes at the beginning, but
172 here is preceded by several paragraphs of background information.

173

174 The division agreed to reorganize the beginning of Chapter One.

175

176 Chapter Two:

177 Pelozo said that Sharon Hlavka of Auburn had submitted a comment requesting the
178 potential impacts of transfer station siting be identified in the report. He said it looked
179 like the Appendix on the siting process may have addressed those impacts, and asked
180 division staff to check Hlavka's concerns against the content of the appendix.

181

182 Garber commented that some of Hlavka's concerns would be more appropriately dealt
183 with as part of the Waste Export System Plan.

184

185 MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow commented on Table 2-5 that Package 1A
186 information should be included because it is not very different from Package 1.

187

188 Kiernan replied that the packages differ on a very significant issue. The division does not
189 have any data on what kind of environmental mitigation would be required for the
190 wetlands on the Factoria site. The division has asked Bellevue and has not yet received a

191 statement on Bellevue's position. He added that regardless of potential mitigation efforts,
192 the division is reluctant in principle to develop wetlands. Kiernan said that the
193 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) coauthored by Bellevue found significant
194 unavoidable adverse impacts and rejected the Factoria site. The division does not have
195 any new data that would reverse that conclusion.

196

197 Bennett said that Bellevue is discussing that with the division. The project scope and
198 Bellevue's regulatory environment have changed since the EIS was written ten years ago.

199

200 Kiernan said that he is unaware that wetlands regulations have become less stringent in
201 the last decade, and the project was not feasible at the time of the EIS. He said the
202 division's position is that rebuilding a full service transfer station at Factoria is not
203 feasible until specific information to the contrary becomes available.

204

205 Rivkin asked if the known costs could be included, instead of saying "no data."

206

207 Greenway said that while Kevin's explanation is helpful, she is very uncomfortable
208 including any numbers because readers will rely on them even if they are footnoted as
209 being incomplete.

210

211 Kiernan said the division will not speculate about costs when the scope of a project that
212 may not be feasible is unknown.

213

214 Armanini suggested that the report should include a summary of Kiernan's statement,
215 rather than incomplete data, especially since mitigation costs in this case could exceed
216 construction costs.

217

218 Pelosa said some explanation of why cost data is not available is needed in the document.

219

220 Garber said the report can reflect this discussion.

221

222 Bennett said that Bellevue does not need to discuss this issue today. The issue has been
223 identified, everyone is aware of it, and the City of Bellevue will continue to meet with the
224 division to discuss solutions.

225

226 Kiernan said the division has a list of Bellevue's concerns and believes that it can address
227 those concerns.

228

229 Spangler asked about the figure on 2-34, which shows solid waste rates exceeding the
230 rate of inflation in 2015 and the statement on 2-12 that all packages can be implemented
231 within the rate commitment. Kiernan explained that the rate commitment is tied to the
232 operation of the Cedar Hills Landfill, and does not extend beyond Cedar Hills' closure.
233 That is why the solid waste rate exceeds inflation after 2015 (Cedar Hills' projected
234 closure date) in Figure 2-5.

235

236 Rivkin suggested that point be clarified in the report.

237

238 Greenway asked if it is more cost effective and efficient to operate a newly designed full
239 service transfer station than a self-haul only station. Kiernan said that it is.

240

241 Armanini commented that an optimally efficient station would serve commercial
242 customers only on weekdays and self-haul only on weekends. Jennings agreed.

243

244 Rivkin said she wanted to restate Redmond's concern that the inputs into the financial
245 model used to generate cost information are not identified in the report.

246

247 Jennings replied that the financial model is very large and would fill an entire disk. She
248 said everyone is welcome to receive a copy of the model on disk, but there is too much
249 information to include in a report.

250

251 Rivkin said that Redmond does not want the entire financial model to be included in the
252 report, but would like to see more information about the model than is currently included.

253

254 Armanini suggested that information should be in an appendix. Jennings agreed to add
255 an appendix on the financial model.

256

257 Chapter Three:

258 Garber commented that this chapter will be part of the third party review. She asked for
259 amendments to Chapter Three. No comments were made.

260

261 Chapter Four:

262 Van Orsow suggested Chapter Four should include language that maintaining backup
263 capacity at Cedar Hills could provide an advantage when negotiating export contracts.

264

265 Council staff member Mike Huddleston commented that often salient issues are bolded or
266 highlighted for emphasis. He suggested that the benefits of extended life at Cedar Hills
267 should be emphasized in this report. Jennings agreed.

268

269 Koppang added that Rivkin has made a similar comment. She said she wanted to talk
270 with Rivkin to be completely clear about how to make the changes, but the division does
271 intend to place emphasis on key points.

272

273 Armanini suggested key points should also be highlighted in the Executive Summary.

274

275 Huddleston said that the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) had questions about the
276 impact recycling could have on landfill capacity. He suggested the report should make it
277 clear that recycling has already had an impact on landfill capacity and that the division is
278 counting on improved recycling in its plans.

279

280 Jennings said this work can be incorporated into the report.

281

282 Bennett said that Karston's presentation considered the effects of increased inflation, but
283 asked what the effects of lower inflation would be.

284

285 Jennings replied that average inflation from 1913 to 2006 has been 3.3%. The division
286 didn't want to analyze numbers outside the range of historical data.

287

288 Rivkin suggested that the division's role in promoting recycling should be explained.

289 Gaisford replied that when the report talks about the effect that recycling has had on
290 Cedar Hills' life, it can also say how that is a result of the division's promotional efforts.

291

292 Huddleston said that would address his concern very well.

293

294 Garber recapped the discussion by saying that the division will add

- 295 1. a discussion of the impact recycling can have on Cedar Hills' lifespan
- 296 2. a description of recycling efforts to date and the importance of continued
297 recycling efforts as part of the Comp Plan.

298

299 Susan Fife-Ferris of Bellevue asked how Karston's analysis of withdrawal of waste from
300 the system differs from increased recycling.

301

302 Jennings said time is a key factor. Recycling rates are achieved over time, as overall
303 waste generation increases, but withdrawal takes place all at once.

304

305 Huddleston added that this means the two scenarios operate with a different baseline.

306 Over time, total generation increases beyond the current baseline of 1 million tons, and
307 increased recycling rates minimize the gap between today's baseline tonnage and the
308 increased generation. Withdrawal removes waste from the baseline of one million tons.

309

310 Greenway said she asked Rist when he presented the forecast to MSWMAC in October if
311 increased recycling would decrease garbage tonnage and the answer was: no, even with
312 increased recycling, garbage continues to increase.

313

314 Fife-Ferris said that it sounds like there is a conflict between the environmental benefits
315 of increased recycling and the financial benefits of income from garbage disposal fees.

316

317 Gaisford replied that it appears that way because there has not yet been a discussion of
318 the economic benefits of the products that are made from recycled materials.

319

320 Garber said that discussion should be included in the Comp Plan Update process.

321

322 MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby said it was difficult to tell which of the lists in
323 Chapter Four refer to measures that have already been taken and which refer to measures
324 that will or might be taken to extend the lifespan of Cedar Hills.

325

326 Kiernan said the division will work to clarify that in the revision.

327

328 Chapter Five:

329 Spangler suggested including the date of the Snohomish County contract that was used in
330 the division's analysis so that readers know the information is current.

331

332 Chapter Six:

333 Van Orsow said the document often refers to a conflict between freight and garbage on
334 the rail lines and asked if the division meant to imply that an intermodal facility near the
335 Port of Seattle would be more costly than one sited farther south in the county.

336

337 Kiernan said the division does not know what the best site would be for intermodal,
338 which is one reason the division is deferring its recommendation on intermodal facilities.
339 Intermodal capacity is changing rapidly; three years ago the Port approached the division
340 asking to export the county's waste, but today the Port's business volume has increased
341 significantly.

342

343 Garber suggested the division see if the language in the report can be clarified.

344

345 Schroeder commented on the phrase "ideal site," saying that last month MSWMAC
346 discussed the possibility of multiple sites. Jennings said it would be corrected.

347

348 Rivkin recognized that Bellevue had asked for a reference to the BNSF letter on page 6-2,
349 but said that she is concerned about including it. She said the reference could
350 compromise the division's negotiating position with the railroads.

351

352 Jennings said that the division will accept MSWMAC's recommendation on whether a
353 reference to the letter should be included.

354

355 Fife-Ferris said the letter was a response to the Business Plan, which had claimed there
356 was insufficient capacity.

357

358 Rivkin said this chapter is about intermodal capacity, but the letter is from a rail
359 company, and does not add anything to the discussion of intermodal.

360

361 Armanini suggested removing the sentence.

362

363 Bennett replied that would shift the impression too far in the other direction.

364

365 Huddleston cautioned that Sound Transit also received letters from the rail companies
366 indicating that adequate capacity was available, and in the end it cost Sound Transit \$880
367 million to add capacity.

368

369 Jennings clarified that the division has never stated there was a shortage of rail capacity.
370 The issue has always been one of intermodal capacity.

371

372 Bennett agreed to removal of the reference.

373

374 Chapter Seven:

375 Bennett said that everyone has seen Bellevue's analysis, and she recognizes that the issue
376 will not be resolved today, but she wants to state for the record that Bellevue is
377 disappointed none of their analysis was included in the revised draft.

378

379 Garber suggested that this chapter is another candidate for the third party review.

380

381 Kiernan said the division agrees, and the responsiveness summary states that the division
382 supports the third party review.

383

384 Rivkin pointed out that the total Snohomish County export cost is used here, while only
385 the transport cost is used in Chapter Five. She said that should be clearly stated to avoid
386 confusion.

387

388 Van Orsow asked if there is an optimal percentage of early export that achieves a
389 financial benefit.

390

391 Kiernan said the division has considered this and feels the best way to answer that
392 question is through a procurement process.

393

394 Chapter Eight:

395 Huddleston suggested that the next steps section should include all of the tasks identified
396 in Ordinance 14971 that have not been completed yet.

397

398 Appendices:

399 Koppang said most of the appendices are unchanged, although they have been reordered.
400 There are two new appendices.

401

402 Pelozza suggested that the project reflect significant (major) milestone events that would
403 provide a snapshot picture and visibility for management purposes.

404

405 Jennings said the division is working on a draft outline of the Waste Export System Plan,
406 which will include a master schedule. That will be available next month.

407

408 In response to a question, Jennings said the Business Plan will proceed after the Waste
409 Export System Plan is approved.

410

411 Armanini said SWAC will review the report at its meeting next Friday, and may
412 recommend minor changes to the version of the report voted on by MSWMAC.

413

414 Garber commented that Armanini sits on both committees and can be trusted not to
415 countermand MSWMAC's intent at SWAC.

416

417 Armanini added that the division is also present at both committees and said that she
418 trusts the division is working in good faith. She said that SWAC meetings are open to the
419 public, and invited MSWMAC members to attend.

420

421 Rivkin said that some changes made to the report today may require changes to the
422 responsiveness summary as well. She asked the division to ensure that changes made
423 today are reflected in the final responsiveness summary.

424

425 **Garber called for a vote on the main motion to approve Milestone Report 4 as**
426 **amended.**

427

428 *Yates performed a roll call vote. The motion was approved with 11 Yes votes and 1 No*
429 *vote, with Bellevue opposing.*

430

431 **Adjourn**

432 The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

433 Submitted by:

434 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff