

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 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>
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Alison Bennett	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
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
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Nina Rivkin	City of Redmond	Senior Policy Analyst
Jon Spangler	City of Redmond	Natural Resources Division Manager
Lys Hornsby	City of Renton	Utilities 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

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Operations Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Tom Karston, Finance and Rates Analyst

Gemma Alexander, Staff

Bert Tarrant, Staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Sanders

Mike Huddleston

Mike Reed

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:05.

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

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

6
7 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka asked that lines 401-402 be changed to read, “Peloza
8 suggested that the project reflect significant (major) milestone events that would provide
9 a snapshot picture and visibility for management purposes.”

10
11 Greenway said King County Council staff Mike Huddleston’s comments in lines 365-367
12 were unclear. After receiving clarification from Huddleston, Greenway suggested
13 changing the minutes to read, “Huddleston cautioned that Sound Transit also received
14 letters from the rail companies indicating that there was adequate capacity, but in the end
15 it cost Sound Transit \$880 million to add capacity.”

16
17 *The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

18
19 Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates asked that all MSWMAC members,
20 guests and staff sign in at every meeting. She said that the sign in sheets are part of the
21 documentation needed for the division to provide lunch.

22
23 **SWAC Update**

24 Yates said that at its last meeting, SWAC voted unanimously to approve Milestone
25 Report 4 with only two minor wording changes. SWAC sent a letter endorsing the report
26 to the Executive, King County Council and Regional Policy Committee.

27
28 **SWD Update**

29 Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that bids for reconstruction of
30 First NE Transfer Station came in under budget. Construction is expected to begin in
31 early May. During construction, self-haul customers will be able to use any King County
32 transfer station. Commercial customers will be rerouted to Snohomish County’s South

33 Transfer and Recycling Station in Mountlake Terrace (SWTRS). County vehicles will
34 transport commercial waste from the SWTRS to the Cedar Hills Landfill.

35

36 The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) voted to approve Criterion 17, which will go to
37 the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee next week. RPC was briefed
38 on Milestone Report 4. The briefing went very well and RPC asked good questions about
39 recycling and its effect on landfill capacity. The division will provide the same briefing
40 to the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee next week.

41

42 In a series of 12 meetings, the division has briefed its 400 employees on the progress of
43 the planning process.

44

45 Huddleston said Report 4 will probably go before the full council in late April or in May.

46

47 **Cost of Delay Presentation**

48 Solid Waste Division Economist Tom Karston presented the costs of delaying transfer
49 system improvements. Primary factors influencing the cost are higher construction prices
50 and the loss of operational savings from compactors. Other costs are harder to quantify,
51 such as reduced site availability and impacts on customer service levels. Transfer station
52 improvements could be expedited by achieving consensus, developing new facilities
53 simultaneously and using alternative procurement methods. The presentation is available
54 online at: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/Costs_of_Delay.ppt

55

56 MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby asked about alternative contracting options. Karston
57 said these require special permission, but often save time and money. Special legislation
58 allows more flexible spending limits for solid waste projects than for other projects.

59

60 **Waste Export System Plan Discussion**

61 Kiernan said a State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process is required for the
62 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (Comp Plan). As system-wide options
63 were identified in Report 4, the division realized it could be argued that the Waste Export
64 System Plan also requires a SEPA process. When the council acts to approve the Waste

65 Export System Plan, it will be eliminating choices, which could be considered an
66 “action” under SEPA. It can be argued that this is not the case, but the division has
67 determined the most conservative approach is to do SEPA analysis now, before asking
68 policymakers to choose a package. This approach will allow policymakers to make a
69 more informed decision. During the SEPA process work can continue on the:

- 70 • Waste Export System Plan
- 71 • Third Party Review
- 72 • Rate Study
- 73 • ILA Discussions
- 74 • Comp Plan

75

76 The decision to move forward with a SEPA analysis means the due date for the Waste
77 Export System Plan will need to be changed. New legislation will be drafted to change
78 the due date for the Waste Export System Plan. Except for the Comp Plan, the division
79 expects all of the work products to be completed in September. The division has hired a
80 consultant to conduct the SEPA process.

81

82 Garber asked if the Waste Export System Plan will include siting criteria and processes.
83 Kiernan said it will.

84

85 In response to another question, Kiernan said the SEPA process will analyze all of the
86 options from the Fourth Report at the programmatic level. More detail may be included
87 for options where sites are known.

88

89 Greenway commented that she is surprised by the change, but feels that it may be helpful
90 to selecting the preferred package. She said that this process may be more efficient in the
91 end than it would have been as originally planned, and asked what comes next.

92

93 Rivkin suggested that a new timeline including tasks is needed so that MSWMAC
94 members can see how all of the project components come together.

95

96 Kiernan said that although the deadline for the Waste Export System Plan will be moved
97 back, projects will not be delayed. In effect, this approach moves more work up-front to
98 bring into sync processes that were previously isolated. He said each of the documents
99 (waste export system plan, rate study, etc.) will bring work to MSWMAC, such as
100 development of siting criteria and process development. Garber added that MSWMAC
101 also needs to generate a list of questions for the Third Party Review.

102

103 Huddleston said that council would like to begin the Third Party Review, which will take
104 about 90 days, after the Fourth Milestone Report is adopted. In the meantime, council
105 hopes that MSWMAC will continue discussion of policy issues that could be
106 incorporated in the Third Party Review, and resolve some of them, thus narrowing the
107 scope of the Review. Huddleston suggested that potential issues for Third Party Analysis
108 include the Sensitivity Analysis, Assumptions for the Comp Plan, Financial and Policy
109 Assumptions, such as bond terms and financing, Recycling and possibly others. He said
110 that he is confident MSWMAC can sufficiently resolve some of these issues, so that only
111 a few of them need to go through third party review.

112

113 In response to a question, Garber said the Waste Export System Plan will include the
114 siting process and siting criteria, but will not involve actual site selection. She said there
115 are several tiers in the siting process, some of which are specific to communities. This
116 plan will only deal with the most general tier of the siting process.

117

118 Kiernan added that most of the work on siting criteria has already been done and
119 presented to MSWMAC, the next step is for MSWMAC to act on it.

120

121 **Adjourn**

122 The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

123

124 Submitted by:

125 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff