

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 14, 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
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
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
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

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

Gemma Alexander, Staff

Sandra Matteson, Staff

Neil Fujii, Staff

Glenn Ueda, Staff

Morgan John, Staff

King County Council Staff

Peggy Sanders

Mike Huddleston

City Staff

Debbie Anspaugh, City of Bothell

1 **Call to Order**

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

3 Everyone present introduced themselves.

4
5 **Approve March Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

6 MSWMAC Vice Chair Joan McGilton moved approval of the March minutes.

7
8 *The minutes were unanimously approved.*

9
10 **SWAC Update**

11 SWAC Chair and MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini reported that SWAC dealt with
12 internal business at its last meeting before viewing the Cost of Delay presentation and
13 following an agenda very similar to MSWMAC's March agenda.

14
15 **SWD Update**

16 Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan reported that talks between the haulers and
17 their drivers are ongoing. The division does not have information on how the talks are
18 proceeding. A strike vote is scheduled for Easter Sunday. If there is a strike, picketing is
19 likely to take place at transfer stations, and could impact traffic. Supervisors will be on
20 site, and will keep the cities informed as events unfold.

21
22 The cities' Comp Plan kickoff meeting, which will be co-hosted by the division and
23 MSWMAC, will be held June 9 at the Mercer Island Community Center from 12-3.

24
25 In response to a question, Kiernan pointed out handouts outlining how the planning work
26 products fit together, and the timing for MSWMAC's work this summer. He said that it
27 is difficult to coordinate the deadlines with the meeting schedules.

28
29 Legislation revising the due date for the Waste Export System Plan has been submitted to
30 council. Milestone Report Four, as well as a motion adding language about other work
31 products that will be due with the Waste Export System Plan, has been adopted by the
32 Regional Policy Committee (RPC).

33

34 Armanini asked why an additional motion was necessary and commented that it seemed
35 to bog down the process of approving a simple date change.

36

37 Council staff Mike Huddleston responded that there was a desire to memorialize the
38 process discussed at the last MSWMAC meeting.

39

40 MSWMAC member Daryl Grigsby asked whether MSWMAC would be expected to
41 review the division's business plan, as stated in the motion approved by RPC last week.

42 Division Director Theresa Jennings responded that the original Ordinance 14971 does
43 call for MSWMAC to review the business plan, and that has not been changed in any of
44 the subsequent amendments.

45

46 Chair Garber said she questions the need for the new motion, because the council
47 obviously cannot adopt the Waste Export System Plan without environmental review, and
48 council staff has already communicated the reasons for the due date change to council in
49 an email. However, she said, the motion is innocuous and she believes the outcome will
50 be the same with or without it. She added that for accuracy, the motion should refer to
51 analysis of the Waste Export System Plan rather than the solid waste system.

52

53 Kiernan said the division has had several discussions with Bellevue on how to proceed
54 with the Factoria/Eastgate property. The division understands that Bellevue has three
55 concerns:

- 56 1. Eastgate Way traffic
- 57 2. Aesthetics from the I-90 corridor
- 58 3. Interest in commercial development

59

60 The division developed a concept design for the Eastgate property in response to these
61 concerns. The concept design involves excavating the Eastgate property and constructing
62 a below-grade transfer station with a green roof. The current traffic pattern would be
63 maintained. Forty percent of the property would be reserved for commercial
64 development. The division has issued a request for information and will meet with

65 developers to test the idea and find out what other ideas for the site the market will
66 generate. The City of Bellevue has hired a consultant to delineate wetlands and
67 determine the impacts of developing a new station on the existing Factoria site.

68

69 In response to questions, Kiernan said the division owns the 14 acre Eastgate site and
70 could maintain the current property access. He said that while excavation and
71 construction below grade is expensive, it is hoped that the commercial development
72 would offset higher costs. Kiernan said that the division is currently pursuing a LEED
73 Silver rating at First NE and intends to incorporate sustainability into the development of
74 Eastgate as well. He added that the concept is not yet a design, and more work would
75 have to be done to determine potential service impacts during construction. It is also
76 likely that the commercial development would be sold.

77

78 MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway commented that the concept of an invisible
79 transfer station would be great for any site where it was logistically possible.

80

81 **Environmental Review Process**

82 Kiernan reported the division has issued a Determination of Significance and request for
83 comments on the scope of the Solid Waste Export System Plan environmental review.

84 The environmental review is a programmatic review that will look broadly at things that
85 will be decided in the plan, for example, Cedar Hills' capacity and the transfer system
86 configuration. Once decisions are made, further project specific environmental review
87 will be necessary.

88

89 The scoping period will end April 28. The draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
90 will be finished in mid-June. There will be a month-long comment period, and the final
91 EIS will be completed in mid-September.

92

93 **Siting Process and Criteria**

94 Kiernan reviewed the legal requirements for facility siting. RCW 70.95.165 establishes
95 the division's authority for solid waste facility siting and identifies some general siting
96 criteria. WAC 173-305 deals with intermediate solid waste handling facilities, but does

97 not establish specific location standards. The King County Comprehensive Plan
98 identifies transfer stations as essential public facilities.

99

100 Armanini commented that the WAC also establishes the Solid Waste Advisory
101 Committee (SWAC) as an advisory body and gives SWAC specific responsibilities
102 regarding facility siting.

103

104 The division has a facilities siting plan that was first included in the 1989 Comprehensive
105 Solid Waste Management Plan and revised in 1992. The Enumclaw Transfer Station was
106 sited according to this plan.

107

108 Kiernan said the division has been asked what other jurisdictions do. He surveyed Solid
109 Waste Association of North America members in the region. Seattle provided a
110 description of the process used to site their intermodal facility, and Snohomish County
111 provided documents describing the siting process for their transfer station. The processes
112 they described were more general than King County's Facilities Siting Plan. Kitsap
113 County, Tacoma and Spokane all reported that their siting process is less rigorous than
114 King County's, and that other jurisdictions use King County's siting process as a model.
115 Kiernan said the division proposes using the existing siting plan as the basis for future
116 siting criteria and processes. He suggested that the criteria would not need to be changed,
117 but may need to be reprioritized.

118

119 Huddleston asked how the division would deal with the hierarchy of waste management
120 strategies (including waste to energy) included in the RCW. Kiernan replied that will be
121 discussed in the Comp Plan.

122

123 Huddleston commented that incinerator ash is regulated as a hazardous waste and cannot
124 be handled at the division's transfer stations. Garber said that incinerator ash has special
125 handling requirements and usually does not go to transfer stations. She agreed that there
126 are issues with incineration that are not being addressed by its proponents.

127

128 Huddleston suggested that since incineration will be considered in the Comp Plan,
129 incinerator siting criteria should be developed.

130

131 Kiernan gave a PowerPoint presentation that illustrated how the siting plan was used to
132 site Enumclaw Transfer Station.

133 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/EnumclawSiting.ppt>

134 The Comp Plan guided the siting efforts. A Citizen Advisory Committee was formed.
135 The division learned that anyone who is interested should be welcome, but that potential
136 opponents should be particularly encouraged to participate in the process.

137

138 Enumclaw was sited using a six step process:

- 139 1. Identify sites
- 140 2. Agree to the criteria that will be used and weigh their relative importance
- 141 3. Screen the sites according to the criteria
- 142 4. Perform a detailed comparative evaluation of remaining sites
- 143 5. Environmental review
- 144 6. Select the site

145

146 Lessons learned include:

- 147 • Comp Plan guidance is important
- 148 • Incorporated area sites are preferable
- 149 • Advisory committee input is necessary
- 150 • The No Action alternative is valuable
- 151 • The process must be clear
- 152 • Early notification is important

153

154 Division Engineer Neil Fujii said that the interested parties tend to shift as sites are
155 identified and choices are narrowed. Early in the process public involvement tends to
156 include people who are interested in the system as a whole. Once specific sites are
157 selected, neighbors become involved. He said it is important that the process be flexible
158 enough to deal with changing interest groups.

159

160 In response to a question, Kiernan said that future siting processes will take longer than
161 the Enumclaw process. The City of Enumclaw was clear about the need for a facility,
162 and so was supportive of the entire process. The division hopes MSWMAC will help
163 provide consensus on facility need in the future. He added that the environmental review
164 process would take longer today than in the example.

165

166 In response to another question, Kiernan said that the advisory committee generally
167 approved of all three finalist sites in the Enumclaw process, and agreed with the
168 division's recommendation of the preferred alternative. The Executive made the final
169 choice, which was to select the preferred alternative.

170

171 Greenway commented that a process is successful if the advisory group approves of all
172 the recommended alternatives.

173

174 Rivkin commented that outside of MSWMAC, not very many people know there is a
175 need for new transfer stations, and it is important to get the message out.

176

177 Kiernan agreed that it is important, and said that getting consensus in MSWMAC is a
178 necessary first step to public involvement. He said the division is well aware that
179 establishing need is not a technical question, and will not be easy.

180

181 Greenway said that Cedar Hills' closure drives the need and can be used to establish the
182 need in the public mind.

183

184 Rivkin suggested the division strategize with communications staff to get the public
185 informed as soon as possible.

186

187 Garber said the public will be most interested in rate impacts.

188

189 Jennings said the division needs to strategize communication before the Waste Export
190 System Plan is completed.

191

192 Huddleston said that leadership support is the key to a successful project. He commented
193 that mitigation is an increasingly large part of public projects and asked how transfer
194 station designs are keeping up.

195

196 Kiernan said that for example, noise from trucks backing up is one impact that has been a
197 problem in the past. The new First NE will be built with walls near neighbors, and
198 openings facing roads where noise levels are already high.

199

200 MSWMAC member Jack Dovey suggested that in order to engage the public in projects
201 that are a few years from implementation, the division should make presentations to the
202 cities' Land Use Committees and then to City Councils. He said that would gain more
203 attention than reports from the MSWMAC representative.

204

205 Kiernan said the division is glad to come out to the cities, and intends to do so as soon as
206 consensus is reached at MSWMAC.

207

208 Armanini commented that timing is an issue because it is hard to engage people on a
209 project that is not imminent. A certain amount of specificity is required to raise interest.

210

211 Rivkin agreed, saying that the time to begin outreach is somewhere between now and
212 siting.

213

214 **Third Party Review**

215 Huddleston said the process for third party review will be established soon after the
216 Fourth Milestone Report is adopted by council. He said that each stakeholder group will
217 have different issues to bring forward. MSWMAC needs to identify which questions it
218 wants to submit for the third party review.

219

220 Garber said that will be the homework for everyone to prepare for the next meeting. She
221 suggested that MSWMAC members email their ideas to her and Intergovernmental
222 Relations Liaison Diane Yates to compile for discussion at the next meeting.

223

224 Yates said she will email MSWMAC for their questions.

225

226 Kiernan asked if council had begun to think about who will be on the review panel. He
227 said that it could be difficult to get people to work over the summer if they are not given
228 enough advance notice.

229

230 Huddleston said they have started to think about it. The general consensus is that a local
231 consultant should be hired to assemble a national team and act as the facilitator. The
232 team composition will depend on the types of questions asked. He said some financial
233 questions may be answered by general county advisors, but that otherwise no local
234 experts would be used, because few companies would be willing to give up the
235 opportunity to bid on the projects.

236

237 Kiernan suggested that local academics may be available, since they would not be
238 bidding on projects later.

239

240 Huddleston said that questions for the review panel could include railroad issues,
241 recycling questions and waste to energy concerns. In response to a question, he said the
242 panel will review the four milestone reports, the adopted Comp Plan and budget provisos.
243 Panel members would have access to any supporting documentation in their area of
244 expertise that they needed to answer the questions.

245

246 Jennings suggested that panel members should be briefed on the solid waste system in
247 King County and Washington State, since experts from the East Coast are unlikely to be
248 familiar with the unique system of franchise areas that is used here.

249

250 Dovey commented that as a board member of Enterprise Seattle, he supports keeping the
251 money for the review in the county.

252

253 Huddleston said that most of the budgeted \$130,000 will be paid to the facilitator. The
254 experts are not likely to be paid professional rates, and will be provided room and board
255 at local establishments.

256

257 Rivkin commented that discussion of the questions for third party review in May is very
258 timely, since MSWMAC will also be reviewing legislation which includes the third party
259 review process in May.

260

261 McGilton asked what action is to be taken on siting at the May MSWMAC meeting.

262 Kiernan replied that the division would like feedback on the siting plan and action to
263 approve it.

264

265 Garber asked MSMWAC members to review the siting plan and commented that ITSG
266 will be looking at the plan as well.

267

268 McGilton asked if there was any value to reviewing the matrix that was used to evaluate
269 existing stations. Kiernan replied that the matrix is useful to view as a reference but that
270 there are significant differences between evaluating existing stations and siting new ones,
271 and those differences limit the matrix's usefulness as a siting tool.

272

273 **Adjourn**

274 The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

275

276 Submitted by:

277 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff