KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
July 14, 2006
11:45 – 2:15 p.m.
King Street Center, 7th Floor Conference Center
Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

Name	Agency	Title
Sharon Hlavka	**City of Auburn**	**Solid Waste Supervisor**
Bill Peloza	**City of Auburn**	**Councilmember**
Alison Bennett	**City of Bellevue**	**Utilities Policy Advisor**
Doug Jacobson	**City of Bothell**	**Public Works Director**
Debbie Anspaugh	**City of Bothell**	**Administrative Coordinator**
Joan McGilton	**City of Burien**	**Mayor**
Dan Bath	**City of Burien**	**Capital Projects Manager/Engineer**
Rob Van Orsow	**City of Federal Way**	**Solid Waste & Recycling Coordinator**
David Baker	**City of Kenmore**	**Deputy Mayor**
Jessica Greenway	**City of Kirkland**	**Councilmember**
Elaine Borjeson	**City of Kirkland**	**Solid Waste Coordinator**
Jean Garber	**City of Newcastle**	**Mayor**
Jon Spangler	**City of Redmond**	**Natural Resources Division Manager**
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**
Don Brocha	**City of Woodinville**	**Councilmember**
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
Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager
Kevin Kiernan, Engineering Services Manager
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison
Jane Gateley, Technical Writer
Gemma Alexander, Staff

King County Council Staff

Mike Huddleston
Mike Reed

City Staff

Alex Murillo, City of Kent

Call to Order

MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:00. Everyone present introduced themselves.

Approve April and May Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda

MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the April minutes.

MSWMAC member Nina Rivkin confirmed lines 257-259. She clarified that she was referring to the language added by the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) to the ordinance amending the due dates.

The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway moved approval of the May minutes.

The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

ITSG Update

ITSG and MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka reported that ITSG members will rotate responsibility for updating MSWMAC each month. She said that since MSMWAC's May meeting, ITSG met to plan the Comp Plan Kickoff, and had three meetings dedicated to ILA discussions. In those meetings, city members and the county discussed the process that will be used for the discussions, and city members caucused without the county. At its regular meeting, ITSG previewed MSWMAC's agenda items, discussing:

- the third party review,
- waste export system plan recommendations,
- the reasons for delaying decisions on intermodal facility needs and long haul transport
- the impact of recycling rates

ITSG did not review the business plan in order to devote more time to the third party review.

Chair Garber said that in the future, if ITSG needs to report on discussions that took place during the cities' caucus, division staff will be asked to leave the room.

SWAC Update

MSWMAC Vice Chair and SWAC member Joan McGilton reported that SWAC met on May 22 and had a Comp Plan kickoff in June. The May meeting covered the same material as MSWMAC. There was an intense discussion of Waste to Energy. The kickoff meeting was not the same as MSWMAC's. Helen Spiegelman of the Product Policy Institute gave a presentation on product stewardship. Her presentation is available online at: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/HelenSWAC june 2006.ppt

Intergovernmental Relations Liaison Diane Yates said the division would like to bring the speaker back to give the presentation to MSWMAC as well, if MSWMAC is interested.

In response to a question, Recycling and Environmental Services Manager Jeff Gaisford said that the recent e-waste bill is an example of product stewardship.

MSWMAC member Jessica Greenway said she would like to hear the presentation.

McGilton reported that David Baker, Deputy Mayor of Kenmore and new MSWMAC member, has also become a member of SWAC.

SWD Update

Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings said Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Waste Export System Plan comments are due July 17.

Jennings reported the ordinance changing the due dates passed on July 10. The September 28th due date is now official.

First NE transfer station construction is ahead of schedule because less garbage than expected needed to be excavated.

Work is progressing on the Bow Lake Transfer Station Facility Master Plan (FMP), which is consistent with the current Comp Plan. The FMP will be transmitted later this year.

MSWMAC member Bill Peloza said there was a schedule of committee activities through the completion of the Comp Plan distributed to MSWMAC a few months ago. He asked the division to provide quarterly updates of that schedule.

Garber agreed that would be useful and asked the division to provide the updated schedule at MSWMAC's August meeting.

ILA Discussions

Garber said that her vision for MSWMAC's role in the ILA discussions is to continue in the same role as for the milestone reports. She said the elected officials on MSWMAC can offer a useful point of view, since their Councils will eventually have to approve the ILA. She believes MSWMAC should be informed on the progress of the discussions and should approve ITSG's report before its transmittal to council.

Rivkin said that ITSG reached consensus that it should prepare the report and bring it to MSWMAC for review before transmittal.

This approach was approved by consensus.

Third Party Review

Garber called MSWMAC's attention to two handouts: the list of questions generated by ITSG, MSWMAC and SWAC, and her own edited version of that list. She asked which handout members would prefer to work from.

Council staff Mike Huddleston said that ITSG has reviewed the first list of questions several times, and that he feels Garber did a good job of tightening and refining the list. He recommended that MSWMAC work from the edited list.

Huddleston said council has assigned temporary staff person Merri Ann Osborne to help with the third party review. An RFP is being prepared to obtain a local facilitator that will assemble the panel. The procurement process is expected to take 6-7 weeks. The review will take place in September. Representatives from SWAC, MSWMAC and the haulers will be asked to meet with the panel.

Greenway asked if questions for the panel are to be limited to the topics already identified.

Huddleston said ITSG believes the topics identified are sufficient, but if MSWMAC has additional concerns, they can be added.

Rivkin suggested that the questions for the panel should be limited to those that are necessary for the approval of the Waste Export System Plan.

Huddleston agreed that would be a good idea.

<u>Public Process</u>

Garber asked about the relationship between the first two questions. She said she believed that #1 covered #2, and that it was better to be general rather than limited to Citizen Advisory Committees.

Hlavka said she submitted #2 originally, but said she agreed that the question was covered by #1.

Rivkin said there are two separate process questions. One questions the overarching planning process, and the other relates to the siting process. She said she believes the ITSG/MSWMAC process is quite thorough and questions the need to review it.

MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow said he does not object to reviewing the siting process, but there may be better uses of the panel's time.

MSWMAC member Don Brocha suggested that the experts may have good comments on siting, and he would like to hear them. However, he agreed that the panel should not spend much time on the question.

Rivkin agreed, saying that siting is a second tier question. Any help on the siting process is welcome, but it is not necessary to spend a lot of resources on it. It is not necessary to find experts specifically to answer this question.

Garber suggested the second question be worded, “Are there other methods that would enhance public/stakeholder participation in the facility siting process?” and that the question be rated as a second tier question.

MSWMAC agreed by consensus.

<u>Transfer Station Issues and Assumptions</u>

MSWMAC member Jon Spangler said he would like #6 returned to the list.

Rivkin commented that #1 on page two was subjective. She asked who defines “adequate” and “easy.”

Garber agreed.

Greenway said it is important to have a system where stations are geographically dispersed, especially in these days of high gas prices. She said an efficient system does not require its haulers to drive long distances.

Rivkin commented that the recommended package is based on that consideration. She said the question is, “Is the proposed system the best system? Are there better alternatives, or is this the best configuration?”

Huddleston said there are two ways to consider this issue. First, the question could be, “Does the preferred alternative provide enough stations on a per capita basis?” Second,

the member jurisdictions, considering the cost of a new transfer station, may ask, “How do we know we aren’t building too many stations?” The answer could be tied to per capita or traffic measurements.

Rivkin asked if this question is necessary.

Garber said she feels that MSWMAC is capable of answering the question, and has already discussed it at length.

Rivkin agreed, but commented that MSWMAC has not yet considered the question together with rate increases.

MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte added that people unfamiliar with the process to date will certainly ask if we really need so many new stations when they are presented with cost information.

Huddleston added that it is important to be clear what comes with the price tag.

Garber agreed. She said the haulers can build a transfer station more cheaply because they would build a metal box. She suggested the question read, “Do the number and location of transfer stations recommended in the Waste Export System Plan seem appropriate for King County?”

Huddleston added, “What changes in demographics could affect the system as configured?” and suggested the cost estimates should be addressed as well, “Are the capital cost estimates in the plan reasonable?”

MSWMAC approved the changes by consensus.

<u>Waste To Energy</u>

There were no changes to this section.

Early Export and Sensitivity Analysis

Rivkin said that on page three, #4 needs to be broadened. The question should not be just about capacity but also the tipping point of the cost of early export versus extended life of Cedar Hills Landfill. It has more to do with export than capacity.

MSWMAC member Linda Knight said Rivkin's question is different from #4, which looks at Cedar Hills as a regional resource.

Jennings said the division's 2007 budget includes a consultant to study Rivkin's question.

Rivkin asked if MSWMAC would be able to review the consultant's work.

Jennings said the division will be happy to talk with MSWMAC about this study, beginning with the development of the scope of work.

Garber suggested leaving #2 unchanged and eliminating #4.

MSWMAC agreed by consensus.

Long Haul Transportation

Garber said she generally thought these questions should be analyzed closer to the time of waste export.

Huddleston suggested MSWMAC note the deferral with a statement to the effect that these are questions that will need to be answered later. This will alert council to the need to plan for future review.

Rivkin commented that the questions that were raised at RPC related to financial assumptions, recycling assumptions, long haul transport and procurement. They will want to know that these questions will be addressed.

Garber suggested that the statement, “In the future MSWMAC will have questions on procurement, long haul transport and intermodal facilities,” be included in a transmittal cover letter.

Rivkin said that MSWMAC has not identified any questions to address RPC’s concern with financial assumptions.

Garber suggested the question on capital cost estimates addressed that concern.

Rivkin said more is needed in order to get to rate issues.

Garber asked for suggested wording.

Jennings asked if question #2 on page 3 was broad enough to cover all financial questions.

Garber suggested changing the name of the topic to “Early Export and the Sensitivity Analysis – Review Financial Assumptions” in order to make the intent of question #2 more clear.

MSWMAC agreed by consensus.

<u>Self Haul Issues</u>

Garber suggested that the remaining question in this section should be moved to Transfer Station Issues.

MSWMAC agreed by consensus.

<u>Waste Export Procurement Process</u>

Garber suggested that this section be included in the list of deferred topics.

MSWMAC agreed by consensus.

MSWMAC adopted the third party review questions as amended by consensus.

Waste Export System Plan Recommendations

Kiernan presented a one page summary of the issues that will be addressed in the plan, the division's recommendations and the bases for those recommendations. He said the information on the page is highly distilled, and some short cuts were necessary to fit everything into a one page summary, so everyone is encouraged to ask for clarification of anything that does not make sense. For example, the recommendation to retain the Fisher property does not go into detail about the shoreline issues associated with that property.

Rivkin commented that ITSG talked about the importance of maintaining flexibility to optimize future possibilities that are not currently foreseeable. This is captured in some places and not in others. For example, the intermodal recommendation is to defer the decision. ITSG had discussed the possibility of multiple intermodal sites. In order to maintain that option, the division should monitor available properties. The division may purchase another potential site if property along a rail line becomes available before the time to make an intermodal decision, as was done with the Fisher property. ITSG expects the division to be open and flexible for action to respond to opportunity.

Rivkin said that the draft plan can be reviewed for language, but today's discussion should focus on substantive issues. She added that she would like to make an addition to the report. Because it focuses mostly on transfer and defers export decisions, she hopes and expects that the process used to date will be used to develop all of the deferred decisions. Rivkin suggested that three more milestone reports be developed in the next few years to deal with:

- recycling
- landfill capacity and disposal options
- deferred export decisions

Rivkin said the report should include next steps.

Kiernan said that determining next steps after the Waste Export System Plan will be discussed, but he anticipates that the recommendation will be to continue with the current process.

Jennings said that recycling will be addressed in the Comp Plan, but she agreed that capacity and deferred export decisions should be addressed in additional reports.

Rivkin said recycling is such a critical issue that it deserves its own report. She added that RPC will be uncomfortable deferring decisions without some indication that there is a process for input and adoption of future decisions.

Garber suggested that the division think about what the future reports should be and when they should be done.

Jennings said that will be included in the next steps section of the report. She commented that the division is happy that there is such strong interest.

Kiernan said the first draft of the report will go to ITSG next week and to MSWMAC next month.

Business Plan

Jennings said that this year the division is preparing three different business plans:

1. one for the 2007 budget
2. the one under review today
3. one that updates the 2004 Business Plan

Kiernan said the plan looks at a three to five year horizon. He said this is not a typical business plan. It is driven by the ordinance, and includes the nine items called for by the ordinance, in order.

4. Discusses capacity.
5. Addresses system reliability.
6. Describes process.

7. There are no significant impacts to employees in the five year time frame, but in the long term, Cedar Hills' closure will have definite impacts.
8. This is the motivation for much of the current planning process.
9. Discusses the goals.
10. Explains the relevance of the transfer system.
11. Environmental protection.
12. Discusses economies of scale.

Greenway said there is a lot of talk and misinformation about Waste to Energy (WTE) lately and she believes it will be helpful to be as clear as possible about the fact that Waste to Energy facilities do not negate the need for a transfer system.

Kiernan agreed, saying that while cities with WTE do not use transfer stations because they are geographically compact, counties need transfer stations. It is important to consider the size of the service area when presented with a system that does not use transfer stations. King County's system processed one million transactions last year, which is a lot of traffic to funnel from Auburn in the south and Shoreline in the north into a single site.

Jennings said that in Baltimore County, several incinerators are needed to handle the tonnage and a transfer system is still maintained.

McGilton asked how many new incinerators there are in the country.

Jennings replied that none of them are new, although Baltimore County is in the process of replacing one of its old facilities with a new one. Kiernan added that LA County has an RFP out for an incinerator.

Greenway commented that her point is that transfer stations are necessary no matter what disposal method is used.

Kiernan agreed, saying that transfer stations are local services while incinerators, like landfills, are regional services.

In response to a question, Kiernan said that the business plan key points went to ITSG but they decided not to review it, because there was a consensus that it was more important to discuss the Waste Export System Plan recommendations in the limited time available.

Garber asked ITSG to review the business plan before MSWMAC's next meeting.

Kiernan said that next time a revised draft will be available.

Rivkin reminded the division to date all drafts.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Submitted by:

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff