

Technical Subcommittee Meeting Notes
DRAFT
September 8, 2004 / King Street Center

Meeting Attendees:

City Staff:

Elaine Borjeson – City of Kirkland
Rika Cecil – City of Shoreline
Sharon Hlavka – City of Auburn
Frank Iriarte – City of Tukwila
Linda Knight – City of Renton
Rob VanOrsow – City of Federal Way
Rick Watson – City of Bellevue

County Staff:

Peggy Dorothy – Council Staff
Neil Fujii – Solid Waste Division
Jane Gateley – Solid Waste Division
Kevin Kiernan - Solid Waste Division
Mike Reed – Council Staff
Diane Yates – Solid Waste Division

Kevin Kiernan began the meeting by discussing the 2nd Quarter Supplemental Budget Ordinance, which was passed by the county council on Tuesday, September 7, 2004. The Ordinance provides supplemental budget authority to the adopted 2004 budget. With adoption of the ordinance the Division is able to move forward on hiring additional FTE positions to handle the increase in tonnage.

The 2005 budget will be transmitted to the County Council on October 11th.

Discussion of Preliminary Transfer System LOS Standards and Criteria

Ordinance No. 14971:

Section 5.C.1. Criteria and Standards must be developed to determine the following: ...when a transfer station needs to be upgraded in place, relocated to a more appropriate location or additional transfer stations need to be built to adequately service the region's growing population.

There was discussion about the difference between 'standards' and 'criteria.' Generally, 'criterion' is the measurement and a 'standard' is the acceptable level within that measurement.

The Division presented the draft outline of LOS Standards and Criteria based on the groups' discussions and review of the 1996 Standards and Criteria and the Preliminary Draft List of Transfer System Level of Service Evaluation Items prepared by Mark Buscher. The Standards and Criteria fall into three general categories:

1. Level of Service to Users
2. Station Characteristics
3. Local and Regional Effects of Facility

Standards that cross all three areas are queue and wait times:

- Users see queuing as amount of time waiting to get into facility.
- For station, it's a question of how to deal with queue on site.
- If queue extends onto public streets, then it falls into 3rd category.

There's also a cost and rate impact. There was discussion that one Standard could be uniform rates for all customers. Rates could also be considered an evaluation criterion or mitigation but not a LOS Standard and Criteria.

The group commented that the work was a good start and followed a logical sequence.

Discussion followed regarding the three categories:

Level of Service to Users:

- *Maximum travel time to a transfer facility:* This refers to maximum travel time within the contiguous urban growth area. The Growth Management Act has different requirements for service in urban and rural areas. It's not clear if the Standard would be different for the three customer types. The Division will have GIS staff calculate average maximum travel times based on peak hours.

The commercial haulers have been contacted for their feedback on maximum travel times.

The comment was made that while some transfer stations may be within the maximum travel time, the number of customers using that station may be few. So Standard should consider population concentration.

- *Queue time:*
 - Ten minutes for commercial vehicles
 - Sixty minutes business self haulers
 - Sixty minutes for residential self haulers
- *Maximum transaction time:*
 - Thirty seconds: Now that the Division takes credit/debit cards, this has become a phone line issue.
- *Minimum hours of operation:* Set in county code: KCC 10.10.020
 - Urban stations: at least 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. 7 days/week
 - Rural stations: at least 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. 4 days/week including one weekend day
- *Recycling services: Recycling services are provided per the 2001 Adopted Solid Waste Comp Plan policies: WRR 2, WRR 10, WRR 36 and WRR 37.*
 - *Business self haulers*

○ *Residential self haulers*

Measurement for recycling could be customer driven and based on needs. Capacity to collect additional materials also needs to be considered where there's a gap in service availability.

If services are customer driven then also need to ask customers if they're willing to pay for service.

Current example of change in recycling service offered at a transfer station is Factoria where collection of primary recyclables was discontinued in order to provide room for permanent collection of household hazardous waste. So, one outcome of this process could be to provide different services at different facilities.

It was noted that HHW service is paid through different funds and planned by a different entity. Solid Waste Division can't make decision about HHW collection at the transfer stations.

Discussion followed about the status of the Potential Needs Assessment and whether service should be driven by customers who may identify a variety of materials without knowledge of markets and potential collection costs. Data on whether or not people will utilize a service may be needed.

If services are not uniform throughout the system, may need an aggressive marketing campaign to inform people.

It was suggested that the bigger policy goal here is to reduce solid waste by recycling. Reducing queue time may be secondary goal. Recycling goals need to be mentioned somewhere. Evaluation criteria need to be tied back to it so services promote WRR.

A key criteria may also be how "meet the needs" is defined. Space is an issue if it's important to facilitate recycling at the transfer stations.

Measuring recycling rates at each transfer station may be a challenge. It was suggested that a policy consistent with the Comp Plan should be promoted and then the two issues should be separated.

The Division encourages the private sector to provide recycling services, such as curbside collection service and the recent Good Guys and Office Depot electronics recycling programs. The Division fills in gaps in services. However, some facilities are extremely constrained and can't meet all needs. If a station can't meet all needs, does that mean it should be replaced or that an additional facility should be sited?

Drop boxes for recyclables at locations separate from transfer stations was suggested when there's no room at a transfer station.

The Division has looked into this alternative and found it to be cost prohibitive. This is also outside the scope of this process, which is to look at transfer station services.

Some felt it was important to ensure the LOS Standards are consistent with the Comp Plan. Others felt that while it is important to reduce garbage volumes through recycling, the issue does not fit into this process.

Discussion followed about whether transfer stations should be looked at separately or systemically. If there's another station within acceptable driving time, then need can still be met for recycling services.

Some cities don't want facility in their jurisdiction so want stations looked at systemically. Some also thought that convenience is important or residents won't use the service.

Station Capacity and Characteristics:

This group is split into two identical parts, which are in relation to space needs. One part addresses current space needs; the second addresses future space needs.

Current Needs:

- *Vehicle Capacity:* Number of vehicles a station can accommodate per day within available queuing on site.
- *Sufficient Tipping Stalls:* The ability to move cars through the transfer building efficiently.
- *Emergency Storage:* Standard is three days storage and is based on past experience with wind/snow storms and information on how long a rail line may be down. Currently most stations only have ½ day's storage capacity.

The County has identified alternatives in the event of a major emergency in order to keep roads open. One alternative is county parks, which are available for storage if buildings are destroyed.

Adequate onsite trailer parking would provide for enough trailers to move all garbage out within 24 hours. Garbage comes in in peaks and valley. Trailers are used onsite to take peaks off. Number of onsite trailers needed at Bow Lake is smaller because the pit can be used as backup storage.

- *Space for Standard Employee Amenities:* Restroom and break room facilities.
- *Space for Public Amenities:* Restrooms; public telephones.

Future Needs:

- *Vehicle capacity:* Capacity not to be exceeded five percent of time.

- *Space for queuing:* Backups on city streets not to be exceeded five to ten percent of the time.

For peak hour capacity, three different measures were suggested as standards: One hour, two hour and average of hours of operation. Standards would have to be met a certain percentage of the time.

It was suggested that one mitigation measure could be to enclose everything.

There are additional criteria under 20 year future needs including roof clearance and environmental nuisance controls, which are immediate needs.

Current standard for roof clearance is 25 feet from lowest hanging obstacle, which are usually the lights. The roof has to be high enough for the haulers' trucks to safely and efficiently unload. The Division will seek haulers' input to ascertain if they are planning to use larger trucks. However, the haulers are constrained by road limitations. It is likely that standard will be a minimum roof height based on the haulers input plus an additional number of feet as a safety factor.

Turning radii, grades and lighting are design criteria and outside the scope of this exercise. The Division has to be meet uniform design and traffic codes. There's also the Uniform Fire Code, Uniform Building Code, OSHA, etc. The introduction to the report will reflect the local, state and federal regulations that the Division must comply with.

The comment was made that the notes should reflect that the group discussed these issues and deferred to county staff.

Local and Regional Effects of Facility:

These are compatibility issues.

- *Regional Equity:* Refers not only to a host city's fair share of regional solid waste tonnage and vehicles, but also of other public facilities.

The map of Locally Unacceptable Land Uses was distributed. The map showed the distribution of transfer stations, jails, transit bases, wastewater treatment facilities, regional airports and drug/alcohol treatment facilities within King County's urban growth boundary. City staff will review and decide if facilities other than those shown on the map should be added.

The suggestion was made to consider the impacts of users from outside the county's solid waste system on the LOS Standards and Criteria.

- *Noise:* The Division complies with local noise ordinances. Standard would be a 'yes' or 'no.'
- *Odors:* The Division complies with Puget Sound Clean Air Agency standards. PSCAA has standards that odor shouldn't be evident across property line.

- *Meets Standards for Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:* This meets SEPA requirements.
- *Adequate Buffer:* Standard is 100 feet, excluding mitigation measures. In other words, a noise wall does not have to be 100 feet from the property line.
- *Acceptable Traffic Impacts on Local Streets:* Level of Service Standards for traffic is widely accepted standard. Under state law, the county can pay mitigation to host cities for road impacts.

In response to a question, the Division responded that there are two trains of thought about whether or not a transfer station increases litter. Some say it does because of unsecured loads. Others say the presence of a station decreases illegal dumping. As part of its good neighbor policy, the Division does have crews that pick up litter around its stations. Littering does not fall within scope of this task.

- *Existence of or ability to construct sidewalks for pedestrians, where needed:* This addresses pedestrian safety around facility, but doesn't apply to all facilities. For example, sidewalks are not necessary around Bow Lake.
- *Aesthetics:* Ability to blend activity with neighboring community.

Discussion followed that this is subjective standard. It's more a mitigation measure than a standard by which a decision would be made to upgrade, relocate or add a facility. It was agreed to change the language to, "facility designed to be aesthetically compatible with surrounding community,"

Cost and Rate Impacts:

- *Capital Costs of New Facility vs. Upgrade of Existing:* Suggested standard is that project can be completed at cost cities will support and county council will adopt.
- *Rate Impacts:* Suggested standard is based on whether or not the cities will support and county council will adopt proposed rate.

The Comment was made that adopted Comp Plan policy is for costs to be kept as low as possible; that rates increases will be at or below CPI.

Costs can be used as a tool by which Level of Service decisions are challenged.