

APPENDIX B
ITSG ADDITIONAL ISSUES

APPENDIX B – ITSG ADDITIONAL ISSUES

During the meetings of the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) where baseline assumptions were developed, a number of additional issues arose that were considered important to address in the fourth milestone report. These issues are listed in this attachment to ensure that they are noted as important topics to be covered in Milestone Report #4 and the Waste Export System Plan.

The items in this appendix are placed in one of four categories, defined as:

- **Policy:** A definite course or method of action selected from alternatives and options.
- **Direction:** Per ordinance 14971 and/or council direction.
- **Information:** Background information that may be used for planning or analysis.
- **Pending issues:** Incorrectly assumed or missing data that may require further analysis.

Where possible, a reference to Milestone Report #4, the final Waste Export System Plan or the Solid Waste Plan has been made to show where each issue will be addressed.

Policy

1. A new solid waste landfill will not be sited by King County. **Chapter 1 – Baseline Assumptions**
2. Cedar Hills will be filled to its current permitted capacity in conformance with the current adopted Site Development Plan and EIS. **Chapter 1 – Baseline Assumptions and Chapter 4, Current Capacity**
3. The useful life of the Cedar Hills Landfill may potentially be extended through operational and other efficiencies. **Chapter 4 – Potential for Developing Additional Capacity**
4. To what extent is King County willing to aggressively pursue additional capacity at Cedar Hills, considering the existing permit, legal settlement, publicly perceived/assumed closure date and insurance issues? **Chapter 4 – Potential for Developing Additional Capacity**
5. Alternative disposal methods exist for exported waste, however landfilling is the method of choice in the current comp plan. **Chapter 1 – Policy Framework, Purpose and Goals and Chapter 4, Landfills Available for Export**
6. Expanding Cedar Hills' permitted capacity by construction of additional cells would require policy changes and new permits. **Chapter 4 – Potential for Developing Additional Capacity**

7. Transfer stations will be dispersed geographically throughout King County to provide for reasonable trip time and accessibility (ease and time to get to facility). **Chapter 2 – Transfer Station Improvements Options**
8. The planning horizon for the comp plan is 20 years. The waste export system plan is limited to the project scope. **Chapter 1 – Policy Framework, Purpose and Goals**

Direction

1. The analysis will evaluate the potential for public only, private only, and a mixture of public and private ownership and operation. **Chapter 3 – Public-Private Options**
2. The analysis will evaluate methods to preserve competition. **Chapter 3 – Public-Private Options**
3. Per Milestone Report #3, a sensitivity analysis will be performed and “will include a comprehensive assessment and analysis so that the future size and configuration of the solid waste system can be developed.” **Chapter 7– Sensitivity Analysis**

Information

1. The division plans to continue to keep CDL waste out of the King County municipal solid waste system through the planning horizon. **Appendix C – Forecast, and Solid Waste Comp Plan**
2. Yard waste, projected to be approximately 52,000 tons/year, is currently and will continue to be managed by the private sector throughout the planning horizon. **Appendix C – Forecast, and Solid Waste Comp Plan**
3. The division will use adaptive management and pursue innovations in capital investments to meet both immediate needs and long-range planning goals. **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
4. The division will analyze the option of preserving emergency capacity at Cedar Hills for backup after closure. **Chapter 4 – Back-up Capacity [at Cedar Hills Landfill]**
5. At least three independent companies are expected to bid competitively for King County's waste when it is marketed at the time of waste export. **Chapter 4 – Landfills Available for Export**
6. Existing landfills outside of King County have legally permitted capacity to handle King County waste for at least 20 years. **Chapter 4 – Out of County Landfills**
7. Per RCW 70.95, primary responsibility for solid waste planning and handling is with the county, with input from cities per the interlocal agreements. **Chapter 3 – Public-Private Options**
8. The Comp Plan guides development and operation of waste reduction, recycling and solid waste management activities. **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**

9. The waste export system plan will address the transfer and disposal system in King County. **Chapters 2 and 4**
10. A waste export system plan will be developed with the collaboration of the 37 cities that have interlocal agreements with King County. **Chapter 1 – Collaborative Process**
11. The waste export system plan will be the foundation for the update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The Comp Plan will be updated beginning in December 2005 and will address solid waste management, CDL and recycling waste streams, including toxics reduction. **Chapter 8 – Next Steps**
12. Transfer stations are an integral part of the solid waste system. **Chapter 2 – Transfer Station Improvements Options**
13. The transfer station system will provide capacity to handle solid waste within a reasonable time period. **Chapter 2 – Analysis of Potential Transfer Station Packages**
14. Existing intermodal facilities are available to export King County's waste. **Chapter 6 – Intermodal Background**
15. A sensitivity analysis will be done to illustrate the effect of a reduction of tonnage from the current system. **Chapter 7 – Sensitivity Analysis**
16. Increased waste reduction and recycling will reduce the amount of solid waste generated in King County and the amount of solid waste requiring export. **Appendix C – Forecast**
17. Settling of solid waste, and operational efficiencies at Cedar Hills Landfill may provide additional capacity within permits. **Chapter 4 – Potential for Additional Capacity [at Cedar Hills Landfill]**
18. Vector waste is currently managed separately from the MMSW stream by both the public and private sector, and requires monitoring to determine long-term projections. **Appendix C – Forecast, and Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
19. Annexations will not affect King County's solid waste system tonnage except for the annexation of White Center by the City of Seattle by 2012 per the Growth Management Act, which will remove approximately 12,000 tons. **Appendix C – Forecast, and Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
20. Landfills designated for waste export in the final plan will comply with environmental regulations. **Chapter 4 – Out-of-County Landfills**
21. A transfer station is a fixed, supplemental collection and transportation facility used by persons and route collection vehicles to deposit collected solid waste from off-site into a larger transfer vehicle for transport to a permanent disposal site or intermodal facility. It consolidates many, smaller loads into fewer, larger loads to reduce overall transportation costs. A transfer station can be co-located with an intermodal facility. **Chapter 2 – Intermodal Co-location**

22. An intermodal facility is a location where containers are transferred from one mode of transportation, such as trucks, to another, such as train or barge. An intermodal facility can be co-located with a transfer station. **Chapter 2 – Intermodal Co-location**
23. Co-location is the siting of a solid waste facility that provides both transfer and intermodal functions. **Chapter 2 – Intermodal Co-location**

Pending Issues

1. Food waste, projected to be approximately 200,000 tons/year, will be removed from the MMSW stream and managed by the private sector over the planning horizon. **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
2. Landfilling is the least expensive method of MMSW disposal. **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
3. The timing of Cedar Hills' closure determines the cost for system improvements. **The statement is not accurate and therefore won't be analyzed in Report Four.**
4. The number of transfer stations that are needed in the system will be an outcome of analysis. **Chapter 2 – Transfer Station Improvements Options**
5. Transfer stations will handle standard recycling (not food, yard waste or CDL). **Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**
6. Installation of compactors at each transfer station requires analysis. **Chapter 2 – Waste Compaction, and Appendix E**