

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

MSWMAC members present		King County staff present
Alison Bennett	Bellevue	Linda Bremer
Chris Searcy	Enumclaw	Grover Cleveland
Rob Van Orsow	Federal Way	Beth Humphreys
John MacGillivray	Kirkland	Lisa Huntley
Mary Jane Goss	Lake Forest Park	Kevin Kiernan
Jerallyn Roetemeyer	Redmond	Thea Severn
John Spangler	Redmond	Diane Yates
Linda Knight	Renton	<b>Others present</b>
Chris Eggen – Chair	Shoreline	Doreen Booth, Sound Cities Association
SWAC members present		
Joe Cassalini		
Jean Garber – Chair		
Kim Kaminski		
Keith Livingston		
Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann		

### Call to Order, Introductions, Process

After introductions, Assistant Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan thanked the group for agreeing to participate in the Transfer Plan Review Part 2 process. He reiterated that the subcommittee would be picking up where the Transfer Plan Review Final Report left off and will be further exploring some of the alternatives in the report. He emphasized looking at the longer term, the view 40 years out, and considering the Transfer Plan Review in that context. Regarding process, he pointed out the discussion guidelines on the back of the agenda. He mentioned that the guidelines were adopted from SWAC, but that references to motions were taken out since the subcommittee won't be making motions or voting.

#### Questions:

Q: Alison Bennett: The subcommittee won't be taking actions? Who will be doing the report?

A: The subcommittee will act as a sounding board and subcommittee members will provide their insights and perspectives. The subcommittee will provide advice on what information to present and how to present it in the report and at a workshop. There will be a workshop on November 17 for a broader group. There needs to be a considerable amount of work completed before then, that the subcommittee will be helping with. The division will be writing the draft report which is due to the King County Council on March 31, 2015. Because of the division's review schedule, that means that we will need to be finished writing the report by the end of January.

Q: Chris Eggen: Is there a Council directive for this group? Who will be at the November 17 workshop?

A: The division was directed to consult with stakeholders in Council Motion 14145. In addition to the subcommittee meetings, there is a workshop scheduled for November 17. The list of invitees could include interested citizens, other city staff and elected officials, council staff, county auditors, etc. The formal list has not been put together yet.

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

Q: Will materials be posted online?

A: Yes, they will be posted online.

### *Comments:*

- Jean Garber: Please speak as succinctly as possible, as the subcommittee will be dependent on the meeting minutes as the basis for reports to the full MSWMAC and SWAC committees.
- Eggen mentioned that he would be scheduling a 5 – 10 minute period at MSWMAC meetings to review subcommittee meetings.

## Review of Scope of Work

Planning and Communications Manager Thea Severn reviewed the handout *Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Scope*. She mentioned that the Scope had been handed out at the joint MSWMAC and SWAC meeting in July, but that this version has a fourth bullet point added about long term goals under Guiding Principles.

### *Questions:*

Q: Mary Jane Goss: What does regional equity mean in terms of the Transfer Plan? Is it the same as the King County Executive's Equity and Social Justice Initiative?

A: In this context, regional equity means that equitable services are provided throughout the region – both type of services and geographic distribution. Based on comments from the cities, this is important. As we design and implement programs, then equity and social justice become important. *(Clarification: The King County Equity and Social justice initiative is focused on under-served populations.)*

Q: Eggen: Will the subcommittee go outside of the specifics of the Council Motion?

A: The subcommittee will address what the Motion said, but it will also look at some other related questions, many of which were brought up by cities in their comments on the Transfer Plan Review report. See the handout [Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Scope](#) for the list of questions. *(Clarification: The primary focus of the review will be to respond to the Council motion.)*

Q: Eggen: Will we be looking at whether to build a NE Station?

A: Yes, the underlying question of this review is, "Do we need a NE station?" The motion refers to reviewing two alternatives, E1 and E2, both of which did not include a NE station. *(Clarification: The primary purpose of the review is to consider specific strategies for serving the northeast area if a new northeast transfer station is not built and to compare the pros and cons of those strategies with building a new northeast facility.)*

Q: Eggen: Why is Renton called out in the Council motion?

A: Specifically looking at Renton was an amendment to the original Council motion. The E1 and E2 alternatives both included keeping Renton open; however, since then the City of Renton has expressed a desire to have the station close.

Q: John Spangler: How will the division reconcile conflicting input on the Guiding Principles?

A: The division will look at the issues and come back to the subcommittee at their next meeting.

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

*(Clarification: The subcommittee serves as a sounding board, so it is appropriate for each subcommittee member to provide his or her own perspective; the division will consider all perspectives.)*

- Q: Bennett: In the Transfer Plan Review Part 1 there was a lot of discussion about the data used. Will there be different data to make a definitive decision?
- A: The division has already met with consultants to discuss gathering more data to help with the analysis.

### Comments:

- Bennett: Some suggested additions to the Guiding Principles – there should be a reference to “regional equity”. A regional system will provide efficiencies, but also facilities that are regionally distributed. Also, the second bullet has some things missing: it should also list changes in tonnage and other changes that impact the system, i.e., changes in traffic, road or other changes that are not anticipated at this time.
- Regional equity is about more than transfer stations – all county services, e.g., jails
- Spangler: Not in favor of adding a bullet about regional equity to the Guiding Principles. Some jurisdictions will have a transfer station and some jurisdictions will have to drive further to get to a transfer station.  
*(Note: There was a discussion about whether regional equity is included in the King County Code: 10.08.030 Acquisition of solid waste disposal facilities. . . . To the extent practicable, solid waste facilities shall be located in a manner that equalizes their distribution around the county, so that no single area of the county will be required to absorb an undue share of the impact from these facilities . . . ; the division believes that this adequately addresses the issue.)*
- Keith Livingston: Having the clause in the King County Code about regional equity provides an umbrella – doesn’t need to be in the Guiding Principles.
- Goss: Disagree that some cities should have to drive further to a transfer station. Houghton takes a lot of system garbage, and if it closes there will be more traffic. Don’t want to see a new NE transfer station taken off of the table.
- Garber: It would be helpful to have a glossary with all the terms that are being used, i.e., regional equity, or at least define the terms when they are used.
- Severn: The effect on collection costs as a result of longer travel distances will be a part of the analysis; the division will work with the haulers to provide as much information as possible.
- Garber: Suggest that the division use demographic data published by the PSRC.

Thea wrapped up the discussion on the *Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Scope* handout by stating that the division will be analyzing the tradeoffs between the alternatives. Questions that will be a part of the review are listed on page 2 of the handout. More questions may be added. The review will inform the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update. Thea also reviewed the proposed meeting subcommittee meeting schedule:

Meetings are planned for September 12 (*note: the September 12 meeting has been cancelled*), September 26, and October 17. The meeting on September 26 is not a SWAC or MSWMAC meeting day. We have reserved the conference room at the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station and the Tipping Floor Conference Room at King Street Center and can decide later which will work best. The workshop on November 17 will be at the Mercer Island Community Center from 10 – 2:30. There may be one more subcommittee meeting scheduled in December.

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

### Review of Identified Alternatives – Base, E1, E2

Thea reviewed the *Alternatives Excerpted from Transfer Plan Review Final Report – Revised and Amended by King County Council, June 2014* handout. The Base Plan is the recommendation from the *2007 Transfer and Waste Management Plan*. Options E1 and E2 do not build a new NE Recycling and Transfer Station. We will be analyzing some modified versions of E1 and E2. For example, E1 and E2 both assumed that the Renton Transfer Station would stay open; we will also look at closing Renton. And E2 had no recycling or Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) collection at Factoria, but the new Factoria Transfer Station was approved to be built with recycling and HHW. The last page of the handout has a chart comparing the three alternatives.

#### Questions:

Q: Kim Kaminski: By when does Renton want the transfer station closed?

A: 2018.

Q: Eggen: Is the new Factoria being built?

A: Yes, the new Factoria is starting construction this summer. The facility is somewhat flexible, but it is moving forward with space to handle garbage, recycling, and HHW collection.

Q: Spangler: Why are the cost numbers on the handout different from the report?

A: Don't know the answer, but will check into it.

*(Note: SWD checked the Transfer Plan Review Final Report submitted to Council in March 2014 against the handout and did not find any differences in cost.)*

### Transfer Station Capacity Presentation

Planning and Communications Program Analyst Lisa Huntley gave a presentation on *Transfer Station Capacity and Demand* (see handout). The presentation distinguished between tonnage and transactional capacity and how the division plans to meet the demand for capacity at transfer stations.

#### Questions:

Q: Eggen: Does the division have the data to look at both self-haul and commercial customers?

A: The division already has some data available, but will be collecting more at the Factoria, Houghton, Shoreline, and Renton Transfer Stations.

*(Note: Since the meeting, the division has also determined that collecting data at the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station will be beneficial.)*

Q: Livingston: What types of things affect queue times? How do we attenuate the wait times?

A: The data the division will be collecting will look at things that may affect wait times including time of day, time in station, etc. The subcommittee will be looking at demand management strategies that may help with wait times. The subcommittee may provide input on acceptable wait times.

Q: Livingston: Is population being taken into account for the selected forecast years (2023 and 2031)?

A: Yes, population and employment are considered. The years were selected because 2023 is projected to be the highest tonnage year and the year 2031 is the lowest tonnage year because Bellevue will have left the system and we are projected to have met our 70 percent recycling goal.

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

### Comments:

- Joe Cassalini: The haulers use the 80/20 rule to plan for transfer capacity – commercial customers bring in the maximum tonnage with minimum transactions and self haulers bring in the minimum tonnage with maximum transactions.

## Demand Management Strategies Discussion

There was a discussion on the demand management strategies that are listed on the last page of the *Transfer Station Capacity and Demand* handout. Subcommittee members asked questions and commented on the viability of the suggested strategies.

### Questions:

Q: Livingston: Does the division keep tare weights on frequent self-haul users?

A: Self-haul users that pay the minimum fee are not weighed. The division does not use tare weights, but, commercial haulers do swipe their own cards and at Algona and Bow Lake have additional scales which helps alleviate wait times.

Q: Eggen: Material recovery on the floor – how will that be impacted by capacity?

A: More tonnage coming to a particular facility may impact our ability to recover materials; it will be considered as part of the analysis. In Part I of the Transfer Plan Review, we did not do a sensitivity analysis of our forecast. We will be doing this in Part 2. For instance, we'll look at what happens if we only recycle 60 percent instead of the 70 percent goal.

Q: Spangler: Does the division track what type of waste self-haulers are bringing in? Is it just regular garbage, recycling, bulky waste?

A: In the past, the division has conducted surveys asking what types of waste that self-haulers are bringing in.

*(Note: this information was presented at a workshop last summer*

*<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Self-Haul.pdf> - see slides 14 and 15.)*

The division will be gathering additional information as part of this review process.

Q: Spangler: Does the division have numbers on where self-haulers are coming from? Are they from cities that have mandatory collection?

A: The division does have some information about what city and zip code self-haulers come from. Even though a city may have mandatory collection, self-haulers still use the transfer station.

*(Note: this information was presented at a workshop last summer*

*<http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Self-Haul.pdf> - see slides 12 and 13.)*

Q: Linda Knight: Keeping Renton open – is that predicated on data or from customers that are coming to Renton?

A: Alternatives E1 and E2 originally identified keeping Renton open to increase system wide capacity. The Council Motion was amended by Council to include analysis of how closure of Renton would affect self-haul customers.

## Transfer Plan Review Part 2

Subcommittee Meeting 1  
August 15, 2014

Meeting Summary

Q: Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann: What are self-haulers that are coming from mandatory collection cities bringing? Is it bulky waste?

A: Self-haulers bring in waste from remodeling, basement clean ups, bulky waste like a sofa or appliance, and other items. Many cities have a bulky waste fee in their contracts that residents could take advantage of; however, it is very costly.

### *Comments:*

- Livingston: Some transfer stations have a place to trade things – it's a place where people can leave reusable goods before the scale and others can take them.
- Schmidt-Pathmann: At a resource recovery facility, customers come, but no trailers with waste have to leave the site.
- Knight: At Renton, self-haulers were very vocal when it was announced there would no longer be recyclables collection at the station. But there are also self-haulers that are bringing in garbage. Try to distinguish between the two. Some self-haulers may just be bringing recyclables and not garbage. Would like to know where people are coming from and what services they are using.
- Eggen: Shoreline's commercial hauler offered a drop in the rate if the City went to mandatory collection; 23 percent of Shoreline residents are not signed up for collection.
- Bennett: From the data presented in Part 1, I remember that there were a big number of self-haulers that come from mandatory collection cities.
- Spangler: A suggested demand management strategy could be to charge self-haulers higher fees the longer they are in the facility.
- Knight: A caution about bulky waste collection. Providing bulky waste collection may stop people from thinking about their consumption patterns. We will need to impact people's behavior to reach a 70 percent recycling goal. As an aside – the bulky waste collection rate in our contract is prohibitively expensive.
- Knight: The City of Renton will go on record to say that it is not in favor of keeping the Renton Transfer Station open.

Thea said that the division will be analyzing the demand management strategies and bringing them back to the subcommittee in a matrix that shows such things as relative cost, effectiveness, and ease of implementation.

Assistant Solid Waste Division Director Kevin Kiernan wrapped the meeting by thanking the subcommittee members for their participation. He stressed that the division welcomes feedback from the subcommittee.