

**CITY OF BELLEVUE
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday
January 7, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Conference Room 1E-112
Bellevue City Hall
Bellevue, Washington

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Szablya, Commissioners Carter, Mach, Roberts, Swenson (*arrived at 6:37*)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vice-Chair Helland, Commissioner Mahon

OTHERS PRESENT: Nav Ota, Joyce Nichols, Susan Fife-Ferris, Tom Spille, Mayor Davidson

MINUTES TAKER: Laurie Hugdahl

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Szablya at 6:32

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Commissioner Roberts, seconded by Commissioner Carter, to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously (4-0)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 3, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion made by Commissioner Mach, seconded by Commissioner Roberts, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously (4-0).

5. FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

None.

[Commissioner Swenson arrived.]

6. REPORTS & SUMMARIES

- a. ESC Calendar/Council Calendar - Ms. Otal stated that there are some revisions to the calendar. She noted that she would review the calendar further under the Director's Report.

- b. Desk Packet Material (s)

Conservation & Outreach Events & Volunteer Opportunities

Ms. Otal stated that this also would be covered under Director's report.

- c. Draft King County Solid Waste Comp Plan

Joyce Nichols, Susan Fife-Ferris and Tom Spille were present to review King County's Draft Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Otal stated that since this is a regional responsibility it is under Council's purview, and the department also wants to keep the ESC apprised of what is going on. Ms. Nichols noted that Tom Spille is the technical expert on solid waste issues. She then reviewed the documents in the ESC's packet. These included a memo to the Environmental Services Commission describing the process for this meeting. Three drafts that will go to the City Council at its January 25 meeting including: Council Draft Briefing Memo; Draft Proposed Guiding Principles/Interests; and Examples of Proposed System Improvements included in the Draft 2009 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

On January 25, staff will be asking for Council's approval of the guiding principles and the comments that staff has included in the briefing. These will be used to guide staff's effort throughout the rest of the planning process and into the future. This county's Solid Waste Plan governs the activities across the county's entire regional solid waste system. She outlined elements of the plan and noted that it takes a 20-year look into the future, but essentially it tries to focus on the five years following adoption. The adoption process is lengthy and the plan won't likely be adopted and implemented until 2011.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the City Council actually has any control over this. Ms. Nichols said that while they don't have control, they do have some influence and ability to impact the outcome. The City has a very good working relationship with King County Solid Waste. She stated that there is a new director of that division who has had an important role in improving the working relationship. Commissioner Roberts recommended making it known to his management that the City appreciates the improvements. Ms. Nichols said they could certainly make that part of the comments on the plan.

The county uses three stakeholder groups to try to get input and comments on the plan. These include Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) which is comprised of elected officials and staff

from cities; the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) which is comprised of staff from cities and King County; and King County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) which is comprised of industry and citizen area representatives.

She reviewed previous Council actions on the Solid Waste Management Plan update, especially the county's recommendations regarding mandatory bans on certain recyclable materials in the garbage. The City expressed concerns as did many other cities and stakeholders. As a result, the county developed a revised draft that reflected and addressed the concerns they had raised. The plan now closely aligns with the City of Bellevue's interests and those of the City's customers.

She then reviewed proposed comments by the staff on the draft plan:

1. Chapter 3 – Waste Prevention and Recycling

Bellevue staff recommend that instead of competitive grants, the SWD support grant programs that return funds to communities in an amount proportional to their contribution to the system. In addition, Bellevue staff does not support the grant program that would award ratepayer funds to private hauling companies.

Ms. Nichols explained that the draft plan has a recommendation that says the County will create a new competitive grant program that would be available to cities as well as private haulers. These grants would be for innovative programs that support the goals in the draft plan. The City does not believe the ratepayer funds should be made available to the private companies. The funds should continue to come back to the cities and other stakeholder groups in the public sector whose ratepayers are actually paying the fees.

2. Chapter 5 – Solid Waste Transfer System

Bellevue staff are concerned that the decision to close the Houghton Transfer Station has not taken into account the amount of waste that would be re-directed to the Factoria Transfer Station and the operational impacts at Factoria. Also of concern is the potential impact on Bellevue streets from the increased traffic by haulers. Staff proposes that Bellevue request further study by the SWD and a plan to mitigate the potential impacts to Bellevue from the closure of the Houghton Transfer Station.

Staff is concerned about the decision to close the Houghton Transfer Station in Kirkland in 2017 and the resulting impacts on the Factoria Transfer Station. Impacts to city streets are another concern. The City would like the Solid Waste Division to conduct a study to look at the

impacts to Bellevue and create some type of mitigation plan for helping to deal with those. Ms. Nichols commented that King County tries very hard to try to mitigate the impacts of the transfer stations.

3. Chapter 6 – Landfill Management and Solid Waste Disposal

Bellevue staff recommends that the City support a decision-making process for selecting a successor site for Cedar Hills that ensures transparency and includes criteria such as cost-benefit analysis data and impacts to the environment. Bellevue has supported the early diversion of waste from Cedar Hills since the mid-1990's. In addition to assisting with evaluation of a range of technologies, early export will also extend the life of Cedar Hills and preserve negotiating leverage with potential vendors.

The draft plan says that it's important to extend the life of Cedar Hills and maximize the capacity that it can hold. Staff is recommending that the Council support recommendations in the plan regarding successor site selection and diverting waste right now to a different facility. Early diversion gives the City more time to find a successor facility and figure out how to dispose of the waste upon the closure of the landfill.

General Discussion:

Commissioner Roberts referred to chapter 5, which states that they are going to demolish and build a new facility at Factoria northwest of where it currently is. He commented that this is probably why they think they can close Houghton. Ms. Nichols explained that when they close a transfer station they have diversionary places where they can take the solid waste. So once Factoria closes we will be dependent on other facilities. Houghton isn't anticipated to close until 2017, and the new Factoria Transfer Station should be completed by then. Mr. Spille added that the new facility will be on the same land as the current one, but it will be expanded.

Chair Szablya asked what the hottest issues were from this list. Ms. Nichols replied that these three are all big issues, but the early export will be a tough issue no matter what happens. It will take awhile to go through a process to actually decide what to do and then the whole process that will follow to find a new technology or a new site to take the place of Cedar Hill will be very lengthy. Commissioner Roberts asked if they thought they would try to site it in King County. Ms. Nichols was not aware of any places in King County that could site a landfill. Mr. Spille noted that there are sites in Eastern Washington and Oregon that would be ideal due to the geography of the areas.

Ms. Nichols summarized that comments regarding the draft plans are due to King County by February 4. After that King County will produce a final plan, which will go back through a fairly lengthy approval process. When it comes

back to Bellevue, the Bellevue Council can then act to approve, disapprove or take no action.

Commissioner Mach asked about current bans that exist on garbage. There was some discussion about items that are banned, but it was noted that there are currently no penalties.

Commissioner Mach asked if Allied Waste provides stickers to put on cans to show what is and is not allowed. Mr. Spille said that all containers should have stickers now, but he pointed out that there have been some problems with these in the past.

Commissioner Roberts commented that it sounds like we are doing the right thing. The Commission thanked Ms. Nichols for her presentation.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None

8. DIRECTOR'S OFFICE REPORT

Ms. Otal explained that the budget process is driving the changes to the calendar. The Commission involvement will need to be sooner rather than later. It appears that the ESC will need to hold two special meetings; the proposed dates were March 18 and April 22. She asked that the commissioners let staff know if they have trouble making one of these dates. Commissioner Carter said that she would not be able to make the March 18 meeting or any meeting that week. Commissioner Roberts said he would be out of town on March 4 for the whole week. Chair Szablya asked if there were any objections with the two dates. There were none. Chair Szablya proposed that they go with those dates and then if there are any problems with a quorum they can reschedule.

9. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Commissioner Roberts, seconded by Commissioner Carter, to adjourn the meeting at 7:03 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (5-0).