

VERIFIED

4/13/82

Introduced by: Lois North

Proposed No. 82-155

ORDINANCE NO. 5055

1 AN ORDINANCE related to Solid Waste;  
2 authorizing the Executive to accept up  
3 to 50,000 tons of Snohomish County Solid  
4 Waste at the Cedar Hills Landfill; establish-  
5 ing solid waste rate policies regarding the  
6 disposal of Snohomish County solid waste;  
7 and adding a new section to K.C.C. 10.12.

8 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

9 SECTION 1. The King County Council hereby authorizes the  
10 acceptance of up to 50,000 tons of Snohomish County Solid Waste at  
11 the Cedar Hills Landfill, on the following conditions:

12 A. Snohomish County supports all costs associated with  
13 landfill depletion at Cedar Hills resulting from the delivery of  
14 their solid waste;

15 B. Snohomish County supports all operating costs associated  
16 with the disposal of Snohomish County Solid Waste in excess of the  
17 current \$7 per ton landfill charge;

18 C. Snohomish County supports all identifiable costs for  
19 road depletion and any other adverse conditions brought about by  
20 increases in hauler traffic at Cedar Hills;

21 D. The Solid Waste Division shall exercise every reasonable  
22 effort to mitigate any possible negative operational impacts to the  
23 citizens of King County from the acceptance of the Snohomish County  
24 Solid Waste;

25 E. The Executive shall propose solid waste rates at the  
26 1st Avenue N.E. Transfer Station to reduce or eliminate the incen-  
27 tive for Snohomish haulers and citizens to bring solid waste to  
that location and to charge such Snohomish haulers and citizens

4/12/82

5955

1 for all of King County costs associated with disposing of addi-  
2 tional Snohomish tonnage delivered to 1st Avenue N.E.

3 INTRODUCED AND READ for the first time this 29<sup>th</sup> day of  
4 March, 1982.

5 PASSED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1982.

6 KING COUNTY COUNCIL  
7 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

8 Lois North  
9 Chairman

10 ATTEST:

11  
12 Dorothy M. Ravens  
13 Deputy Clerk of the Council

14 ~~APPROVED~~ this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of APRIL, 1982.  
15 R<sub>2</sub> Vetoed

16 Randy K. Willis  
17 King County Executive

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**King County Executive**  
Randy Revelle

April 23, 1982

RECEIVED  
1982 APR 23 PM 4:23  
CLERK  
KING COUNTY COUNCIL

The Honorable Lois North  
Chairman, King County Council  
B U I L D I N G

RE: Ordinance 5955

Dear Madam Chairman:

Enclosed is Ordinance 5955 which I have vetoed under the authority granted to me by the King County Charter, Section 230.20.

I have vetoed Ordinance 5955 because it is an unnecessary and unacceptable restriction on the authority previously granted to me by the King County Council. In my judgment, moreover, Ordinance 5955 jeopardizes the operational stability of the King County Department of Public Works.

Resolution 24834, codified in the King County Code 10.08.130, grants the King County Executive the authority to accept solid waste from other public agencies. Section 10.08.130 reads:

"Any commercial establishment or industry and/or any public or private hospital or institution and/or any other public or private agency or agencies desiring to use official King County refuse disposal facilities shall first make arrangements satisfactory to the King County Sanitary Operation Department for use of such facilities and comply with the service fees required under Chapter 10.12."

Ordinance 5955 "authorizes" (not directs) the King County Executive to carry out an activity already authorized by Resolution 24834. Therefore, Ordinance 5955 is duplicative and unnecessary. Furthermore, one condition to be imposed by Ordinance 5955 is unacceptable.

If I decide to accept Snohomish County's solid waste, my acceptance will be for a definite and realistic period of time. The period will be of sufficient duration so as to allow predictability for King County residents, Snohomish County, and the Department of Public Works.

The Honorable Lois North  
April 23, 1982  
Page Two

By limiting the acceptance of Snohomish County solid waste to a total of 50,000 tons, Ordinance 5955 would restrict the Department of Public Works' ability to develop a stable fiscal and management plan for the operation of Cedar Hills during the next year. The King County Council's tonnage limitation is set at a level below the desires of Snohomish County, is not related to a predictable time frame, and could create false expectations on the part of King County residents.

Let me assure you that if my decision is to accept Snohomish County solid waste at the Cedar Hills landfill, the remaining conditions outlined in Ordinance 5955 will be imposed administratively by the King County Executive Branch. In fact, additional conditions suggested by my staff to protect the interests of King County residents would likely be negotiated with Snohomish County.

My veto of Ordinance 5955 is by no means an indication of a decision not to accept Snohomish County solid waste at the Cedar Hills Landfill. I have not yet made a decision. In fact, I am currently evaluating a formal proposal from Snohomish County Executive Willis Tucker and Council Chairman Cliff Bailey (a copy of which is attached). I expect to make a final decision on the Snohomish County proposal by no later than mid-May.

I will keep the King County Council informed about any and all relevant developments regarding Snohomish County solid waste. In the meantime, if you or any other members of the County Council have any questions about my veto of Ordinance 5955 or the status of my decision on the Snohomish County proposal, please contact me personally or Tom Fitzsimmons of my Executive Staff at 344-7590.

Sincerely,



RANDY REVELLE  
King County Executive

RR:TF:ce

Enclosure

cc: King County Councilmembers  
Norm Maleng, King County Prosecuting Attorney  
Cliff Bailey, Chairman, Snohomish County Council  
Willis Tucker, Snohomish County Executive  
Jim Guenther, Director, King County Department of Public Works  
Shelly Yapp, Director, King County Budget Department  
Tom Fitzsimmons, Program Development Manager



WILLIS D. TUCKER  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
County Administration Building  
Everett, Washington 98201 • (206) 259-9460

APR 20 1982

April 19, 1982

Mr. Randy Revelle  
King County Executive  
County Counthouse  
516 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104

Received \_\_\_\_\_  
KING COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
To: T.F. R.T.  
Due Date: 4/22/82  
Author: Tucker, Willis  
Subject: Snoho, Solid Waste  
Init. Resp: \_\_\_\_\_ Staff Review: \_\_\_\_\_  
Action:  Response For Exec. Sig.  
 Recommend Action  
 Other

CO

Dear Mr. Revelle:

Attached is background information and the outlines of a proposal addressing short and long term approaches towards joint county cooperation in the area of solid waste disposal. We have kept this material brief and somewhat general, as specific details will undoubtedly have to be negotiated between the administrative departments of the two counties.

We appreciate the opportunity to further explore this subject with our neighboring county and look forward to working closely with you on many subjects of mutual interest and concern in the future.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL

SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE

By Cliff Bailey  
Cliff Bailey, Chairman

Willis D. Tucker  
WILLIS D. TUCKER



WILLIS D. TUCKER  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
County Administration Building  
Everett, Washington 98201 • (206) 259-9460

April 19, 1982

Mr. Randy Revelle  
King County Executive  
County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Proposal for a plan for Joint King/Snohomish  
County Solid Waste Disposal/Recovery

Dear Mr. Revelle:

BACKGROUND

1. Problem Statement

The Snohomish County Council recently hired the firm of Arthur Young and Company to conduct a rate study and management audit of its solid waste transfer and disposal operations. Earlier staff assessments, addressed by the study, indicated that the life expectancy of our landfill at Cathcart, originally estimated at ten additional years, now appears to be reduced to four. With only four years of operating life left in our only major landfill, we must act immediately and decisively to identify and pursue other alternatives. The new time estimate points to financial problems as well. We are earnestly pursuing all viable recommendations contained in the consultant's report to help alleviate our short-term problems. At the same time, we have been moving as rapidly as possible towards the obvious solution of resource recovery.

The consultant's report predicted that Snohomish County's disposal rates would have to be increased significantly even if all possible steps were taken to extend the life of the landfill or implement identified alternative disposal mechanisms. Consequently, the Snohomish County Council approved a rate increase from \$20 to \$35 per ton, effective April 11, 1982. This new rate assumes that the County will be able to implement most of the study recommendations. Obviously, the rates will have to be further increased if this does not prove to be the case.

Mr. Randy Revelle  
Page 2  
April 19, 1982

## 2. Mutual Impacts

Our study indicates that user diversion of wastes from Snohomish to King County disposal sites will occur as a result of substantial rate differentials between the counties. While the extent of such diversion is unknown at this time, Snohomish County will lose waste volumes from its Southwest Transfer Station in proportion to King County's increased waste volumes at First Northeast. However, it is not clear to what extent this waste volume will increase revenue to King County or would offset the additional costs, nor can the impact on service delivery or staffing needs be assessed at this time. Snohomish County could further increase rates or close its Southwest Transfer Station as a response to revenue losses. Neither option is desirable. Raising the rates would undoubtedly result in increased user diversion; closure of the station would have an even greater impact on King County's facility.

The present circumstances dramatically point to the fact that neither county can afford to look at its own solid waste disposal system in isolation and further emphasizes the need for regional cooperation and solutions. It is with the need for a regional approach in mind that we outline our short and long term proposals.

### PROPOSALS

#### SHORT TERM

Snohomish County proposes to temporarily transport approximately 6,700 tons of solid waste per month (45% of the total County waste) from its Southwest Transfer Station to King County's Cedar Hills site for disposal. This temporary arrangement would be made for a mutually acceptable period of time. Snohomish County transfer trucks would follow the same Renton/Maple Valley route used in the Spring of 1981. Although this route is longer than alternate routes, it was found to have the least impact on traffic and citizens in King County. It is our understanding that King County's current disposal rate is adequate to cover direct costs with some flexibility to cover unanticipated expenses. It is also our understanding that the First Northeast Station operates at a loss. In order to assure no increased cost to King County residents while increasing King County positive cash flow and stabilizing Snohomish County expenditures, we would propose to reimburse King County at your standard disposal rate of \$7 per ton for refuse transported by Snohomish County to Cedar Hills for disposal.

During this period of interim operation, Snohomish County would have the opportunity to pursue alternative means of

Mr. Randy Revelle  
Page 3  
April 19, 1982

stabilizing its rates. The additional time would be used to actively pursue the possibility of acquiring a new landfill site as well as to implement recommended operational changes. At the same time, King County would have time to adjust to the impact of the diversion. King County could also use the time to evaluate the impact of Snohomish County solid waste on its operation assessing the benefits of increased revenues versus possible offsetting costs. This information would be used to determine if continuation of such an arrangement would be feasible or desirable.

Most importantly, both counties could use this period to pursue joint long-term efforts.

#### LONG-TERM

A study completed by CH2M-Hill for Snohomish County has shown resource recovery through incineration and electrical generation to be feasible for a plant in size ranging between 500 and 1200 tons per day. We are currently proceeding towards implementation. However, assurance of waste volume and availability of air shed capacity are key components to successful implementation which appear to be enhanced through a regional approach. Thus, a joint planning effort would appear to be in the best interest of the citizens of both counties.

Snohomish County's need to stabilize user fees dictates that we proceed expeditiously. While King County does not have the same problems, the sense of urgency exists for both counties to pursue resource recovery solutions in light of community, environmental and possibly financial considerations.

Snohomish County has pursued a phase two energy resource recovery implementation study to the point of selecting a nationally recognized consulting firm. This selection has not been announced so that we may further pursue the potential of a joint project with King County. We have reviewed our proposed scope of work with your staff and found it to be compatible with King County's needs. We remain at a threshold where a joint study, a separate but coordinated study, or a completely separate study can be rapidly undertaken. While we cannot afford a significant delay, we are most willing and anxious to pursue various alternatives with King County.

Possible approaches would be 1) to expand the scope of work of the Snohomish County study to include procurement planning for a north King County site, with consideration of the benefits of a joint operation, or 2) to bring the study efforts of the two counties into synchronization, so that there can be one comprehensive study which explores and assesses all geographical



Mr. Randy Revelle  
Page 4  
April 19, 1982

and jurisdictional options available to King County, Snohomish County and the city of Seattle. Either or both of these approaches would enable King County to move towards resource recovery more quickly, at less expense with a better and more complete information base.

On the other hand, both counties have on-going problems with their existing landfill operations which seem to go with the "state of the art". If Snohomish County can, by buying time, identify a new landfill site, there would certainly be consideration of future use tradeoffs with King County. The possibility of at any time only having one landfill in operation for the entire region remains both real and frightening until such a time as resource recovery is an accomplished fact. Temporary assistance to Snohomish County which would allow selection of a new site could be of real benefit ultimately to both counties.

CONCLUSION

Snohomish County lends its earnest support to any viable short and long term efforts and cooperative solutions to the regional problem of solid waste disposal. It is hoped that this material can serve as a basis for productive negotiations to take place in the very near future.

Sincerely,

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL

SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE

By

Cliff Bailey  
CLIFF BAILEY  
Chairman

Willis D. Tucker  
WILLIS D. TUCKER