

Cynthia Sullivan
Greg Nickels
Bill Reams
Lois North
Audrey Gruger
Gary Grant
Ron Sims
Paul Barden

January 15, 1988(2)
3864B:SM:m1s

INTRODUCED BY:

PROPOSED NO. 88-40

ORDINANCE NO. 8383

AN ORDINANCE to establish a process and schedule for making policy decisions on solid waste management options.

PREAMBLE:

Efficient, environmentally sound and cost-effective management of the county's solid waste is essential for the health and well-being of all of the residents of King County.

In 1987 nearly 1.4 million tons of solid waste were generated within King County, and this amount is expected with current practices to increase at the rate of four to six percent each year in the future. At this rate, the county's only major landfill would be depleted in only twenty years. This county recognizes that there will be considerable difficulty in siting a new landfill at any time now or in the future. The county, therefore, finds that the Cedar Hills landfill is a valuable and irreplaceable resource and that aggressive and timely action must be taken to preserve and insure the safe use of this resource as long as possible for the future. Further, a change from relying on landfilling is necessary since it is the lowest priority and the least desirable disposal option under state law.

To this end the county has adopted a series of ordinances establishing waste reduction and recycling as the county's top priorities for solid waste management and calling for development of strategies to reduce the volume of waste to be disposed in landfills, including energy resource recovery. While the county has recently initiated major new efforts towards waste reduction and recycling in the 1988 budget, those have been lost in the immediate controversy over the energy resource recovery siting process.

It is the responsibility of the council to provide clear policy direction through a comprehensive, open, and credible process. It is within the authority of the council under R.C.W. 36.58.090 to contract for the design, construction, or operation of systems or plants for solid waste treatment, processing and disposal.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Legislative Intent.

A. King County is committed to vigorously pursue and

1 implement a program which evaluates all alternatives and
2 implements those which are demonstrably safe and sound
3 environmentally and necessary to meet the solid waste needs of
4 current and future generations of King County citizens.

5 B. The county desires to give far greater emphasis to the
6 management of solid waste problems by means of waste reduction and
7 recycling.

8 C. The county believes that any process to choose and
9 implement solid waste disposal options should rest on conclusions
10 which have been developed in a public and open process. Issues
11 which should be examined objectively include whether waste
12 reduction and recycling can eliminate the need for other disposal
13 alternatives, whether energy resource recovery is necessary,
14 whether mass burn incineration is a suitable and safe technology
15 for energy resource recovery and whether mandatory collection is
16 necessary. It is incumbent upon the county to determine these
17 issues and consider all the choices reasonably available. Such an
18 examination will lay the foundation for implementing the policies
19 chosen.

20 D. The county desires to make these policy decisions as part
21 of the development of the comprehensive review of the solid waste
22 management system as an integrated whole rather than as individual
23 parts and confront the choices directly and explicitly.

24 E. The county believes that unnecessary delay in making
25 decisions will only make the choices harder and the options more
26 limited.

27 F. The county has noted that the prospect of siting an energy
28 resource recovery facility has elicited much greater public
29 interest and commitment to waste reduction and recycling.

30 G. Prior to any final decision to construct energy resource
31 recovery in order to reduce the reliance on landfills, the county
32 will:

1 1. Develop and assess, with meaningful participation of the
2 public, a full range of public and private waste reduction and
3 recycling alternative strategies including source separation,
4 packaging legislation, materials recovery, composting, recycling,
5 battery removal from the waste stream, pre-processing and rate
6 incentives and disincentives;

7 2. Apply rigorous tests for protection of the public and
8 the environment and refuse to accept any technological solution
9 unless the county is clearly convinced that it meets those tests.

10 SECTION 2. Process Established.

11 Under the authority invested in the council and the executive
12 by the charter and state law, the council with assistance and full
13 participation of the executive shall decide the elements of a
14 program for the King County solid waste management system
15 according to the process as set forth in this section.

16 In order to avoid unnecessary delay, the following section
17 sets forth time goals for specific steps towards making these
18 decisions on solid waste reduction and disposal. If unforeseen,
19 unavoidable technical or extraordinary causes for delay are
20 encountered, the executive may recommend revisions and the council
21 may approve such revisions to the time goals by motion.

22 A. Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

23 The county shall accelerate the development of revision to the
24 comprehensive solid waste management plan as required by R.C.W.
25 70.95. The environmental, economic, and political choices
26 involved in implementing waste reduction, recycling, source
27 separation, energy resource recovery and land filling shall be
28 examined during the development of the plan with the active
29 participation of the cities of King County. Other mechanisms for
30 meaningful participation in the development of the plan by
31
32
33

1 interested citizens, business and community groups and the solid
2 waste advisory committee shall be established separately.

3 B. Development of Programmatic E.I.S.

4 Environmental and economic analyses of solid waste management
5 options addressing a reasonable range of waste reduction,
6 recycling, energy resource recovery and landfilling alternatives
7 shall be immediately undertaken by the executive. The analyses
8 shall include but not be limited to packaging legislation,
9 recycling, source separation, materials recovery, composting,
10 pre-processing, rate incentives and disincentives, and energy
11 resource recovery. Recent analyses generated by other
12 jurisdictions may be utilized as appropriate to save time and
13 expense. The analysis shall include the following information:

14 1. Cost/return assessments of investments for various
15 strategies and technologies for waste reduction.

16 2. Environmental and economic impacts of each waste
17 reduction and disposal option including analysis of the impacts of
18 energy resource recovery at representative urban, suburban, and
19 rural sites as well as reasonable non-King County options. The
20 environmental assessment shall consider establishing as a
21 preferred alternative for energy resource recovery, central
22 service area sites, both urban and rural. Such assessment shall
23 consider as the basis for establishing the central service area as
24 the preferred alternative its central location, the need to await
25 assessment of the results of the waste reduction efforts and
26 potential joint energy resource recovery efforts with Snohomish
27 and Pierce counties.
28
29
30
31
32
33

1 C. Schedule for Programmatic E.I.S.

2 A draft E.I.S. on the policy choices for waste reduction,
3 processing and disposal options available to the King County
4 system shall be issued by June, 1988 for public review and
5 comment. A final programmatic E.I.S. shall be available by
6 September, 1988.

7 D. Development of Waste Reduction and Recycling Package.

8 The council committee responsible for solid waste shall
9 consider waste reduction and recycling options including those
10 presented in the waste reduction and recycling plan; and prior to
11 August, 1988 shall propose to the council a comprehensive program
12 of recycling and waste reduction for consideration and adoption to
13 strengthen the strategies implemented in 1988.

14 The executive is requested to provide to the committee in a
15 timely fashion the results of studies and projects funded in the
16 1988 budget including but not limited to the incorporation of
17 recycling facilities into transfer stations and rural landfill
18 sites, battery collection recycling plan, yard waste and
19 composting project, commercial and institutional generators
20 project and a pilot program for curbside pick-up of recyclable
21 materials.

22 E. Incentive Rates.

23 The council committee responsible for solid waste shall
24 develop and propose prior to September 1988 a program and rate
25 structure for solid waste disposal which provides incentives for
26 desirable solid waste practices and disincentives for
27 environmentally and economically costly practices.

28 F. Executive Recommendation and Council Disposal Option
29 Decision/Schedule.

1 The executive is requested to submit to the council a
2 recommendation on the executive's preferred disposal options after
3 completion of the final programmatic E.I.S.

4 The county council will conduct a full and public review in
5 September 1988 and establish policies on waste reduction and
6 disposal options.

7 G. Energy Resource Recovery Siting Studies

8 During 1988 the county shall continue an appropriate level of
9 the environmental analysis of and the development of mitigation
10 programs for the energy resource recovery sites. Mitigation of
11 ash disposal through collocation of the site of incinerator in the
12 immediate area of the regional landfill shall be considered. If
13 energy resource recovery is included in the policy program as
14 determined in subsection F, the executive may issue a project
15 specific Draft E.I.S. containing no fewer than three sites
16 including an urban, a rural and a collocation site.

17 INTRODUCED AND READ for the first time this 4th day of
18 January, 1988.

19 PASSED this 19th day of January 1988.

21 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
22 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

23 Greg Grant
24 Chairman

25 ATTEST:

26 Janet M. Owens
27 Clerk of the Council

28 APPROVED this 28th day of January, 1988.

29 Jim Hill
30 King County Executive