

June 27, 1996

Introduced By: Sullivan

Solid Waste Export
MR

Proposed No.: 96-210

ORDINANCE NO. **12378**

AN ORDINANCE defining regional policy on
the export of solid waste out-of-county,
and amending Ordinance No. 11949, Section
4 and K.C.C. 10.22.025

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 11949, Section 4 and K.C.C.

10.22.025 are each hereby amended to read as follows: **Out-of-**

County Waste Disposal, Findings and Recommendations. ((The

~~council finds that the solid waste division is conducting a~~

~~study of out of county disposal options, which is not yet~~

~~complete but which has reached some preliminary conclusions.~~

~~The key preliminary conclusion is that export of even some~~

~~county waste prior to closure of Cedar Hills Landfill appears~~

~~not to save money over the long term. This conclusion~~

~~assumes, however, that the county will not pay a premium for~~

~~disposal after closure of Cedar Hills, an assumption that the~~

~~council is not yet prepared to make. The study also assumes~~

~~that a new landfill will not be built in or by King County.))~~

The council finds that the solid waste division has reviewed

options for solid waste export, and that the division has

demonstrated that, for a wide range of scenarios, the export

of waste prior to the depletion of Cedar Hills Landfill is not

the least expensive policy. The council finds, however, that

1 there are a number of questions affecting waste export policy
2 that can best be answered by continued monitoring and
3 analysis, and that it is prudent to undertake planning for
4 waste export at this time, to be in position to go forward
5 with export when conditions warrant. Based on these findings,
6 the council directs the following:

7 A. At this time, the county should not seek to site a
8 replacement landfill for Cedar Hills and should assume that a
9 replacement landfill will not be built in King County. The
10 updated CSWMP should discuss these policies and should
11 recommend whether they be continued or modified in any way.

12 B. (~~The division should complete its waste export study~~
13 ~~by August 31, 1995, recognizing that certain of its~~
14 ~~assumptions cannot be tested without a review of actual~~
15 ~~responses from bidders in an appropriate procurement process.~~
16 ~~The completed study should be transmitted to the council with~~
17 ~~a recommendation from the executive concerning whether and how~~
18 ~~the county should proceed with such a procurement process.~~
19 ~~This recommendation should include a discussion of whether the~~
20 ~~increases in near term rates that are projected to be caused~~
21 ~~by export would be worth later, anticipated benefits.~~

22 C. ~~After receiving the executive's recommendation, it~~
23 ~~is the intention of the council to decide whether or not to~~
24 ~~pursue a waste export contract, or whether critical~~
25 ~~information for this decision must still be sought through a~~
26 ~~separate process, prior to December 31, 1995, consistent with~~
27 ~~time requirements for applicable environmental review. The~~
28 ~~updated CSWMP should reflect the council's decision on pursuit~~
29 ~~of a waste export contract and the implications of the results~~

1 ~~for the solid waste handling system.~~ The policy of King
2 County shall be to monitor and analyze conditions impacting
3 the appropriateness, feasibility and timing of waste export on
4 a continuous basis, and to regularly report to the council on
5 such conditions. When such conditions warrant, and upon
6 council approval, the division shall initiate solid waste
7 export. In preparation, the division shall develop a
8 comprehensive plan for waste export, to be included within the
9 CSWMP. The plan shall be based on a thorough review of a
10 comprehensive solid waste export strategy, and shall include
11 at least the following elements:

12 1. A process for monitoring changes in export markets,
13 solid waste regulations both at the federal, state and local
14 levels and particularly in jurisdictions which may receive
15 wastes, legal parameters affecting waste export, and solid
16 waste operational issues;

17 2. A discussion of how existing transfer station
18 facilities will be upgraded to be compatible with waste
19 export, including a strategy for installation of compactors to
20 support efficient long hauling of waste, and consideration of
21 the most effective means of transporting waste from transfer
22 stations to rail lines, such as the development of rail spurs
23 to support such transfer;

24 3. Developing operational and locational criteria for
25 new transfer stations, including consideration of the
26 proximity of new stations to existing rail lines available for
27 long haul, or consideration of rail spurs for transport to
28 rail lines;

29 4. Permitting requirements associated with export, and
30 timelines for permitting;

