1. Welcome, Roll Call, Introduction of New Members - Mia Gregerson, PIC Chair 7 minutes

2. Approval of minutes – December 12, 2013 meeting 3 minutes

3. Chair’s Report – SeaTac Councilmember Mia Gregerson 10 minutes

4. Executive Director’s Report – Deanna Dawson, SCA 10 minutes

5. Small Cities Update - Deanna Dawson, SCA
   Mayor Dave Hill, Algona and Councilmember Barre Siebert, Clyde Hill 5 minutes

6. Policy Position Regarding Public Records Request
   ACTION ITEM
   Deanna Dawson, SCA
   (3 minute update, 7 minute discussion) 10 minutes

7. Policy Recommendation from the PIC Watershed Investment District (WID) Subcommittee
   ACTION ITEM
   Councilmember Andy Rheame, Chair of the PIC WID Subcommittee
   (5 minute update, 10 minute discussion) 15 minutes

8. SCA Potential Position Regarding South County Transfer Station
   ACTION ITEM
   Deanna Dawson, SCA
   (3 minute update, 12 minute discussion) 15 minutes

9. Update on the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement
   DISCUSSION
   Deanna Dawson, SCA
   (3 minute update, 7 minutes Q and A) 10 minutes
10. Upcoming Events
   a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – February 6, 2013 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall
   b) 2013 SCA Committee Appointee Orientation – January 23, 2013 6:30 PM at SeaTac City Hall Council Chambers
   c) Next SCA Networking Dinner — January TBD, 2013 5:30 PM Tukwila Embassy Suites

11. For the Good of the Order

12. Adjourn

Did You Know?

In 2011, at least 30,704 individuals (19,785 adults and 10,919 youth/children) received one or more MIDD-funded services in the third year.

The goals of the Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) strategies include reducing the number of mentally ill and chemically dependent people using costly interventions, such as jail, emergency rooms, and hospitals, reducing the number of people who recycle through the jail, returning repeatedly as a result of their mental illness or chemical dependency, reducing the incidence and severity of chemical dependency and mental and emotional disorders in youth and adults and diverting mentally ill and chemically dependent youth and adults from initial or further justice system involvement. (MIDD)

Sound Cities Association

Mission
To provide leadership through advocacy, education, mutual support and networking to suburban cities in King County as they act locally and partner regionally to create livable vital communities.

Vision
To be the most influential advocate for cities, effectively collaborating to create regional solutions.

Values
SCA aspires to create an environment that fosters mutual support, respect, trust, fairness and integrity for the greater good of the association and its membership.

SCA operates in a consistent, inclusive, and transparent manner that respects the diversity of our members and encourages open discussion and risk-taking.
Welcome and Roll Call
Mia Gregerson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Twenty-four cities had representation. See Attachment A to these minutes. Guests included Kevin Kiernan, King County; Councilmember Doug Osterman, Normandy Park City Council & WRIA 9; Councilmember Don Davidson, Bellevue City Council; Rob Gala, Seattle; Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s Office.

Approval of the November 7, 2012 Minutes
Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the November 7, 2012 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report
Mia Gregerson, PIC Chair, reported that the SCA South and South Valley Caucus met on December 5, 2012 to elect Jamie Perry, Kent, to a second term on the SCA Board of Directors. The Caucus unanimously agreed with the Board Nominating Committee’s preliminary recommendation to continue with the same board officers for 2013. The South and South Valley Caucus is looking forward to working on policy issues in 2013; as well as, media relations and added value through the new SCA website member portal. Specific issues that members are interested in addressing this year include: The King County Parks Levy, enhanced technology (recording workshops, etc.), next steps for transportation funding, Public Records Requests, and FEMA Flood plain certification. Gregerson reported that the North and North Valley caucus will be meeting the week after PIC.

Executive Director’s Report
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, thanked the members of the PIC for their hard work and accomplishments in 2012. At the 2013 SCA Board Retreat, there will be discussion on the changes in 2012 and goals for taking a larger policy role in 2013. ED Dawson elaborated on the Board Nominating Committee’s preliminary recommendation. Since SCA has experienced so much change in 2012, the Board Nominating Committee is recommending that the current Board Officers continue in 2013.

ED Dawson passed around the 2013 appointments for Regional Boards and Committees, approved by the SCA Board of Directors. The 2013 SCA Committee Appointee Orientation is scheduled for Wednesday, January 23, 2013 at SeaTac City Hall Council Chambers, starting at 6:30pm. There will be a light dinner starting at 6:00pm. ED Dawson encouraged all members
of the PIC to attend. Guest speakers for the orientation include King County Councilmember Joe McDermott, Chair of Board of Health; King County Councilmember Reagan Dunn, Chair of the Regional Transit Committee; King County Prosecuting Attorney Dan Satterberg to speak about Regional Law, Safety, and Justice, Domestic Violence Initiative, and Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Committee; and Kitsap County Commissioner Josh Brown, PSRC President, to speak about PSRC Boards and Committees.

2013 Election of PIC Chair and Vice Chair
Jim Haggerton, PIC Nominating Committee Chair, thanked the members of the PIC Nominating Committee; Dave Hill, Ross Loudenback, and Hank Margeson. He also thanked all applicants for their nominations.

Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, moved, seconded by Dave Hill, Algona, to elect Mia Gregerson, SeaTac, as the 2013 PIC Chair for a second year and Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, as the 2013 PIC Vice Chair.

There were no nominations from the floor. The motion passed unanimously.

ED Dawson thanked Hank Margeson for an outstanding job as PIC Vice Chair for 2012. Members showed their appreciation for Margeson by applause.

PIC Operations and Procedures Subcommittee (PIC OPS)
Hank Margeson, PIC Operations and Procedures Subcommittee Chair, reported that this agenda item was brought forward from the November 7, 2012 meeting of the PIC for action. PIC OPS Chair Margeson thanked the members of the PIC OPS; Pete Lewis, Amy Ockerlander, Amy Walen, and Mia Gregerson. Chair Margeson noted that along with the changes to the PIC Operating Policies, he is pleased with the revised PIC agenda structure. One of primary goals of the proposed amendments to the PIC operating procedures was to better link the PIC Operating Policies with the SCA Board Policies and SCA Bylaws.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved, seconded by Chris Eggen, Shoreline, to approve the amendments to the PIC Operating Policies as recommended by the PIC Operations & Procedures Subcommittee.

During discussion of this motion, Dave Hill, Algona, made a friendly amendment to clarify that a SCA member can add an issue to the PIC agenda. In section B, paragraph 8 of the PIC Operating Policies “member,” will be added in the first sentence after the word any. Pete Lewis accepted this as a friendly amendment to the motion.

Barre Seibert, Clyde Hill, voiced concerns that the City of Clyde Hill has regarding divisive issues. Seibert added that one of the greatest strengths of SCA is its consensus building and the organization’s ability to discuss issues and come up with solutions that are in the best interest for the region. Margeson responded that this language allows a city that would be harmed by a particular position to voice their city’s position. ED Dawson clarified that this language is taken from SCA Board Policy 104.1.

The motion passed. Clyde Hill voted no.
Proposed Public Policy Position – South County Transfer Station
Chair Gregerson reported that the proposed public policy position concerning the south county transfer station was brought forward by Pete Lewis at the November 7, 2012 PIC meeting.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved, seconded by Dave Hill, Algona, that the Sound Cities Association support removing the planned South King County transfer station capital project from the Transfer Station Plan saving over $70 million dollars for the ratepayers of King County.

During discussion of this motion, Jeanne Burbidge, Federal reported that Federal Way staff prepared two handouts, Attachment B and Attachment C to these minutes, outlining the City of Federal Way’s concerns.

Jeanne Burbidge, Federal Way, moved, seconded by Dave Hill, Algona, to postpone this issue to the next meeting of the PIC so that information can be discussed among staff. Federal Way is requesting that SCA member cities take their provided information back to council and city staff for discussion and possible further research. Vice Chair Margeson added that King County Solid Waste Division is available to answer any questions that cities may have.

The motion passed. Bothell, Issaquah, Kirkland, North Bend, Redmond, Shoreline, and Snoqualmie voted no.

PIC Watershed Investment District (WID) Subcommittee
At the request of the PIC, following the November SCA Study Session on the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda and Watershed Investment Districts, a subcommittee was formed to further explore the potential advantages and challenges associated with funding multiple benefit projects which support watershed management goals.

Andy Rheau, Chair of the PIC Watershed Investment District Subcommittee (PIC WID), reported on the work of the subcommittee including a brief overview of some of the potential governance and finance benefits/challenges. The subcommittee determined that 2013 isn’t the appropriate timing to introduce a bill to the Washington State legislature; however, there are a number of reasons to support the legislature taking interim measures to begin looking at the pros and cons of forming Watershed Investment Districts between now and 2014.

The PIC WID is recommending that the SCA advance a study bill to the legislature to be addressed during the 2013 legislative session. Toby Nixon provided clarification on the process.

Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Bernie Talmes, Woodinville, to bring back to the next meeting of the PIC, that SCA support a study by the Washington State Legislature on the concept of a watershed investment authority.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Records Request
Chair Gregerson reported that this agenda item concerning public records requests was brought forward by discussion at the SCA South and South Valley Caucus meeting on
December 5, 2012. ED Dawson continued that this is one of high priorities for the members in South King County.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved, seconded by Jamie Perry, Kent, to bring back to the next meeting of the PIC to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors that:

*SCA is committed to open and transparent government and to upholding the intent of the Public Records Act. SCA supports the legislative efforts of the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) and others to help relieve the onerous cost burdens associated with Public Records Requests that are harassing, frivolous, or overly burdensome.*

Toby Nixon, Kirkland, informed the committee that he serves on the Washington Coalition for Open Government Board. Nixon stated that the City of Kirkland is in favor of the motion because it supports general principles of the Public Records Act. Don Gerend, Sammamish City Councilmember and President of the Association of Washington Cities, stated that AWC has also made this one of their top legislative priorities. Hank Margeson, Redmond, added that Redmond has also included this on its legislative agenda. Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, stated that to have success with this issue in the legislature, the position needs to be more specific. Haggerton encourages AWC to be more detailed and to communicate that cities not only want to be transparent in this issue, but also limit nuisance and frivolous requests by the public.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Local Transportation Funding Options**
ED Dawson reported that many groups are meeting to discuss possible funding sources, both statewide and locally. These groups include city staff, intergovernmental staff, technical staff, King County staff, and a Mayor’s group including mayors from around the state. Currently, SCA is working with its member cities, Seattle, and King County on a transportation package. ED Dawson provided a handout (see **Attachment D** to these minutes), which provides options including an increase in the gas tax, a motor vehicle excise tax (MVET), and an increase of the current councilmanic Transportation Benefit District (TBD) authority from $20 to $40. ED Dawson asked PIC members to take this information back to their cities for discussion and feedback. Dave Hill, Algona, commented that while a 1.5% MVET does not provide a great deal of funding for a city as small as Algona; nevertheless, Algona is supportive as it is regionally beneficial. Hank Margeson, Redmond, stated that Redmond is concerned that the county needs to invest in transit for underserved areas. Ross Loudenback, North Bend, commented that North Bend would support a 1 cent/gallon gas tax that is voted locally so that funds are available locally. Matt Pina Des Moines was concerned that not enough funds would be raised through even these combinations of funding streams to entirely address the roads needs of cities.

ED Dawson polled PIC members regarding support for sending a letter to the Governor supporting the option of a 1.5% MVET. While Bernie Talmas voiced concern about whether his council would support the proposal, the group indicated support for sending a letter.

**Update on Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (ILA)**
ED Dawson gave an update on the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (ILA) status. There was a briefing on the Solid Waste ILA at the PIC Workshop prior to the PIC meeting. The draft Solid
Waste ILA is in the process and is currently being reviewed by city attorneys. A draft should be ready to send out to SCA members by next week. The goal is to have the final draft of the ILA complete by the end of 2012. ED Dawson offered to give a presentation on the update of the Solid Waste ILA to individual councils upon request. ED Dawson added that she gave a presentation on this issue at the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) this afternoon and members can stream the RPC meeting to view the presentation. See Attachment E to these minutes.

Informational Items
Chair Gregerson asked that members review the Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) recommendations for funding low to moderate-income housing projects and share this information with their councils.

Upcoming Events
a) SCA North and Snoqualmie Valley Regional Caucus Meeting to elect SCA Board of Directors – December 19, 2012 6:30 PM at Heritage Hall Kirkland
(South and South Valley Caucus meeting was held on December 5)
b) Next SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – January 9, 2013 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall
c) Next SCA Networking Dinner — January TBD, 2013 5:30 PM Tukwila Embassy Suites
d) 2013 SCA Committee Appointee Orientation – January 23, 2013 6:30 PM at SeaTac City Hall Council Chambers

For the Good of the Order
Don Gerend, Sammamish, commented that AWC has identified general priorities for 2013; AWC’s lobbyists are starting to work on specific bills.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.
2012 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting  
December 12, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Lynda Osborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Pete Lewis</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Rebecca Olness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Andy Rheume</td>
<td>Tom Agnew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Jerry Robison</td>
<td>Bob Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Hartó</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Matt Pina</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Linda Kochmar</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Fred McConkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Paul Winterstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Allan Van Ness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Jamie Perry</td>
<td>Suzette Cooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Amy Walen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Sandy Koppenol</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Rich Crisko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td>Doug Osterman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Rich Zwicker</td>
<td>Terri Briere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Tom Vance</td>
<td>Tom Odell</td>
<td>Don Gerend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Tony Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td>Scott MacColl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Jim Haggerton</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Whitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doreen Booth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristy Burwell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electeds present are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are bolded.
Notes on South King County Transfer Station Siting Process

- The City of Federal Way agrees with the concept of taking a second look at capacity needs and seeing how that impacts facility costs.

- The City does not support removing the planned South County Transfer Station from further consideration. The City does not support zeroing-out the projected capital funding ($61 Million for planning, design and construction) required to construct an appropriately-sized facility to replace the existing Algona station. (Note: $20 Million is set aside for property acquisition and contingency).

- The Algona Transfer Station is almost 50 years old, and has an estimated nine years of life remaining. It is the second busiest transfer station in the County-wide system, and this disposal capacity will continue to be in demand into the foreseeable future. It experienced the smallest decline in tonnage due to the recession, and is the only station that has seen recent tonnage growth as the economy moves toward recovery.

- The Regional Solid Waste Transfer System map shows the large incorporated/unincorporated area that the South County Transfer Station services. It is a major component of the regional transfer system. A significant, growing population relies on the South Transfer Station, including self-haulers, businesses, and our contracted collection company. The capacity this station provides can’t simply be “wished away”. Further, the south county would still pay into the cost of the new, more efficient stations in the regional solid waste transfer and disposal system.

- Bow Lake Transfer Station, 11 miles to the north, is the next closest facility. The facility is not designed to take the added volume if the Algona transfer station is not replaced.

- If there is no replacement for the South Transfer Station, the inefficiency will increase solid waste service and collection rates for Federal Way (and south county) ratepayers in the coming years. Costs will increase for labor, fuel, and capital equipment, since it will take extra time to bring loads and queue for dumping at the Bow Lake Transfer Station.

- Waste Management estimates its additional operations costs will total approximately $1.3 Million annually, plus require additional trucks totaling $1.2 Million. These costs (plus profit) will be borne by ratepayers. These costs do not account for higher costs also incurred by all self-haulers in the south county, or for the cost of additional illegal dumping abatement resulting from lack of a convenient disposal site.

- The South County Transfer Station siting process should continue to move ahead even if the overall Solid Waste Transfer Plan is revisited.
Figure 2
Locations of Solid Waste Facilities by Geographic Area
Revenues from the following three local options will provide funding necessary to sustain transit service and address unmet transit and other critical local transportation needs.

**State**
- 8-cent increase in State Gas Tax
  - Distribution as follows
    - State: 65%
    - Cities: 18%
    - Counties: 12%
    - TIB: 4%
    - CRAB: 1%

**Regional**
- 1.5% Local Option Motor Vehicle Excise Tax
  - Councilmanic authority for counties, with voter option, up to 1.5%
  - Generates approximately $140 million in King County in 2014*
  - Replaces existing Congestion Reduction Charge in King County
  - Seek ability to collect monthly, similar to a utility bill
  - In King County, agreement to seek 1.5% MVET authority. This amount of revenues is necessary to sustain transit service and address the funding gap for other critical local transportation needs. For a 1.5% MVET, revenues would be allocated 60% to Transit, and 40% to cities and the county distributed by population for local transportation needs
  - Outside of King, distribution negotiated between county and cities

*Source: DOL Vehicles transactions Data Warehouse, Sep 2012; renewals only, excludes commercial vehicles and trailers

**Local**
- $40 Councilmanic Vehicle License Fee
  - Expand councilmanic authority for the Transportation Benefit District from $20 to $40
  - Retain option for voter approval up to $100
## 1.5% MVET – 40% Cities and County Local Transportation Needs Jurisdiction Share by Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>April 1st OFM 2012 Pop Estimate</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>$87,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn (part)</td>
<td>63,390</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>$1,813,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>$8,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>124,600</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>$3,565,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>$119,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell (part)</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>$494,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>47,730</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>$1,365,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>$51,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>$85,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>$508,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>$849,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>$197,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw (part)</td>
<td>11,030</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>$315,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>89,460</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
<td>$2,559,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>$11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>31,150</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>$891,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>21,020</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>$601,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>119,100</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td>$3,408,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>255,720</td>
<td>13.07%</td>
<td>$7,317,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>81,480</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>$2,331,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>12,640</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>$361,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>23,340</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>$667,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>$85,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>22,690</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>$649,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton (part)</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>$23,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>$299,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>$181,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>$167,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific (part)</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>$187,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>55,360</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>$1,584,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>93,910</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>$2,687,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>47,420</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>$1,356,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>27,210</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>$778,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>616,500</td>
<td>31.50%</td>
<td>$17,641,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>53,270</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>$1,524,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>$5,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>11,320</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>$323,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>19,080</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>$545,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>$313,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>$30,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,957,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement between King County and Cities

Regional Policy Committee
December 12, 2012

Background/History:

• 2010-2012: ILA Drafting Committee updates ILA incorporating MSWMAC recommendations; Negotiations stalled over environmental liability
• July 2012: RPC briefed on status
• August 15, 2012: SCA adopts liability principles
• October 2012: City/County team convenes to restart discussions
• December 2012: ILA drafting complete, final review underway
SCA Principles: Environmental Liability

Principles on liability were adopted by the SCA Board on August 15, 2012:

- SCA believes that solid waste system costs, which includes liability, should be funded by the utility;
- The solid waste interlocal agreement (ILA) between King County and participating cities should fairly allocate risk between both the cities and the county and should, to the greatest extent possible, protect both the county’s general fund and cities’ general funds against liability for cleanup claims arising at Cedar Hills Landfill;
- Neither party should receive priority in terms of the use of grant funds, insurance proceeds, reserve funds, or disposal rates to satisfy environmental liability;
- The ILA should establish that grant funding, if available, and disposal rates shall be used to set up a line of first defense to protect both the county’s general fund, and the cities’ general fund.
- The ILA should provide that:
  - The county will purchase and maintain liability insurance using disposal rates to cover liability arising out of the Cedar Hills Landfill, if such insurance is available under commercially reasonable terms and conditions. Said insurance shall cover both the county, and the cities;
  - The county will establish and maintain a reserve fund from disposal rates to cover both the city and the county for liability not covered by insurance. The county shall consult with the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) as to the amount of the reserve fund;
  - In the event that liability for cleanup exceeds the funds available through the insurance and reserve fund, disposal rates should be used to cover both county and city liability to the fullest extent legal and feasible.

Goals for an New ILA

- Extension to allow long-term financing to keep rates lower
- Protect City and County general funds from long-term environmental liability
- Provide long-term system stability
- Update to be consistent with current conditions and laws
Key Improvements Over Current ILA

- Extends ILA 12.5 years, through December 2040
- Updates liability section guided by principles from Sound Cities Association (SCA)
- Expands City role in System planning
- Adds new mitigation section guided by principles from SCA
- Adds new dispute resolution section

Key Improvements Over Current ILA: Environmental Liability

- Nothing in the agreement creates new environmental liability or releases any third party from environmental liability
- Establishes a protocol for setting aside funds to pay for environmental liability and, if necessary, a fair and equitable process for distributing those funds
- Explicitly recognizes the intent of the parties to protect City and County general funds to the extent possible from environmental liability, including:
  - Purchasing insurance
  - Establishing an environmental reserve fund
  - Pursuing grants to cover costs
  - Developing a financial plan, including a rate schedule to cover costs
Key Improvements Over Current ILA: Governance

- Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) memorialized in ILA
- Maintains consistency with role of the RPC as provided by the King County Charter
- Increased City role in System planning, including a framework for reviewing financial policies and long-term disposal options
- Dispute resolution provisions
- Mitigation for host and neighboring Cities

The Transfer System

- ILA recognizes the need for transfer system improvements
- The parties determined that an extension of the ILA will facilitate long-term financing of those improvements while mitigating rate impacts – longer-term bonds will keep rates lower
- Allows for long-term financing for the adopted Transfer System Plan and recognizes that the Plan can be modified
### Benefits of New ILA

- Rate savings of $7 to $9 per ton on debt
- Savings of about $4 million in the 2013/14 rate period and over $8 million per year by 2019
- Long-term protection for City and County general funds from environmental liability
- Expanded City role in system planning, including financial policies and long-term disposal options
- City mitigation for transfer facilities
- Long-term stability in planning and financing of solid waste system for residents and businesses

### Next Steps

- City attorneys reviewing agreement and briefing City staff
- County distributes proposed agreement by end of December
- County requests a non-binding statement of interest in signing new ILA from Cities by January 31, 2013
- Executive transmits City approved ILAs to County Council February 14, 2013
Item 6:  
SCA Policy Position Regarding Public Records Request  

Action Item  

SCA Staff Contact  
Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@suburbancities.org  

Recommended Action  

To recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:  

SCA is committed to open and transparent government, and to upholding the intent of the Public Records Act. SCA supports the legislative efforts of the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) and others to help relieve the onerous cost burdens associated with Public Records Requests that are harassing, frivolous, or overly burdensome.  

Background Information  

This agenda item, concerning public records requests, was identified as a top priority by the SCA South and South Valley Caucus meeting at their December 5, 2012 meeting. The motion passed unanimously at the December 12, 2012 meeting of the PIC, advancing it to the January meeting for potential action.
Item 7:
Recommendation from the PIC Watershed Investment District Subcommittee

Action Item

SCA Staff Contact
Monica Whitman, Senior Policy Analyst, office 206-433-7169, monica@suburbancities.org

PIC Watershed Investment Authority Subcommittee Members
Councilmember Andy Rheume (Subcommittee Chair), Bothell; Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville; Mayor Joan McBride, Kirkland; Councilmember Doug Osterman, Normandy Park; Carolyn Robertson, City of Auburn Staff; Monica Whitman, SCA Staff.

Recommended Action

To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors: That SCA support the formation of a stakeholder group by the Washington State Legislature, as the means to reach consensus on bill language regarding watershed investment authorities, to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session.

Background Information

At the December 12, 2012 meeting of the SCA Public Issues Committee, members voted unanimously to bring back to the following position to the next meeting of the PIC:

*To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors: that SCA support a study by the Washington State Legislature on the concept of a watershed investment authority.*

The subcommittee met on December 18, 2012 to clarify the process and to further refine the position moving forward. While it has been determined that 2013 isn’t the appropriate timing to introduce a bill to the Washington State legislature; there are a number of reasons to support the legislature taking interim measures to begin looking at the pros and cons of forming Watershed Investment Districts between now and 2014.

The Subcommittee discussed at length whether this is really a "study" requiring technical expertise/consultants, or if it is more of a "stakeholder group" to reach consensus on bill language. The subcommittee determined that a consensus bill, which would include governance and funding that could be introduced (and hopefully passed) in 2014 would be more effective than a study bill. Administrative support would be needed, and some staff support for research on options, although much of the research has already been done during
the process of developing the draft bill that already exists. Stakeholder group discussion and consensus could focus on final naming for WIDs ("Authority", "District", "Council", etc.), composition of WIA board, how they are selected, revenue-generation options, revenue approval processes, project selection and prioritization, whether WID will build projects itself or only serve as fiscal agent/pass through to local jurisdictions, funding distribution methods, etc.

Stakeholder participants could include: Legislators (one from each of four caucuses, appointed by caucus leadership), representatives of WRIA Forums, AWC, WSAC, Tribes, State agencies (Ecology, DFW), Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council, NGOs (People for Puget Sound, Environmental Priorities Coalition, Nature Conservancy, Washington Environmental Council, PSRC, and others.

The existing draft WIA bill would be used as a starting point, in addition to the background info that WRIA 9 has used to develop the bill (to avoid duplication of effort), PSP Action Plan, info on how similar authorities are governed and funded both in Washington and in other states. Possible outcomes include: a draft consensus bill for 2014 session, background text to be included in bill analysis to inform legislators, PowerPoint deck to use during committee hearings or work sessions. Outputs will be posted publicly and provided by email to all participants and legislative committees.

The subcommittee is recommending that the formation of a stakeholder group minimize costs to avoid rejection due to budget impacts. Participants could pay their own costs for participation in the group (travel cost, meals, etc.). Staff support could be provided by legislative staff (OPR/SCS), within existing funding, to assist with meeting notices and agendas, meeting minutes, mailing list maintenance, posting group documents on legislature web site, etc. Legislative staff will not be expected to do extensive research or drafting of output materials; participants and staff from their organizations would provide supporting documents. Interested parties could work with legislative committee(s) to create a budget proviso or committee interim work plan item to convene the stakeholder group and provide direction.

Future Actions

- Subcommittee members will be consulting with and identifying key legislators who will sponsor or champion the proposal throughout the process.
Item 8:
Solid Waste Transfer Station – South County

Action Item

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@suburbancities.org.

Potential Action Item
The following proposed public policy position concerning the proposed South County transfer station was brought forward by Pete Lewis at the November 7, 2012 PIC meeting.

Over the past several years, tonnage in the King County solid waste system has declined significantly in part due to the economy but also due to the increase in recycling creating what appears to be a new normal.

We believe this “new normal” requires a second look at the capacity needs of the system. It has been nearly seven years since the system alternatives were analyzed. Solid Waste Division’s current tonnage forecast for year 2030 is about 600,000 tons lower than the former forecast. By the time the proposed stations reach the end of their expected useful lives, they will be utilizing about 42% of their total capacity.

The Suburban Cities Association supports removing the planned South King County transfer station capital project from the Transfer Station Plan saving over $70 million dollars for the ratepayers of King County.

Background Information

The city of Auburn has prepared background information on the proposed policy; it is included here as Exhibit A. King County Solid Waste has prepared a fact sheet on the South County Transfer Station and an overview of the transfer station system; it is included here as Exhibit B.

At the December 12, 2012 meeting of the PIC, during discussion of the proposed motion, Jeanne Burbidge, Federal reported that Federal Way staff prepared two handouts (Attachment C and D) outlining the City of Federal Way’s concerns. Jeanne Burbidge, Federal Way, moved, seconded by Dave Hill, Algona, to postpone this issue to the next meeting of the PIC so that information can be discussed amongst staff. Federal Way requested that SCA member cities take this new information back to their council and city staff for discussion and possible further research. The motion passed. Bothell, Issaquah, Kirkland, North Bend, Redmond, Shoreline, and Snoqualmie voted no.
Other Information

In September of 2006, King County issued a Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan. That plan can be found at http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/Transfer-Waste-Export-Plan.pdf. One of the Plan’s recommendations is to: Modernize the transfer system, including the addition of waste compactors, to accommodate a growing population and industry changes and to provide efficient and cost-effective services to customers. To do this, the plan recommended constructing 4 new transfer stations, retaining 5 existing transfer stations [Enumclaw; Shoreline, Vashon, Cedar Falls (drop box facility), Skykomish (drop box facility)] and closing 3 transfer stations (Algona, Houghton, Renton) when replacement facilities are completed. SCA supported the adoption of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan in September 2007.

King County’s most recent schedule for Transfer System Renovations

- **Bow Lake** – New Transfer Station opened in July 2012 for business, site completion in late 2013
- **Factoria** – New Transfer Station will be constructed at existing location, construction to begin in 2014; new station open in 2016.
- **Northeast Lake Washington** – Siting process will begin in 2013. Design and permitting is proposed to take place in 2015-16; construction in 2017-18; facility opening in 2019.
- **South County** – New Transfer Station environment review began in late 2012. Design and permitting is proposed to take place in 2013-14; construction in 2016-17; facility opening in 2018.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond also provided additional information regarding this item. Margeson received the Solid Waste Divisions Transfer Station Volume Date from 2011 (Attachment E) from the King County Solid Waste’s Annual Report. Essentially is shows the volume (in tons and trips) to each transfer station in 2011. The Solid Waste division estimates that approximately 89% of the trips would flow to Bow Lake and 11% to Enumclaw. This will result in Bow Lake exceeding self-haul trip capacity on Saturday’s over several hours during the day.

Attachments:

a) Exhibit A – City of Auburn Background Information
b) Exhibit B – King County Background Information
c) Attachment C – Federal Way - South King County Transfer Station Siting Process
d) Attachment D – Federal Way - Transfer Station Graphic
e) Attachment E – Solid Waste Division Transfer Station Volume Data from 2011
As requested by the PIC of SCA, the City of Auburn is providing the following information for members in preparation for the December meeting:

**Solid Waste System Capacity**
According to the 2011 State Audit report, by the time the proposed stations reach the end of their expected useful lives, they will be utilizing about 42% of their total capacity. We recognize that the tonnage at the Algona site has not declined as significantly as other facilities but we are weighing the overall capacity of a regional system against significant costs to the ratepayers.

**Station Costs**
The most recent transfer station (Bow Lake) was a $70 million dollar investment. A South King County site will likely be considerably more given the proposed locations’ infrastructure needs and mitigation requirements of the host cities.

Current tonnage rates are close to $122 per ton. The costs of the Factoria facility have not been added nor have the proposed South King County and North County sites. When completed, tonnage costs could be more than $150 per ton.

**King County Budget 2013-2014**
Chair of the Finance Committee, Councilmember McDermott, proposed and it is included in the budget, a proviso requiring “a report from the Solid Waste Division listing the interlocal agreements approved by cities indicating commitments in the regional solid waste system through at least 2040.”

It also goes on to indicate that “If the report transmitted by the executive does not include enough cities to warrant proceeding with the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, then the executive shall submit a motion recommending that the county seek to reopen a planning effort.”


Page 81, Line 1813

Any questions, please contact Mayor Lewis personally at plewis@auburnwa.gov.
The King County Transfer System

- The King County Solid Waste Transfer System consists of eight transfer stations (six urban and two rural) and two rural drop boxes.

- The original purpose of the transfer system was to replace the open, community dump sites in use in the early 1960s, with environmentally safe transfer facilities where garbage could be delivered by curbside collection trucks and self-haulers. From these geographically dispersed transfer sites, garbage could be consolidated into fewer loads for transport to the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. This practice reduces truck travel time for the commercial collectors, thereby increasing overall efficiency and sustainability.

- While the transfer network has served the region well for almost 50 years, it was not built to accommodate the increase in population that has occurred between the 1960s and today, or the increased emphasis on recycling. Space constraints limit the number of recycling containers and the range of materials that can be recycled at each facility (the Algona and Factoria Transfer Stations do not have recycling). The 1960s’ era buildings are not enclosed and changes in the industry have created operational constraints, for example, commercial collection trucks are now larger, making it difficult to accommodate these vehicles in the older stations.

- Using a collaborative, regional approach to solid waste planning, the Solid Waste Division and its advisory committees – the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) – developed a plan to renovate the out-of-date transfer system.

- Five of the urban transfer stations were evaluated using 17 criteria that focused on the level of service to users, the capacity of stations to handle garbage and recyclables both now and in the future, structural integrity, and the effects of facilities on surrounding communities. The advisory committees worked closely with the division to develop and apply the 17 criteria, evaluate options, and formulate recommendations for upgrading the transfer system. This work culminated in the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, which was approved by the King County Council in December 2007. The approved recommendations would have the division replace the Bow Lake and Factoria Transfer Stations at their existing locations, site new facilities in Northeast and South County to replace the Houghton and Algona Transfer Stations respectively, and close the Renton Transfer Station when new facilities are in place.

- New recycling and transfer stations will include design features such as rainwater collection, energy efficient fixtures, space to collect a wide array of recyclables, room for on-site queuing, which reduces traffic impacts on local streets, enclosed buildings, and solid waste compactors. By compacting garbage prior to transport for disposal, truck trips are reduced by about one-third.
The Algona Transfer Station

- The Algona Transfer Station is a critical component of the transfer system, serving the cities of Algona, Auburn, Federal Way, and Pacific, and the surrounding unincorporated area of South King County.

- The Algona Transfer Station is almost 50 years old. Based on previous analysis of the timber piles that support the transfer building, and the irreversible nature of timber deterioration, the existing Algona Transfer Station structure has an estimated nine years of remaining life. This is a rough estimate; the service life may be shorter based on unforeseen wear to the piles or to the slab which rests on the piles. The relatively new roof structure has a separate foundation from the rest of the building. The division will commission a new structural analysis in 2013.

- A decision not to replace the Algona Transfer Station would leave South King County with no transfer facility beginning in 2022 or sooner. The added distance that commercial haulers would need to travel to reach a transfer facility would increase the cost of garbage collection for residents and businesses, as well as increase overall traffic in South King County. South King County would be the only area of the county without easy access to safe, reliable, and efficient transfer services, raising concerns around problems such as illegal dumping and issues of equity and social justice for South County citizens.

- The closest transfer facility to the Algona Transfer Station is the Bow Lake Recycling and Transfer Station. It is approximately 11 miles from Algona to Bow Lake. In addition to the cost that would be incurred by South County curbside collection customers and self-haulers due to this added distance, the new Bow Lake facility was not designed to accommodate the additional tonnage that would need to be absorbed. Nor was the additional traffic that would be created around the Bow Lake site anticipated in the environmental review.

- While overall system tonnage has dropped about 20% since 2007, tonnage at Algona has dropped far less – about 11% since 2007.

- When the transfer system was being analyzed in 2004, Algona received about 147,500 tons. In 2011, the station received about 137,500 tons. Even with the tonnage decline, the capacity of the facility does not meet the current need.

- Algona was the only transfer station in the system with higher tonnage in 2011 than in 2010. Based on trends so far this year, tonnage at Algona is expected to be flat in 2012.

- In 2011, Algona was the third busiest transfer station for tonnage, receiving about 13,000 tons less than Houghton, but was the second busiest for transactions with over 134,000 transactions – that is 25,000 more transactions than at Houghton.

- The division’s economist forecasts that in 2040 a South County facility would receive about 190,000 tons of refuse.

- A new South County facility would be designed with the new tonnage projections in mind and with flexibility to meet changing needs as recycling increases.
Notes on South King County Transfer Station Siting Process
(Document provided by the City of Federal Way 12/12/2012)

- The City of Federal Way agrees with the concept of taking a second look at capacity needs and seeing how that impacts facility costs.

- The City does not support removing the planned South County Transfer Station from further consideration. The City does not support zeroing-out the projected capital funding ($61 Million for planning, design and construction) required to construct an appropriately-sized facility to replace the existing Algona station. (Note: $20 Million is set aside for property acquisition and contingency).

- The Algona Transfer Station is almost 50 years old, and has an estimated nine years of life remaining. It is the second busiest transfer station in the County-wide system, and this disposal capacity will continue to be in demand into the foreseeable future. It experienced the smallest decline in tonnage due to the recession, and is the only station that has seen recent tonnage growth as the economy moves toward recovery.

- The Regional Solid Waste Transfer System map shows the large incorporated/unincorporated area that the South County Transfer Station services. It is a major component of the regional transfer system. A significant, growing population relies on the South Transfer Station, including self-haulers, businesses, and our contracted collection company. The capacity this station provides can’t simply be “wished away”. Further, the south county would still pay into the cost of the new, more efficient stations in the regional solid waste transfer and disposal system.

- Bow Lake Transfer Station, 11 miles to the north, is the next closest facility. The facility is not designed to take the added volume if the Algona transfer station is not replaced.

- If there is no replacement for the South Transfer Station, the inefficiency will increase solid waste service and collection rates for Federal Way (and south county) ratepayers in the coming years. Costs will increase for labor, fuel, and capital equipment, since it will take extra time to bring loads and queue for dumping at the Bow Lake Transfer Station.

- Waste Management estimates its additional operations costs will total approximately $1.3 Million annually, plus require additional trucks totaling $1.2 Million. These costs (plus profit) will be borne by ratepayers. These costs do not account for higher costs also incurred by all self-haulers in the south county, or for the cost of additional illegal dumping abatement resulting from lack of a convenient disposal site.

- The South County Transfer Station siting process should continue to move ahead even if the overall Solid Waste Transfer Plan is revisited.
### Table A-5: 2011 Tons Disposed at Transfer Facilities¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Stations &amp; Drop Boxes</th>
<th>Total Tons</th>
<th>% Self-Haul</th>
<th>% Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algonia</td>
<td>137,533</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>249,199</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Falls Drop Box</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>19,570</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>121,854</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>150,379</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>61,872</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>44,647</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish Drop Box²</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>796,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Tons measured on arrival at Cedar Hills.
² Solid waste transported from Skykomish to the Houghton station; this row is not added to totals.

### Table A-6: 2011 Transactions at Transfer Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer &amp; Drop Box Stations</th>
<th>Total Transactions</th>
<th>% Self-Haul</th>
<th>% Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algonia</td>
<td>134,360</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>170,256</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Falls Drop Box</td>
<td>17,972</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>41,115</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>98,194</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>109,317</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>73,226</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>70,785</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>738,566</strong></td>
<td><strong>88%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 9:
Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement

Discussion Item

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@suburbancities.org.

This item is scheduled as a briefing with additional time for Q and A.

Background Information

Member cities have been provided the following briefing materials, ILA transmittal letter (Attachment A) and ILA Non-Binding Statement of Interest (Attachment B). King County is requesting that each City that is interested in signing the new ILA sign the attached non-binding statement of interest by close of business January 31, 2013.

King County and the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee have been working together over the past two years to extend the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement of 1988. After intensive negotiations, a team of City and County representatives has reached agreement on a new ILA that will foster cooperation in our regional solid waste system. This agreement extends the original ILA by 12.5 years, from June 2028 through December 2040, which will keep rates lower by allowing for longer-term bonding for capital projects.

The new ILA includes several significant enhancements over the original ILA. It deals much more effectively with liability, establishing a protocol for payment of Environmental Liabilities, if and when they arise, including insurance and reserves. The intent to protect both City and County general funds from Environmental Liabilities to the greatest extent feasible is explicit. Other improvements over the original ILA include:

- Commitment to the continued involvement of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC)
- An expanded role for Cities in system planning, including long-term disposal alternatives and in establishing financial policies
- A dispute resolution process, which includes non-binding mediation
- An acknowledgment that solid waste facilities are regional facilities and host cities and neighboring cities may receive mitigation for impacts
In order to develop, in collaboration with MSWAC, financial policies that will affect the next rate study, the County needs each City to act on the ILA by April 30, 2013. Briefing materials to assist you in making a decision can be found here:

1) *Amending and Restating the Interlocal Agreement of 1988, an overview*
2) *Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement between King County and Cities, a PowerPoint presentation, including notes* – *(this links you to the main folder, click on the file to access)*
3) ILA Term Sheet
4) Solid Waste Governance
5) Effect of Different Bond Terms on Fees
6) System Map
7) Frequently Asked Questions
8) Redline Comparison of the 1988 Interlocal Agreement with Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement
9) Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement

**Attachments:**

a) Attachment A - ILA transmittal letter
b) Attachment B - ILA Non-Binding Statement of Interest
December 28, 2012

The Honorable
Mayor, City of

Dear Mayor:

With this letter I am transmitting to you the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (new ILA) for your review and approval. As you may know, King County (County) and the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee have been working together over the past two years to extend the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement of 1988 (original ILA), which your City has signed. After intensive negotiations, a team of City and County representatives has reached agreement on a new ILA that will foster cooperation in our regional solid waste system. This agreement extends the original ILA by 12.5 years, from June 2028 through December 2040, which will keep rates lower by allowing for longer-term bonding for capital projects.

The new ILA includes several significant enhancements over the original ILA. It deals much more effectively with liability, establishing a protocol for payment of Environmental Liabilities, if and when they arise, including insurance and reserves. The intent to protect both City and County general funds from Environmental Liabilities to the greatest extent feasible is explicit. Other improvements over the original ILA include:

- Commitment to the continued involvement of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC)
- An expanded role for Cities in system planning, including long-term disposal alternatives and in establishing financial policies
- A dispute resolution process, which includes non-binding mediation
- An acknowledgment that solid waste facilities are regional facilities and host cities and neighboring cities may receive mitigation for impacts

Also included with this transmittal is a non-binding statement of interest. We are requesting this non-binding statement from each City as to whether you are interested in signing the new ILA.
The Honorable  
December 28, 2012  
Page 2

To accomplish this, we are asking that you complete the attached form, indicating which option best represents your City’s position at this time and email it to me by close of business January 31, 2013. Again, this is non-binding, but will assist the County in planning.

In order to develop, in collaboration with MSWAC, financial policies that will affect the next rate study, the County needs each City to act on the ILA by April 30, 2013. Briefing materials to assist you in making a decision can be found here City ILA Briefing Package. Upon request, we would be happy to provide briefings to you, your City Council, or staff.

If you have any questions or would like to schedule a briefing, please call or email me at 206-296-4385 or pat.mclaughlin@kingcounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Pat D. McLaughlin  
Division Director

Enclosure

cc:

Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, Suburban Cities Association  
Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, King County Executive Office  
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources & Parks (DNRP)  
Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, Solid Waste Division (SWD), DNRP  
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, SWD, DNRP
December 28, 2012

TO: The Honorable , Mayor
City of

RE: Request for Non-Binding Statement of Interest in signing an Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement by January 31, 2013

We are requesting a non-binding statement from each City as to whether you are interested in signing the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement. To accomplish this, we are asking that a representative of the City complete the form below, indicating which option best reflects the City’s position at this time, and email it to me by close of business January 31, 2013. Again, this is non-binding, but will assist the County in planning.

Please respond by completing the information below:

City of Algona Non-Binding Statement of Interest with Respect to Entering into the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement.

It is likely that my City will sign the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement.

It is not likely that my City will sign the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement.

My Name/Title: ____________________________ Date: ____________

If you have any questions about the attached materials, please call or email me at 206-296-4385 or pat.mclaughlin@kingcounty.gov.

cc: Diana Quinn, City Administrator, City of Algona
    Paul Mallary, Councilmember, City of Algona
    Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, Suburban Cities Association
    Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, King County Executive Office
    Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources & Parks (DNRP)
    Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, Solid Waste Division (SWD), DNRP
    Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, SWD, DNRP