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11. **Upcoming Events**

a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – TBD

b) Future SCA Networking Dinners:

   - Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:30 PM – TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club – SCA will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
   - Wednesday, November 20, 2013 5:30 PM – Location TBD – SCA will be joined by Governor Jay Inslee

12. **For the Good of the Order**
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**Did You Know?**

The Regional Food Policy Council was established in September 2010 at the Puget Sound Regional Council to bring together community, government, business and agricultural interests to work on integrated and sustainable policy recommendations to strengthen the regional food system. Its mission is to develop just and integrated policy and action recommendations that promote health, sustain and strengthen the local and regional food system, and engage and partner with agriculture, business, communities and governments in the four-county region. The Regional Food Policy Council has developed recommendations for local governments interested in addressing the local food economy and food access through policy and programs.

The Regional Food Policy Council developed a set of food policy blueprints to address four initial topic areas:

- Comprehensive Plans
- Urban Agriculture
- Farmers Markets
- Local Food Procurement

These blueprints show steps local jurisdictions have already taken to support the food system. These illustrated examples provide recommendations for local governments interested in addressing the local food economy and food access through policy and programs. The policy blueprints can be found at [http://www.psrc.org/growth/foodpolicy/blueprints/](http://www.psrc.org/growth/foodpolicy/blueprints/). For more information, contact PIC Chair Mia Gregerson.
Sound Cities Association

Mission
To provide leadership through advocacy, education, mutual support and networking to 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.
1. **Welcome and Roll Call**
Mia Gregerson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Twenty-seven cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: John Stokes, Bellevue City Council; Shari Song, King County Council candidate; Michelle Allison, King County Councilmember Joe McDermott’s office; Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s office.

2. **Public Comment**
Chair Gregerson asked if any member of the public had any public comment. Seeing none, Chair Gregerson closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

3. **Approval of the April 10, 2013 Minutes**
Chris Roberts, Shoreline, moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the May 8, 2013 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Gregerson did not give a report.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported that there will be an Eastside Transportation Town Hall event at Bellevue City Hall on Wednesday, June 19 at 5:30 p.m. There will be an open house and comment period from 5:30-6:30 p.m. followed by a moderated panel discussion and questions from 6:30-8:00 p.m. SCA is co-sponsoring this event with King County and the City of Bellevue to discuss the transportation preservation, maintenance, and infrastructure needs throughout King County. The public will have an opportunity to meet with elected officials as well as city and county staff to learn more about needs for specific roads and bridge projects and transit. ED Dawson told members that if their city was interested in participating to please let her know.

ED Dawson reported that she sent an email to SCA members on June 11, 2013 regarding the alternate transportation package proposed by Senator King during the second special session
of the legislature. ED Dawson’s email identified the primary differences between Senator King’s proposal and Representative Clibborn’s proposal with regards to local options.

ED Dawson encouraged members to start thinking about 2014 committee assignments where SCA has appointing authority. There are many SCA members who are retiring from public office as well as members rotating off of committees due to term limits. Committee information can be found in the SCA Committee Booklet on our website, [http://soundcities.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/2013-appointments-booklet.pdf](http://soundcities.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/2013-appointments-booklet.pdf). ED Dawson encouraged members to start attending committee meetings on which they are interested in serving. This will show interest and dedication to committee members, as well as the PIC Nominating Committee. It will also help members become familiar with committee procedures, key issues, and critical background information.

ED Dawson encouraged members to invite her to their city council meetings to speak about the benefits of SCA to their cities. This is also a good way for cities to learn about committees to which SCA appoints, and to encourage new members to get involved.

ED Dawson reported that she just received a copy of Ann Macfarlane of Jurassic Parliament’s new book, *Mastering Council Meetings*. Ann gave an informative presentation at the May 8, 2013 Pre-PIC Workshop and has been a longtime supporter of SCA. This book would be a good addition and valuable resource to each city’s council library.

ED Dawson concluded her report, and asked if members had any questions.

Kate Kruller, Tukwila, asked what SCA’s position was on Senator King’s package. Dawson indicated that SCA had not adopted a position on the package, and that she had sent the email earlier in the week to get feedback from member cities on the package. She encouraged member cities to give feedback on the package, and whether member cities thought that this package would be beneficial for their cities.

Kruller asked that Dawson elaborate on what was contained in this package. ED Dawson referred to the email she had sent to members regarding the primary differences between Senator King’s proposal and Representative Clibborn’s proposal concerning the “local option” provisions:

- Senator King’s proposal would extend the current $20 “congestion relief” car tab fee authority that King County has, and expand use to Pierce and Snohomish Counties. However, while those dollars are currently used to fund Metro in King County, this proposal would limit the use of those funds to roads and bridges (no transit). To impose this fee, the County Council would need a super majority, or voter approval;
- Instead of a Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET), Senator King’s proposal would allow King County to raise the sales tax by an additional .3% to fund transit. This would require a vote of the people to approve. And in addition, in contrast to the proposal to split an MVET between transit and roads (with the bulk of the roads funds dollars going to cities), no portion of these new funds would be available for roads. Instead, all of the new sales tax would go to transit;
• Senator King’s proposal does not contain the provision that would allow cities with Transportation Benefit Districts (TBDs) to impose a $40 car tab fee councilmanically (up from the current $20 limit). Instead, cities’ sales tax authority would be raised from 0.2 percent to 0.3 percent. But, that authority would not be councilmanic. Instead, it would require approval by a vote of the people within each jurisdiction.

Dawson noted that the local options proposal that SCA member cities had supported was a collaboration between SCA cities, the County, and Seattle, and was now also supported by Bellevue. The parties had come together and compromised to reach a result that all parties could support. It tied together county and cities, and roads and transit, and represented a partnership between the county and cities. In contrast, Senator King’s proposal separated roads and transit, and separated taxing authority between the county and individual cities.

David Baker, Kenmore, asked for more information on the differences between the budgets on the statewide package. ED Dawson replied that while staff had not had time to analyze the package in depth yet, a major difference between Senator King’s package and Representative Clibborn’s package is that the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project was eliminated in Senator King’s package. Because both packages bring in similar amounts of funding from the gas tax, elimination of that major element freed up dollars to fund other projects. For example, it appears that Senator King’s package contains more funding for SR 167.

Tom Vance, Sammamish, inquired about the likelihood that the legislature will reach an agreement on a statewide transportation package. ED Dawson stated that the fact that Senator King had made a counterproposal should perhaps be seen as a sign that there is a window of opportunity for passing some sort of package this year. She noted that the local option for funding both roads and transit that SCA cities had proposed and supported actually brought in somewhat less in tax dollars than did the .3% sales tax for transit only as proposed by Senator King. She was hopeful that some compromise could be achieved, and that legislators would see the wisdom of allowing some flexibility to allow local jurisdictions to do what makes the most sense for their citizens. A sales tax increase of up to .6% (if both the county and cities were to pass the local option) may not be a good option for King County. Sales taxes are already high in King County, and sales tax revenues as a percentage of personal income has been on the decline. Having a different, and more stable, source of revenue for transportation infrastructure might make more sense in King County. PIC members concurred.

Suzette Cooke, Kent, stated that King County had unique challenges that may not be fully understood by leaders from other parts of the state. She noted that this new package appeared more heavily weighted to other areas. She jokingly noted that the package could be viewed as the “Inland Empire Economic Development Package.”

ED Dawson noted that they were still analyzing individual components of the package and the impact to projects important to SCA cities, and looked forward to hearing back from cities on their reactions to the package. She noted that many cities had adopted positions of support for the earlier package, and noted that cities may wish to take positions regarding this new proposal. While PIC always has the option of taking emergency action, it would likely be up to
individual cities to analyze the package, and adopt individual positions and resolutions as they deemed appropriate.

Marlla Mhoon, Covington, asked whether the group could do a “temperature check” on whether cities supported taking action regarding a position on the package. ED Dawson noted that if someone wanted to bring forward a motion that would allow discussion and possible action.

David Baker, Kenmore, moved, seconded by Marlla Mhoon, Covington, to take emergency action to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors that it adopt a position supporting the 2013 transportation package authored by Representative Clibborn.

Chris Roberts stated that Shoreline is supportive of the local options portion of Representative Clibborn’s package. He suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to simply adopt a position on that component of the package. David Baker added that it is important that transit funding be included, and that was why he supported the entire package, not just the local option component.

Bill Peloza, Auburn, asked for clarification on the language of the motion. ED Dawson restated the motion. The maker and seconder confirmed that their motion was to take emergency action, and to recommend to the Board that SCA to adopt a position of support for the transportation package authored by Rep. Clibborn.

Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, questioned whether or not SCA should be picking sides in a battle between the House and Senate, and whether that could harm relationships or make SCA lose some clout.

Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, asked ED Dawson to clarify if the package proposed by Representative Clibborn included the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET). ED Dawson confirmed that Clibborn’s package includes both a $20 - $40 Local Transportation Benefit District (TBD) fee option in addition to an MVET.

Dave Hill, Algona, asked for some additional detail on what is contained in the new package proposed by Senator King outside of the local options component. ED Dawson indicated that staff had not had sufficient time to do an in depth analysis of all components of the package.

Suzette Cooke asked that there be a week’s time before any communications are sent from SCA to allow city councils to discuss and potentially change their vote. ED Dawson reported that the SCA Board is scheduled to meet on June 19, 2013 and there will be no formal adoption of an SCA position until the Board has had an opportunity to analyze, debate, and possibly approve the proposed PIC position. This would give cities a week to review the new package, and give feedback to the Board. The Board always has the ability to modify or change positions recommended by the PIC.
Tom Vance stated that Sammamish is supportive of the original motion and requested that SCA send a letter of support as soon as possible. He expressed concern that the second special session could end before SCA had a chance to weigh in.

Hank Margeson stated that Redmond passed a resolution supporting Representative Clibborn’s package. It was important to demonstrate to our legislators from King County that they have support from the cities within their legislative districts to pass this package. Redmond is supportive of this emergency action.

Kate Kruller stated that most cities have sent multiple messages affirming that cities in King County are working together and are supportive of Representative Clibborn’s package. Taking this action would reinforce that message.

ED Dawson read a quote from Representative Clibborn that was included in an article from The News Tribune, “He just ripped the heart out of things that were really important to King County and probably Pierce and Snohomish.”

Amy Walen, Kirkland, commented that it’s important to show continuity, and that cities are still united in support for Rep. Clibborn’s package.

Catherine Stanford stated that it’s important to support both local options and a statewide package.

ED Dawson reviewed some of her notes on specific differences between the King and Clibborn packages. She noted that while there was funding for SR 167 and SR 509 in both packages, Senator King’s package contains more gas tax dollars for these projects, Rep. Clibborn’s package relies also on tolling revenues. She also noted that Senator King’s package devotes nearly twice as much to the Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM) I-5 improvements. She reiterated that there were more gas tax dollars available for specific projects in Senator King’s project because it does not fund the CRC project.

Chair Gregerson called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed. North Bend voted no. All other 26 cities voted in favor. The vote therefore received the required 85% needed for passage of an emergency action. ED Dawson noted that the Board would be meeting on June 19, 2013. She encouraged members to continue to review the two packages, and to provide feedback before the Board meeting.

6. **Solid Waste – Energy Waste Technology**

ED Dawson reminded members that SCA recently adopted policy positions regarding the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement, and the Solid Waste Transfer Station Plan. The Board and staff have been working to give additional direction to the County regarding specifics on what SCA member cities would like to have reviewed in regards to the Solid Waste Transfer Station plan. Through these discussions, a number of cities have raised the issue of waste-to-energy, and whether the Solid Waste Division should be doing more to look at waste-to-energy options.
Members of the SCA Regional Policy Committee Caucus asked the PIC to consider adopting a public policy position supporting consideration of waste-to-energy options as the Solid Waste Division conducts updates to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The County is in the process of beginning to conduct a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study, which will help to inform the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan updates.

Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Hank Margeson, Redmond, to bring back to the next meeting of the PIC the recommendation to the SCA Board of Directors that the Board adopt a position of support for the Solid Waste Division conducting a full review of options for waste disposal, including waste-to-energy, as part of the upcoming Sustainable Solid Waste System Study and through the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan process.

David Baker stated that this high level policy position is very helpful guidance for the SCA appointees to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC). ED Dawson added that by exploring waste-to-energy options, it can be determined if they are feasible for our region. Dave Hill commented that this policy position is critical because the current technology is from the early to mid-1900s and it’s time to take a look at alternative options for solid waste. Hill is also interested in the impact on current host cities and future host cities. Ross Loudenback, North Bend, commented that San Juan County is moving forward with waste-to-energy methods and it may be feasible for King County as well. Bill Peloza stated that as a member of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC), he has attended multiple presentations on incineration methods, and that there should be sufficient data on this method. Suzette Cooke suggested that perhaps SCA should adopt an even stronger position and suggested taking out “conducting a full review of options for waste disposal” from the motion.

Hank Margeson suggested that if members wanted to make changes that could be done prior to adoption of a position next month. He discouraged the group from trying to wordsmith and make amendments on the fly.

Dave Hill agreed, and thought that the motion as stated was a better policy. He suggested that it was important to take a look at all options for waste disposal, not just waste-to-energy.

The motion passed unanimously.

David Baker inquired if he could state that SCA is considering taking this position at the June 21, 2013 SWAC meeting. ED Dawson responded that it would be appropriate to say that SCA is considering the position, and that the discussion clearly indicated that members of the PIC are supportive of waste-to-energy options.

7. **King County Metro Strategic Plan Update**

Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, provided an update on the King County Metro 2013 Update to the Strategic Plan and Guidelines. King County is proposing two updates to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and 12 updates to the King County Metro Service Guidelines. The SCA RTC caucus held a workshop on June 10, 2013. Primary items for caucus discussion included:
• Identifying the appropriate measure for adding service and overcrowding;
• Integrating the Metro Long Range Plan with City Comprehensive plans and other provider’s plans, specifically Sound Transit;
• Determining the appropriate performance measures; and
• Addressing park-and-rides that are at 95% capacity or greater.

Whitman pointed out that there are several park-and-rides throughout the region that are at capacity. Members requested a copy of the park-and-ride capacity map discussed at the SCA RTC Caucus meeting (Attachment B). Park-and-ride access impacts all three subareas. Members are particularly interested in utilizing digital signage and smart phone technology. Members also inquired about fees for parking.

Margeson noted that the system needs to be reliable, consistent, and dependable. His hope is that Metro realizes that park-and-rides are hubs. Alternative services and local feeder routes are essential to meet ridership demand at park-and-rides.

Whitman noted that the under the leadership of the RTC’s new Chair, Councilmember Dembowski, and through the efforts of RTC members and city staff, the RTC is ahead of schedule and communication is better than ever.

8. King County Flood Control District 2014 Work Program and Budget
ED Dawson reported that the King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) is a challenging committee for both appointees and staff. Meeting materials are often provided the day of the meeting and are very technical, making it difficult for SCA staff to provide caucus members with necessary background information.

Ten cities, cities prone to flooding (Tukwila, Auburn, Kent, Renton, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Carnation, Seattle, and Bellevue), have their own permanent seats. The remaining 29 cities in the county are represented by 4 members (and 4 alternate members) appointed by SCA. SCA appointees are looking to benefit all cities. The Advisory Committee addresses policy priorities for district funding. ED Dawson noted that there are some philosophical questions concerning whether each basin should receive a set amount of funding, or whether projects should compete district-wide. Jim Berger added that the district was formed to manage flooding from six major river systems. Since then, funds have been diminished by non-river projects such as the Seattle Seawall. The District has not exercised its full taxing authority; therefore, there is a lot of interest from various agencies in increasing the district’s mission.

SCA KCFCDAC Caucus Chair Lee reported that the members on the caucus are superb and that they handle enormously complex issues. He is not running for re-election next year and wants to leave the caucus with a structure that the succeeding chair will be able to continue. Chair Lee requested that members provide feedback to help sharpen the process so that SCA appointees can be more productive.

Monica Whitman asked that members please share the following list of questions from slide 19 (Attachment C), presented at the last advisory committee meeting, with city
environmental staff. Whitman will work with Flood Control District and City staff prior to the July 10, 2013 meeting of the PIC to provide members with additional background information and context. Whitman recommended bringing this item back to the PIC for further discussion in July.

Mhoon mentioned that King County has technical staff available to help evaluate projects. Cooke highlighted a number of policies that the advisory committee may want to weigh in on related to: the purchase of property, the purpose of System Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF), FEMA accreditation, and the process for hiring a new Flood Control District Executive Director to fill the currently vacant position.

Whitman added that there is going be significant turnover on this committee and encouraged members to contact her at monica@soundcities.org if they’re interested in serving on this committee. Whitman also encouraged members to start attending these meetings. Chair Gregerson requested that members take these questions back to their councils and technical staff and to provide feedback, if any, at the next meeting of the PIC.

9. Informational Items
Chair Gregerson asked that members take the informational items included in their packets back to their councils and contact SCA know if there are any questions. Informational items include: Secure Medicine Draft Rules and Regulations, 2014 Federal Legislative Priorities, and the 2013 Economic Review Forecast for King County.

10. Upcoming Events
a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, July 10, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
b) SCA Pre-PIC Workshop - TBD
c) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
   • Wednesday, September 25, 2013, 5:30 p.m. at the TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club, Snoqualmie – SCA will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
   • Wednesday, November 20, 2013, 5:30 p.m. –Location TBD – SCA will be joined by Governor Jay Inslee (note: this is also the 2013 SCA Annual Membership Meeting)

ED Dawson mentioned that she has recently met with Attorney General Ferguson. ED Dawson asked that members submit topics on which they’d like to hear AG Ferguson speak at the September 25, 2013 SCA Networking Dinner, deanna@soundcities.org.

11. For the Good of the Order
David Baker announced the next Thursday, June 20, 2013, the Board of Health will be voting on Secure Medicine Take Back.

Layne Barnes thanked members who helped on the Donut Hole issue. Barnes also invited members to the 5th Anniversary of the Maple Valley Farmers Market, this Saturday, June 15, 2013.
Chris Roberts suggested that in the future when individual cities have bills on individual legislation that they are brought to PIC. ED Dawson commented that SCA supported a bill a couple years ago, which has had some detrimental effects on Shoreline. Roberts invited members to the 2nd Annual Farmers Market, which starts this Saturday at Shoreline City Hall.

Catherine Stanford invited members to the Lake Forest Park Farmers Market that opens on Sunday, June 16, 2013. Stanford also invited members to attend the Annual Lake Forest Park Secret Garden Tour where there will be a plant sale and Cisco Morris will be present, http://secretgardensoflakeforestpark.com/.

Bill Peloza invited members to the City of Auburn’s 122nd Birthday Party on June 14. Peloza also invited members to the Auburn Farmers Market.

David Baker invited members to Log Boom Park in Kenmore this summer. There will be kayak, canoe, and paddle board rentals as well as sky boarding rentals and other water activities. Kenmore will also have a floating Farmers Market.

Rebecca Olness invited members to Black Diamond Miners Day on Saturday, July 6 at 1:00 p.m. There will be a Ribbon Cutting and Unveiling of Coal Miners Honor Garden containing Coal Miner Statue and Memorial Wall inscribed with the names of the 1100 coal miners who lost their lives in Washington State. This event is located in front of Black Diamond Museum, 32627 Railroad Ave, Black Diamond.

ED Dawson asked that all members send their city’s farmers market information so that SCA can post it on its website.

Liz Reynolds invited members to the 13th Annual Stars & Stripes Celebration in downtown Enumclaw. A citizen is being honored with a key to the city, and as grand marshal of the parade.

Hank Margeson mentioned that he was able to find Ann Macfarlane’s book, Mastering Council Meetings, on Amazon.

Kate Kruller, member to the King Conservation District (KCD) panel, announced that the panel will be meeting in July and she welcomes comments.

John Stokes, Bellevue, looks forward to the day when he can sit around the table at address regional issues with other SCA members. He invited SCA members to attend the Transportation Town Hall at Bellevue City Hall on June 19, 2013. Stokes also invited SCA members to the 10th Annual Saturday Farmers Market as well as the Farmers Markets on Thursdays. He mentioned that he is on the KCD panel and looking to preserve the quality of life in the region, both rural and urban. Stokes appreciates being able to attend and the SCA direction to move items through the Regional Policy Committee (RPC). One of the reasons that Bellevue did not sign the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement is that there are going to be changes in waste management technology in the long term.
Tana Senn invited members to the Mercer Island Summer Celebration on July 13 where there will be a parade, art projects, a bouncy castle, and fireworks show.

Leanne Guier invited members to Pacific Days on July 13 and invited members to join in the parade. Guier is strongly hoping to bring the community back together.

Mia Gregerson invited members to the SeaTac Splash Park at Angle Lake.

12. **Adjourn**
The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.
### 2013 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
#### June 12, 2013

<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></td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</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 Rheuma</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>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td></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 Harto</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>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Jamie Perry</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
<td>Suzette Cooke</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>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
<td>Bob Lee</td>
<td>Mary Jane Goss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Tana Senn</td>
<td>Bruce Bassett</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></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>Ed Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Tom Odell</td>
<td>Ramiro Valderrama</td>
<td>Tom Vance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td>Tony Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td></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>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electeds present are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are bolded.
Legend

Park and Rides

- 1,000 Stalls
- 500 Stalls
- 100 Stalls

Permanent Lots

- <95% Full
- >95% Full

Leased Lots, >40 Stalls

- <95% Full
- >95% Full

Leased Lots, <40 Stalls

- <95% Full
- >95% Full

Transportation

- Link
- Sounder
- Bus Routes
- 1/4 Mi Walkshed*
- Freeways

*1/4 mile walking distance for the 2011 "All Day Network"
BTC Comments on Preliminary Draft

**Operating:** No concerns identified to date.

**Capital:**

1. If we are doing a corridor planning effort should we commit funding to specific capital projects in advance of completing the planning effort? Under what circumstances can actions move forward in advance of the larger planning effort?

2. Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time, and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration?
   - If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?

3. Should FEMA accreditation be a policy priority for District funding?

4. Should we have predetermined allocations for each basin from year to year, or adjust the CIP across the entire county?

5. Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?

6. How do we make sure that the CIP reflects the highest priority needs across the county?
Item 6:  
Solid Waste – Waste-to-Energy Technologies  
Regional Policy Committee  

Action Item

SCA Staff Contact  
Deanna Dawson, Executive Director, deanna@soundcities.org; office (206) 433-7170, cell (206) 310-0599

SCA Regional Policy Committee Representatives  
Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis (SCA Caucus Chair and RPC Vice Chair); Federal Way Councilmember Dini Duclos (SCA Caucus Vice Chair); Woodinville Mayor Bernie Talmas; Shoreline Councilmember Will Hall; Kent Councilmember Dennis Higgins (alternate); Bellevue Councilmember John Stokes (alternate).

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

The Sound Cities Association supports the Solid Waste Division conducting a full review of options for waste disposal, including waste-to-energy, as part of the upcoming Sustainable Solid Waste System Study and through the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan process.

Background

This matter came to the PIC at the recommendation of the SCA Caucus of the Regional Policy Committee (RPC), who asked the PIC to consider adopting a public policy position supporting consideration of waste-to-energy options as the Solid Waste Division conducts updates to the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

At the June 12, 2013 PIC meeting, the PIC voted unanimously to bring back this public policy position for action at the July meeting. If approved by the PIC at the July 10, 2013 meeting, this public policy position will be forwarded to the SCA Board for consideration and possible adoption at its July 17, 2013 meeting.

As a reminder and by way of background, the Cedar Hills Landfill is currently projected to reach capacity in 2025. Where and how to dispose of waste after the closure of Cedar Hills is an important policy decision that will have major financial, environmental, and land use ramifications for cities throughout King County. Decisions on post-Cedar Hills disposal options will be made through the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan process. The County is
in the process of beginning to conduct a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study, which will help to inform the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan updates.

The Final Draft 2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan provides in part:

The 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan directed the division to “contract for long-term disposal at an out-of-county landfill once Cedar Hills reaches capacity and closes.” With this plan, the division has proposed eliminating the policy in favor of exploring a range of options for future disposal. Emerging technologies for converting solid waste to energy or other resources, such as fuels, are in various stages of development and testing in U.S. and international markets. Some of the technologies are capable of processing the entire solid waste stream, while others target specific components, such as plastics or organics. The division is committed to the continued exploration of emerging technologies and advances in established disposal methods, including landfilling and incineration with energy and resource recovery.


SCA members have expressed strong support for exploring a full range of options for future disposal, including but not limited to waste-to-energy. Technologies for waste disposal are evolving, and SCA member cities want to ensure that the County’s Solid Waste Division is keeping up with these emerging technologies in order to ensure that waste is disposed of in a manner that is efficient, financially responsible, and sustainable.
**Item 7:**
Water Quality Assessment Scope of Work
Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC)

*Potential Future Action Item*

**SCA Staff Contact**
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, Doreen@soundcities.org; 206-433-7147

**SCA Regional Water Quality Committee Members:**
SCA RWQC Caucus Chair Bill Peloza, Auburn City Councilmember; Craig Goodwin, Black Diamond Councilmember; Doris McConnell, Shoreline City Councilmember; Don Davidson, Bellevue City Councilmember; Elizabeth Albertson (alternate), Kent City Councilmember; John Wright, Lake Forest Park City Councilmember (alternate).

---

At the June 5, 2013 Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC), King County Council and Executive staff brought forward a Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study for action by the RWQC. SCA caucus members were not provided with sufficient information and requested that the study be deferred.

Since then, SCA staff has been working with the King County Wastewater Treatment Division to address the caucus’s concerns and to provide additional detail and analysis prior to the July 10, 2013 meeting of the PIC.

The SCA RWQC caucus will be meeting on July 3, 2013; a recommendation will be transmitted to PIC members in advance of the meeting, based on the outcome of the caucus discussion.

**Background**

In October 2012, the Executive’s Combined Sewer Overflow Control (CSO) Plan, as amended by the King County Council and approved by the Regional Water Quality Committee, was transmitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology.

In April of 2012, SCA held a study session to review and provide feedback on the draft CSO plan. At that time, members discussed the regional significance and value of this plan to suburban cities in King County. The PIC also questioned if investing in CSO’s is most cost effective approach to clean up Puget Sound including environmental and social risks.

The Plan carries forward the nine CSO control projects presented in the October 2011 Wastewater Treatment Division’s recommended CSO Control Plan. Completion of the projects
will meet federal and state regulations by controlling all King County CSO locations to no more than one overflow per year on average at each location. The schedule calls for completing the projects by 2030, which continues the County’s earlier commitments to regulators and the community. These nine projects are estimated to cost a total of $711 million (in 2010 dollars). In addition to his recommended plan, the Executive recommended completion of a water quality assessment and monitoring study.

The Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study is required by King County Ordinance 17413 and is intended to provide information on how CSO control can work in conjunction with other water quality projects, identify opportunities to lower the cost of CSO control, evaluate the effectiveness of emerging technologies, and build a foundation for conducting post-construction monitoring of CSO control projects. It is also intended to help in deciding whether to pursue an integrated CSO control plan under the EPA Consent Decree.

Recommendations that emerge from the assessment may include changes in the sequencing and prioritization of the last seven CSO control projects while meeting the County’s legal obligations to complete all projects by 2030.

SCA members expressed concern about the scope of the study and cost prior to the acceptance of the CSO plan and adopting ordinance. Based on feedback from SCA and other members of the RWQC that shared SCA’s concerns, the adopting Ordinance was revised in September of 2012 to include a prescriptive list of parameters for what the study should include:

*The study should utilize the new EPA integrated planning approach framework to allow integration and sequencing of projects to ensure that investments in CSO control projects are well-planned and timed to optimize water quality improvements in the sub-basins to which King County's CSOs discharge. Furthermore, the study should emphasize and support value-engineering efforts to refine projects and reduce the costs of constructing CSO infrastructure. This should include opportunities to pursue complementary or combined projects with the city of Seattle or other entities, if it is cost-effective for King County ratepayers.*

*The study shall include:*
1. Analyzing and synthesizing findings from existing studies;
2. Collecting new information and filling data gaps through additional monitoring and sampling where identified as necessary;
3. Assessing factors affecting water quality in the sub-basins and water bodies where King County CSOs discharge; and
4. Recommending integration and sequencing of projects to meet current federal and state water quality standards and improve water quality.

**SCA Staff Analysis**
The information presented at the June 5th RWQC meeting included a staff report and a scope of work for the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study, included here as Attachment A.
The cost of the study for technical work and project management was estimated at $2,225,000 with an additional statement that the project costs would not exceed $5,000,000, including the stakeholder and expert review process.

The SCA caucus was not comfortable with the range of costs from $2.25M - $5M. The caucus also found that the scope of work did not contain sufficient information to assess the costs and study components. The caucus was also concerned that some of the items included in the scope or staff report were not consistent with the provisions of Ordinance 17413.

At the June 5th meeting, Councilmember Peloza asked that the study be deferred. The RWQC did defer the study. Since then, SCA staff has been working with county staff on the additional information that SCA members requested in order to take a position on the study.

Additional information was provided to SCA by county staff on June 28, 2013 Attachment B. The revised draft addresses a number of issues raised by the RWQC. The scope elements have been defined, how elements are related to the CSO program are addressed, and specific costs or a range of costs have been assigned to each element.

The June 28, 2013 draft sets out the project objective: “to help ensure that the significant investments in Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) control of $711 million are well-planned and timed to optimize water quality improvements where King County’s CSOs discharge.”

The project scope elements in the revised study scope, Table 1, have been more fully described, including an explanation for each element of:

- What CSO project planning needs are met,
- What the work accomplishes,
- How the element adds value to the CSO program,
- The estimated cost required for the CSO projects; and
- The estimated cost for added Water Quality Study elements.

The total budget for the project has now decreased; the range is now $2.1M to $3.2M. Of that amount, according to the draft, $1.5M - $2M covers items required for CSO program reviews, plan updates and program implementation. The Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study will lead to the monies being spent earlier, frontloading work which is required for each CSO project, not necessarily resulting in an additional expenditure of the dollars.

The additional $620,000 to $1.2M is for three items, elements 3-5 of the scope:

- Synthesis Report ($440,000 - $550,000): This report will attempt to address actions that will improve costs or improve water quality outcomes.
- Science and Technical Review Team ($180,000 - $225,000): This team in intended to provide independent review of scientific data analysis and methods.
- Executive Advisory Panel ($0 - $450,000): This panel will make recommendations to the Executive and Council for the next CSO Control Program Review. The panel would have
facilitation and staff support. If the synthesis report does not suggest the possibility of significant changes to the CSO program, this Panel would not be convened.

These items appear to be discretionary. These elements are further described in the issue paper prepared for SCA by the King County Wastewater Treatment Division Attachment B. PIC members are encouraged to provide feedback regarding the necessity of these additional items.

**Attachments**

A. [King County Staff Report and Scope of Work for Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study](#)

B. [Revised Draft Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study; June 28, 2013](#)
SUBJECT:

A MOTION approving a scope of work for a water quality assessment and monitoring study.

SUMMARY:

Ordinance 17413 which approved the amendment to the King County’s long-term combined sewer overflow (“CSO”) control plan also authorized the Executive to implement a water quality assessment and monitoring study in Section 2 of the ordinance.

The assessment and monitoring study is intended to provide information on how CSO control can work in conjunction with other water quality projects, identify opportunities to lower the cost of CSO control, evaluate the effectiveness of emerging technologies, and build a foundation for conducting post-construction monitoring of CSO control projects. It is also intended to help in deciding whether to pursue an integrated CSO control plan under the EPA Consent Decree. Recommendations that emerge from the assessment may include changes in the sequencing and prioritization of the last seven CSO control projects while meeting the County’s legal obligations to complete all projects by 2030.

BACKGROUND:

In December 2012 committee and Executive staff reviewed with the committee the purpose of the study and the proposed process to develop a work plan (including input from the Regional Water Quality Committee) for this study based on the most recent input from the intergovernmental staff group.

Ordinance 17413 states:

SECTION 2. A. The King County executive is hereby authorized to implement a water quality assessment and monitoring study, consistent with applicable legal requirements, including analysis and value engineering of planned projects to
inform EPA’s integrated planning approach and future CSO control program review with regard to sequencing and prioritization of CSO projects while meeting the county’s state and federal legal obligations to complete required CSO control projects by 2030 and to conform to CSO control regulations in chapter 173-245 WAC.

B. The study should utilize the new EPA integrated planning approach framework to allow integration and sequencing of projects to ensure that investments in CSO control projects are well-planned and timed to optimize water quality improvements in the sub-basins to which King County’s CSOs discharge. Furthermore, the study should emphasize and support value-engineering efforts to refine projects and reduce the costs of constructing CSO infrastructure. This should include opportunities to pursue complementary or combined projects with the city of Seattle or other entities, if it is cost-effective for King County ratepayers.

C. The study shall include:
   1. Analyzing and synthesizing findings from existing studies;
   2. Collecting new information and filling data gaps through additional monitoring and sampling where identified as necessary;
   3. Assessing factors affecting water quality in the sub-basins and water bodies where King County CSOs discharge; and
   4. Recommending integration and sequencing of projects to meet current federal and state water quality standards and improve water quality.

D. The regional water quality committee shall provide policy guidance and specific questions for analysis in the study scope of work.

E. The King County executive shall transmit legislation for approval of a scope of work for the study and its cost, consistent with the direction of this ordinance, including a transparent and inclusive stakeholder process. Where appropriate, participation by federal, state, tribal and regional environmental leaders shall be arranged through executive appointment and confirmation by the King County council.

F. The regional water quality committee shall review the recommendations that emerge from the analysis and study.

Since then the intergovernmental staff met with representatives of WTD and Water and Land Resources to discuss and suggest refinements to the work program for the water quality assessment and monitoring program.

**ANALYSIS:**

The proposed legislation approves a scope of work for the water quality assessment and monitoring study. The scope is not detailed but provides a summary of the main elements of the work plan and a tentative schedule for the work and involvement of an advisory science panel and other stakeholders.

The main elements of the scope of work and timeframes for their completion are as follows:
Schedule and Scope

- **2013:** Review and analyze the large amount of existing scientific and technical data on impairments, defined as water quality-related concerns, in receiving waters where uncontrolled county CSOs discharge (e.g., the Ship Canal, Duwamish River, and Elliot Bay); the sources of impairments; and planned and potential corrective actions.

- **2013 - 2016:** Provide venues for stakeholders to be engaged throughout the process.

- **2014 - 2015:** Conduct targeted data gathering and monitoring, as necessary, to fill identified gaps in scientific data on water quality in these receiving waters.

- **2015:** Analyze, synthesize, and summarize scientific and technical data collected and reviewed during the assessment and produce a comprehensive synthesis report.

- **2016:** Make recommendations on (1) the sequencing and integration of CSO control projects and other corrective actions, and (2) additional means, such as coordinating projects with the City of Seattle, to increase the effectiveness and reduce the costs of controlling all County CSOs by 2030.

The Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) will take lead responsibility for completing the assessment. The Water and Land Resources Division will be enlisted to perform the scientific and technical work.

Advisory Groups
Advice and recommendations will be made by an Executive’s Advisory Panel to the King County Executive and Council. These two groups are proposed to provide independent review. The groups and their roles are as follows:

- **The Scientific and Technical Review Team** will consist of approximately five independent technical experts in water quality science, stormwater, and wastewater management who will review scientific methodologies and findings.

- **The Executive’s Advisory Panel** composed of approximately 10 regional leaders with a variety of perspectives and expertise will provide advice and make recommendations based on assessment findings, regional values, and interested party input. Members will be appointed by the King County Executive and confirmed by the County Council in 2015, as described below.

Questions to be Addressed by the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study
Of particular interest to RWQC members where what questions this assessment would address. The questions proposed to be addressed by the assessment and monitoring study are contained in Exhibit B of the Scope of Work. These questions are broken into two categories, those addressed during data gathering and analysis and the second set that would be addressed during a ‘recommendations phase’ of the work program.

**Data gathering and analysis questions:**

1. What are the existing and projected water quality impairments in receiving waters (water bodies) where King County CSOs discharge?
2. How do County CSOs contribute to the identified impairments?
3. How do other sources contribute to the identified impairments?
4. What activities are planned through 2030 that could affect water quality in the receiving waters?
5. How can CSO control projects and other planned or potential corrective actions be most effective in addressing the impairments?

6. How do various alternative sequences of CSO control projects integrated with other corrective actions compare in terms of cost, schedule, and effectiveness in addressing impairments?

7. What other possible ways, such as coordinating projects with the City of Seattle and altering the design of planned CSO control projects, could make CSO control projects more effective and/or help reduce the costs to WTD and the region of completing all CSO control projects by 2030?

Questions to develop recommendations:

1. What regional values, priorities, and objectives should be considered when sequencing CSO control and other corrective actions? (examples: saving money, maximizing water quality improvements, expediting CSO control project completion, equity and social justice)

2. What is the best way to sequence CSO control projects and integrate them with other corrective actions to meet these regional values, priorities, and objectives?

Cost of Study
The Scope of Work for this assessment notes that the final cost estimate for the study will vary depending on the assessment of available data and the data needed to fill identified gaps. The current cost estimate for the technical work and project management component is $2,250,000; however, WTD and WLRD staff expect to refine the cost estimate in the early phases of the assessment once it has been determined if additional sampling and data analysis is needed. However, the cost for the technical work, project management and the stakeholder and expert review process will not exceed $5 million for the life of the assessment.

REASONABLENESS:
Proposed Motion 2013-0260 meets the intent of Ordinance 17413 by providing a scope of work for the water quality assessment and monitoring study to be conducted as a part of the Combined Sewer Overflow Program. There is not a lot of specificity to the work program. However, the Executive has pledged to be transparent with regard to carrying out the assessment, therefore as the work plan is carried out or develops more specificity, the RWQC and other stakeholders can informed.

The scope of work notes that:
WTD will also provide opportunities for other interested parties to review and provide input. Interested parties are residents, businesses, environmental organizations, elected officials, local sewer utilities, and technical staff from government agencies who want to stay informed and provide input to the assessment. They will have opportunities for involvement during all phases of the assessment, including the recommendations phase. There will be additional effort to collaborate with jurisdictions in the assessment area.
Given the nature of the assessment, this scope appears to adequately describe the intent of the assessment, questions to be addressed and general activities to be accomplished. However, should the RWQC have additional questions or revisions to the proposed questions included in the scope – this should be addressed at this time. Looking to the future, RWQC should also be briefed at regular intervals to stay abreast of the assessment activities and information/data being gathered.

When there are opportunities for additional stakeholder input, RWQC should be briefed and invited to participate providing input either as a committee – or with members participating in other forums.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Proposed Motion 2013-0260, with attachments
Scope of Work for Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study
For comments or questions, contact:

Pam Elardo, P.E.
Division Director, King County Wastewater Treatment Division
201 South Jackson Street
KSC-NR-0501
Seattle, WA 98104-3856
206-684-1236
pam.elardo@kingcounty.gov

This information is available in alternative formats on request at 206-684-1280 (voice) or 711 (TTY).
Introduction

On Sept. 17, 2012, the King County Council, through Ordinance 17413, approved an amendment to the County’s long-term combined sewer overflow (CSO) control plan. The approved plan includes construction of nine capital projects to control the remaining 14 uncontrolled CSOs to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) standard.\(^1\) Completion of the projects will meet the Ecology and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirement that all King County CSOs be controlled by 2030. The planning-level cost estimate to complete the amended long-term CSO control plan is $711 million (2010 dollars).

Section 2 of Ordinance 17413 authorizes the County Executive to conduct a water quality assessment and monitoring study (assessment) to help ensure that investments in CSO control optimize water quality improvements in the sub-basins where CSOs discharge. Results of the assessment will inform the next CSO control program review.

The assessment will provide information on how CSO control can work in conjunction with other water quality projects, identify opportunities to lower the cost of CSO control, evaluate the effectiveness of emerging technologies, and build a foundation for conducting post-construction monitoring of CSO control projects. It will also help in deciding whether to pursue an integrated CSO control plan under the EPA Consent Decree. Recommendations that emerge from the assessment may include changes in the sequencing and prioritization of the last seven CSO control projects while meeting the County’s legal obligations to complete all projects by 2030.

Scope of Work and Cost to Complete the Assessment

The project team plans to complete the assessment in 2016 so that information can be considered during the next CSO control program review, scheduled to be submitted to the Council in 2017.

The scope of work closely follows the elements listed in Section 2C of Ordinance 17413; fulfills the requirement in Section 2E that the assessment include a transparent and inclusive stakeholder process; and reflects guidance from the Regional Water Quality Committee, per Section 2D of the ordinance.

Additional information can be found at:

- The County’s long-term CSO control plan:
- Exhibit A of this scope of work - Section 2 of King County Ordinance 17413 Authorizing the Executive to Implement a Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study
- Exhibit B of this scope of work – Questions to be Addressed by the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study

\(^1\) Ecology’s standard for CSO control is an average of one untreated discharge per CSO outfall per year based on a 20-year moving average.
Elements of the Scope of Work

The main elements of the scope of work and timeframes for their completion are as follows:

- Review and analyze the large amount of existing scientific and technical data on impairments, defined as water quality-related concerns, in receiving waters where uncontrolled county CSOs discharge (e.g., the Ship Canal, Duwamish River, and Elliot Bay); the sources of impairments; and planned and potential corrective actions. 2013
- Provide venues for stakeholders to be engaged throughout the process. 2013–2016
- Conduct targeted data gathering and monitoring, as necessary, to fill identified gaps in scientific data on water quality in these receiving waters. 2014–2015
- Analyze, synthesize, and summarize scientific and technical data collected and reviewed during the assessment and produce a comprehensive synthesis report. 2015
- Make recommendations on (1) the sequencing and integration of CSO control projects and other corrective actions, and (2) additional means, such as coordinating projects with the City of Seattle, to increase the effectiveness and reduce the costs of controlling all County CSOs by 2030. 2016

The Water and Land Resources Division will perform the scientific and technical work. Advice and recommendations will be made by an Executive’s Advisory Panel to the King County Executive and Council as described below. The Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) will take lead responsibility for completing the assessment.

Transparent and Inclusive Stakeholder Process

Stakeholder involvement began in fall 2012 to help develop the questions to be addressed in the assessment and help shape the stakeholder process. As a starting point for developing a list of stakeholders, WTD began with those parties who had expressed interest in the CSO plan update process that concluded in September 2012. There is a wide range of stakeholders and WTD is planning additional effort to identify stakeholder groups. Input from our stakeholders thus far has emphasized the importance of maintaining communication and seeking independent review throughout the assessment.

To achieve these objectives, two main groups will provide independent review. The groups and their roles are as follows:

- The Scientific and Technical Review Team will consist of approximately five independent technical experts in water quality science, stormwater, and wastewater management who will review scientific methodologies and findings.
- The Executive’s Advisory Panel, composed of approximately 10 regional leaders with a variety of perspectives and expertise will provide advice and make recommendations based on assessment findings, regional values, and interested party input. Members will
be appointed by the King County Executive and confirmed by the County Council in 2015.

WTD will also provide opportunities for other interested parties to review and provide input. Interested parties are residents, businesses, environmental organizations, elected officials, local sewer utilities, and technical staff from government agencies who want to stay informed and provide input to the assessment. They will have opportunities for involvement during all phases of the assessment, including the recommendations phase. There will be additional effort to collaborate with jurisdictions in the assessment area.

**Study Cost**

The cost estimate for the water quality assessment and monitoring study will vary depending on the assessment of available data and the data needed to fill identified gaps. The current cost estimate for the technical work and project management component is $2,250,000; however, the cost estimate will be refined in the early phases of the assessment once it has been determined if additional sampling and data analysis is needed. Nonetheless, the cost for the technical work, project management and the stakeholder and expert review process will not exceed $5 million for the life of the assessment. This cost estimate covers technical work, project management, and the stakeholder process as described in more detail below:

- **Technical work and project management.** This component will cover the following work: (1) conducting a comprehensive review of existing data, identifying data gaps, and monitoring and modeling to fill data gaps as needed to address the assessment questions, (2) analyzing the impact of CSO control projects and other projects on water quality, schedule, and cost, and (3) preparing the synthesis report described above.

- **Transparent and objective stakeholder and expert review process.** This includes the following activities: (1) communicating with interested parties throughout the process; (2) convening and facilitating the Scientific and Technical Review Team to ensure the assessment’s design and results are scientifically robust; and (3) convening and facilitating the Executive’s Advisory Panel to make recommendations to inform the next CSO control program review.

An equivalent of five employees per year will be engaged on the assessment, consisting of existing or temporary staff. This includes County employees and consultants.
Section 2 of King County Ordinance 17413 Authorizing the Executive to Implement a Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study

SECTION 2. A. The King County executive is hereby authorized to implement a water quality assessment and monitoring study, consistent with applicable legal requirements, including analysis and value engineering of planned projects to inform EPA's integrated planning approach and future CSO control program review with regard to sequencing and prioritization of CSO projects while meeting the county's state and federal legal obligations to complete required CSO control projects by 2030 and to conform to CSO control regulations in chapter 173-245 WAC.

B. The study should utilize the new EPA integrated planning approach framework to allow integration and sequencing of projects to ensure that investments in CSO control projects are well-planned and timed to optimize water quality improvements in the sub-basins to which King County's CSOs discharge. Furthermore, the study should emphasize and support value-engineering efforts to refine projects and reduce the costs of constructing CSO infrastructure. This should include opportunities to pursue complementary or combined projects with the city of Seattle or other entities, if it is cost-effective for King County ratepayers.

C. The study shall include:

1. Analyzing and synthesizing findings from existing studies;
2. Collecting new information and filling data gaps through additional monitoring and sampling where identified as necessary;
3. Assessing factors affecting water quality in the sub-basins and water bodies where King County CSOs discharge; and
4. Recommending integration and sequencing of projects to meet current federal and state water quality standards and improve water quality.
D. The regional water quality committee shall provide policy guidance and specific questions for analysis in the study scope of work.

E. The King County executive shall transmit legislation for approval of a scope of work for the study and its cost, consistent with the direction of this ordinance, including a transparent and inclusive stakeholder process. Where appropriate, participation by federal, state, tribal and regional environmental leaders shall be arranged through executive appointment and confirmation by the King County council.

F. The regional water quality committee shall review the recommendations that emerge from the analysis and study.
Questions to be Addressed by the
Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study

This first set of questions will be addressed during the data gathering and analysis phase of the project:

1. What are the existing and projected water quality impairments in receiving waters (water bodies) where King County CSOs discharge?
2. How do County CSOs contribute to the identified impairments?
3. How do other sources contribute to the identified impairments?
4. What activities are planned through 2030 that could affect water quality in the receiving waters?
5. How can CSO control projects and other planned or potential corrective actions be most effective in addressing the impairments?
6. How do various alternative sequences of CSO control projects integrated with other corrective actions compare in terms of cost, schedule, and effectiveness in addressing impairments?
7. What other possible ways, such as coordinating projects with the City of Seattle and altering the design of planned CSO control projects, could make CSO control projects more effective and/or help reduce the costs to WTD and the region of completing all CSO control projects by 2030?

This second set of questions will be addressed in the recommendations phase of the project:

1. What regional values, priorities, and objectives should be considered when sequencing CSO control and other corrective actions? (examples: saving money, maximizing water quality improvements, expediting CSO control project completion, equity and social justice)
2. What is the best way to sequence CSO control projects and integrate them with other corrective actions to meet these regional values, priorities, and objectives?
Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study

Project Objective
The primary objective of the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study (“WQA” or “assessment”) is to help ensure that the significant investments in Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) control ($711 million) are well-planned and timed to optimize water quality improvements where King County’s CSOs discharge. Specifically, the assessment will:

- identify opportunities to lower the cost of CSO control;
- provide information on how CSO control can work in conjunction with other water quality projects;
- evaluate the effectiveness of emerging technologies (such as green stormwater infrastructure);
- and
- establish baseline conditions for mandatory post-construction monitoring of CSO control projects.

Any new monitoring conducted in order to fill data gaps during the assessment would help establish baseline conditions for County CSO sub-basins now, which will be used for comparison throughout CSO program implementation to 2030; provide information about the overall contribution of CSO’s to existing/current water quality impairments; and help predict water quality outcomes post-CSO project construction.

The assessment will also help inform whether to pursue an integrated CSO control plan under the EPA Consent Decree, and would provide needed information for the plan if a decision is made to pursue it. Recommendations that emerge from the assessment could focus on changes in the composition, sequencing and prioritization of seven of the remaining nine CSO control projects, while maintaining King County’s commitment to complete all projects by 2030.

Project Scope Elements and Initial Cost Estimate
The cost estimate for the Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study ranges from $2.1 million to $3.2 million based on implementation of all scope elements described in Table 1 below. Of this amount, approximately $1.5 million to $2 million covers items required for CSO program reviews, plan updates and project implementation. The additional $620,000 to $1.2 million covers scope items that add value to the existing CSO program and planning efforts, by providing information that could lead to increased water quality outcomes while potentially reducing the cost of delivering the CSO program objectives by 2030. The additional investments also provide for an independent scientific review of the data analysis, as well as an external advisory group that would provide a transparent regional discussion around policy recommendations that could come from the assessment. All cost items include coordinated project management of scope, schedule and budget for the water quality assessment, team coordination and project reporting.

A detailed description of the scope elements and costs are in Table 1 on the next page. The table describes which of the scope elements would already be needed for CSO planning efforts, and those which add value to the program as unique efforts.

---

1 “Integrated Planning” is a new regulatory approach introduced by the Environmental Protection Agency, that allows entities to pursue ways to meet their CSO control obligations simultaneously with other water quality projects, so that water quality improvements can be achieved more quickly and potentially at lower overall cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope Element &amp; Existing Data Review and Analysis</th>
<th>Accomplishes</th>
<th>CSO Project Planning Needs Met</th>
<th>WQA Added Value to CSO Program</th>
<th>Estimated Cost Required for CSO Projects</th>
<th>Estimated Cost for Added WQA Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Literature Search &amp; Existing Data Review and Analysis</td>
<td>Analyzes existing reports and data for impairments in water bodies where CSOs discharge, and the causes (the contribution of CSOs and other sources); reviews existing and planned corrective actions; identifies and summarizes data gaps in understanding the impairments and causes.</td>
<td>This work would need to be conducted for each CSO project anyway to establish baseline water quality conditions as part of post-construction monitoring. This information is also needed for the next CSO program review. The previous CSO planning literature review (for the 2012 Plan Update) was high level to inform prioritization, but did not analyze data comprehensively. This additional literature and data review and analysis allows for characterization of water quality in the receiving waters, against which success of the CSO program will be measured. Detailed analysis increases knowledge of baseline conditions and of each CSO contribution to impairment in receiving waters.</td>
<td>Provides comprehensive review sooner than would be done for individual projects.</td>
<td>$400,000-500,000 (4,500 staff hours over one year if done as part of WQA, or similar level of effort spread over several years if done on project or basin-specific basis for CSO program)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Filling Data Gaps (additional monitoring)</td>
<td>Fills scientific data gaps, as needed, to answer prioritization and benefit enhancement questions.</td>
<td>Monitoring for each of the basins would be needed anyway for post construction monitoring, as well as the next program review. This information would be key to support any future changes to the sequencing of CSO projects.</td>
<td>Provide additional data as needed for baseline and post-construction monitoring for CSO projects. This work also allows a better understanding of water quality impairments where CSOs discharge; and the causes of those impairments.</td>
<td>$360,000-450,000 (3,800 staff hours over 1.5 year period if done as part of WQA, or similar effort done over several years on a project or basin-specific basis for each project)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope Element</td>
<td>CSO Project Planning Needs Met</td>
<td>WQA Added Value to CSO Program</td>
<td>Estimated Cost Required for CSO Projects</td>
<td>Estimated Cost for Added WQA Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Synthesis Report</td>
<td>Answers: How can CSO control projects and other planned/potential actions be integrated to be most effective? How do various actions compare? What other possible actions would help to reduce costs or improve water quality outcomes?</td>
<td>The Synthesis Report would provide information needed to evaluate other means to increase the cost-effectiveness of controlling all county CSOs by 2030. Synthesizes the literature and data search and results of any monitoring project impacts on water quality, and provides information sufficient for WTD to decide whether to pursue integrated planning, or a change in current CSO schedule.</td>
<td>$440,000-550,000</td>
<td>$440,000-550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Science and Technical Review Team (technical experts)</td>
<td>Independent review of scientific data analysis and methods. Responds to KC Auditor’s interest in applying the best science to program decisions. Responds to interested party input emphasizing importance of scientific rigor and independent external review.</td>
<td>Obtains objective, independent and expert input on the scientific and technical analyses and report findings. For every CSO program review, WTD does outreach to regional experts and scientists. Responds to KC Auditor’s interest in applying the best science to program decisions.</td>
<td>$180,000-225,000</td>
<td>$180,000-225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated cost for the Synthesis Report is $440,000 to $550,000, which includes 9,800 staff hours over one year, including 3 water quality analysts, 1 technical writer and project management. Work completed by WLRD staff in-house. The estimated cost for the Science and Technical Review Team is $180,000 to $225,000, which includes 1,800 staff hours over 2.25 years, a $50K consultant contract, and $150K for science team stipends/salary reimbursements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope Element</th>
<th>Accomishes</th>
<th>CSO Project Planning Needs Met</th>
<th>WQA Added Value to CSO Program</th>
<th>Estimated Cost Required for CSO Projects</th>
<th>Estimated Cost for Added WQA Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Executive Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Independent advisory panel, to be appointed by the County Executive but confirmed by the County Council, which would make recommendations to Executive and Council for next CSO Control Program Review. The panel would have facilitation and staff support.</td>
<td>If convened, this group would make recommendations for changes in CSO sequencing or integrated planning. Would ensure any changes to the recommended CSO project sequencing and timing maximize water quality benefits for the region. There would be significant value in having any major policy recommendations come from a transparent regional discussion. If the synthesis report does not suggest the possibility of significant changes to the CSO program, this Panel would not be convened.</td>
<td>$0: Low $225,000: Mid $450,000: High Dependent on level of effort required. (up to 1,800 staff hours over one year; $100-200K consultant cost. Range is dependent on the effort required based on relative significance of recommendations.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outreach to Interested Parties</td>
<td>Provides a transparent stakeholder process, engaging interested parties for input on the scientific study, milestones, interim findings and conclusions.</td>
<td>Outreach to interested parties is a requirement of the CSO program review and plan update process.</td>
<td>The value of the WQA in terms of stakeholder involvement is that it provides a comprehensive review of data and allows for consolidated communication and engagement with interested parties throughout the data gathering process, so there is understanding and support for the findings.</td>
<td>$125,000-250,000 (2,000 staff hours over 3.5 years; less effort if findings and recommendations do not result in significant changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Category Subtotals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.5 million to $2 million</td>
<td>$620,000 to $1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Project Total Estimate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.1 million to $3.2 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Schedule and RWQC Briefing Points

The WQA project has a narrow window to complete the science and technical study and produce a synthesis report to feed into the CSO program review in 2016. Effectively, work needs to be complete on the scientific assessment by the end of 2015. The following schedule illustrates the sequence of work so that the Executive Advisory Panel could deliberate in 2016.

The schedule shows points at which the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) could be briefed during the project. It should be emphasized that in addition to periodic briefings of the technical work, the County Council (and RWQC) will have a role in determining the outcome of the study in late 2015, with its role in approving the Executive Advisory Panel. Any recommendations emerging from the assessment would be made by that body.

Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring Study Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involve interested parties and public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Study questions &amp; Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perform scientific analysis &amp; produce synthesis report (literature search; fill data gaps; complete synthesis report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate Science and Technical Team review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form Executive Advisory Panel</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Advisory Panel recommends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use study results in next CSO control program review to inform 2018 CSO Plan Update</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★ = Potential RWQC Briefing and Stakeholder Outreach points (e.g., workshops)
★ = RWQC and Council Vote
Item 8: Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan Update  
**UPDATE AND FEEDBACK**

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

On April 17, 2013 the SCA Board of Directors adopted the following public policy position:

*SCA requests that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the King County Solid Waste Division review and recommend any appropriate updates to the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.*

The purpose of this agenda item is to update the PIC on progress of the Transfer Station Plan review, and to seek feedback from the PIC on the Division’s proposed course of action.

**Background Information**  
The current Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan provides for construction or reconstruction of five transfer facilities to support the capacity, service, and operational needs of the waste system into the future: Shoreline, Bow Lake, Factoria, Northeast, and South. Shoreline and Bow Lake have been built and are in operation and Factoria is scheduled to begin construction in mid-2014. The South Transfer Station is in the environmental review stage and the Northeast Station is in the beginning planning stages.

*The 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan* was approved by the King County Council in December 2007. Since that time, circumstances have changed due to the economic downturn, and changes in technology. The SCA Board therefore adopted a public policy position requesting that the Division conduct a review of the Plan, and update the Plan as appropriate.

In response to a request for clarification from the Solid Waste Division (SWD), on June 11, 2013 the SCA Board sent a follow up letter to Chris Eggen, Chair of MSWAC and to the SWD.  
(Attachment A)

On July 1, 2013, staff from the SWD and the County Executive’s Office met with SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson and MSWAC Chair Chris Eggen to discuss next steps, and a proposed timeline for Plan review.

The King County Council has now also asked the SWD to review the Plan. At the July 2, 2013 Budget and Fiscal Management (BFM) Committee meeting, the BFM recommended a budget proviso requiring a review of the Plan that is closely aligned with the SCA request for review.
(Attachment B) The full Council is expected to act on this budget proviso at its July 8, 2013 meeting.

At the July 10, 2013 PIC meeting, the PIC will have an opportunity to weigh in on the SWD’s proposed scope of review and timeline. SCA staff is working with County staff to finalize that proposed scope of work and timeline now, and will provide additional documentation to PIC members at or before the July 10, 2013 PIC meeting. SCA staff is also planning a pre-PIC workshop on the Plan review for August.

Attachments

A.  SCA Board of Directors letter to Chris Eggen, Chair of MSWAC, and to the Solid Waste Division
B.  King County Budget and Fiscal Management Committee budget proviso
June 11, 2013

Chris Eggen, Chair
Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee
King County Solid Waste Division
King Street Center 201 S. Jackson Street, Suite 701
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Chair Eggen:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) adopted a policy position in March 2013 requesting review and recommendations for appropriate updates to the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan. Specifically, the policy adopted by SCA was as follows:

SCA requests that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the King County Solid Waste Division review and recommend any appropriate updates to the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.

The Solid Waste Division (SWD) has expressed willingness to review this Plan and has asked for clarification of what SCA would like the review to include.

As you recall, we discussed this matter at our recent Board meeting, and you asked (as Chair of MSWAC) for staff to put together some additional detail to inform this discussion at MSWAC, and with SWD. SCA staff has worked with staff from member cities to assist in this effort.

As you know, SCA’s policy position was informed by the significant reduction in solid waste tonnage and revised 2030 tonnage forecast as a result of the economic recession, as well as a 42% utilization rate of the total capacity of the transfer station system by the time the transfer stations reach the end of their expected useful lives. Three of the transfer stations identified in the Plan have not yet been constructed and therefore we have the opportunity to revisit the assumptions, basis and conclusions of the Plan. We also note the conclusion of negotiations with cities, resulting in an Amended and Re-stated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement. A handful of cities (including the city of Bellevue) have declined to sign onto this new, longer term agreement, and have instead indicated that they will not be a part of the system after 2028. Based on all these factors, the environment within which we are planning for the future, long-term solid waste system has changed considerably since planning began. SCA would therefore like the Plan to be reviewed, and updated as appropriate, to reflect this changed environment.

The “King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects”, completed in September 2011, identifies a number of issues and contains important recommendations that need to be implemented. In addition, the “Independent, Third Party Review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export Plan”, completed in July 2007, notes important items to consider. The review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Management Plan should be informed by the recommendations and ideas contained in both of these documents, including the following items:

- Update system tonnage projections and base these projections on solid waste tonnage from unincorporated King County and cities who have signed the Amended and Re-stated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement and who have committed to participate in the regional solid waste system for the system long-term;
- Review cash flows and revenue from within unincorporated King County and cities that have signed the Amended and Re-stated solid waste Interlocal Agreement and have committed to participate in the regional solid waste system for the system long-term. Such a review should also be included as updated financial policies will be developed in the latter half of 2013;
- Include cost as a transfer station evaluation criteria and conduct cost analysis for system configuration alternatives, including full cost per ton and facility-specific cost metrics;
- Evaluate costs for the full range of functionality at the transfer station system, including compaction costs per transfer station and cost to serve self-haulers at each transfer station;
- Evaluate transfer station system utilization by the time the transfer stations reach the end of their expected useful lives;
- Evaluate the 19 Evaluation Criteria for transfer stations, including adding, removing, or changing the criteria, and evaluate the outcome of potential changes to the criteria;
  - Specifically evaluate and review changes to Evaluation Criteria #1, “90 percent of the users of a facility to be within 30 minutes travel time” and evaluate different time thresholds, including between 30 - 40 minutes travel time
- Audit Recommendation #4, SWD should provide county policy-makers and regional partners systematic analysis of the incremental cost impacts of the number and capacities of the transfer stations, the functionalities of the stations, and an assessment of which project financing and delivery method is most likely to result in lower capital costs

In light of the considerable work conducted by the King County Auditor from their Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects, and ongoing work by the County Auditor’s Capital Project Oversight Program, which includes oversight of the Factoria transfer station capital project, we recommend that the King County Auditor work with the Solid Waste Division to conduct this review of the solid waste system and the issues identified above.

Furthermore, the County may wish to consider re-engaging Gershmans, Brickner and Bratton (GBB), who conducted the Independent Third-Party Review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, to provide independent recommendations for the optimal, cost-effective and efficient solid waste system to meet the needs of King County and its’ partners for the next fifty years.

SCA looks forward to working with the County on this important and timely update to the Solid Waste Transfer and Management Plan. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of SCA, and your leadership as Chair of MSWAC.

Sincerely,

Denis Law
President, Sound Cities Association
Mayor, City of Renton

Cc: SCA Board of Directors
SCA Public Issues Committee
Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee
Pat McLaughlin, Division Director, King County Solid Waste Division
Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, King County Solid Waste Division
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, King County Solid Waste Division
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks Director
P1 PROVIDED THAT:

A. Of the appropriation for CIP project 1048385, Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station, no more than $750,000 shall be expended or encumbered after the effective date of this legislation and before the division completes a review and report on the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan, and the council accepts the review and report by adoption of the motion by the council. The review and report shall address, at a minimum:

1. Tonnage projections, to be based on waste volumes from cities that have indicated commitment to the regional solid waste system through 2040, through approval of the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement;

2. Revenue projections, to be based on waste volumes from cities that have indicated commitment to the regional solid waste system through 2040, through approval of the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement;

3. Overall costs of the region-wide transfer station upgrade;

4. Functionality and service alternatives at the respective transfer stations;

5. Level of service criteria addressed in the 2006 plan, with particular attention to options for revision to the travel time criterion in the plan, which requires that ninety percent of a station's users be within thirty minutes' travel time;

6. Retention and repair of the existing transfer station, pending further clarification of long-term tonnage circumstances; and

7. The recommendation 4 of the King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects, which requires systematic analysis of incremental cost impacts of the number, capacities and functionality of the transfer stations and assessment of project financing and delivery methods.
B. The division shall undertake and complete this review and report, with the participation of the metropolitan solid waste management advisory committee and the solid waste advisory committee, by October 17, 2013. The executive shall file the report required by this proviso, together with a motion providing for acceptance of the report, in the form of a paper original and electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff and the lead staffs of the budget and fiscal management committee and the transportation, economy and environment committee or their successors.
Item 9:
2014 Preliminary Draft Work Program and Budget
Flood Control District Advisory Committee

Discussion Item

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

SCA King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee Members:
Members Appointed by SCA: Lake Forest Park Councilmember Bob Lee (SCA Caucus Chair); Covington Councilmember Marilla Mhoon (SCA Caucus Vice Chair); Kirkland Mayor Joan McBride; Algona Councilmember Bill Thomas; Duvall Mayor Will Ibershof (alternate); Maple Valley Deputy Mayor Victoria Laise Jonas (alternate); Mercer Island Councilmember Mike Cero (alternate); Federal Way Councilmember Susan Honda (alternate).

SCA member cities with their own individual seats: Carnation Mayor Jim Berger; Kent Mayor Suzette Cooke, Tukwila Mayor Jim Haggertion, North Bend Mayor Ken Hearing; Snoqualmie Mayor Matt Larson, Renton Mayor Denis Law, Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis.

This item is continuation of the PIC discussion that occurred on June 12, 2013. The King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee reviews and recommends an annual work program and budget for the district, including capital improvement program projects and funding levels. A report must be transmitted to the Flood Control District Board by August 31, 2013.

At the last Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) meeting the committee had its first briefing on the 2014 Preliminary Draft Work Program and Budget. SCA caucus members requested feedback from the PIC regarding any specific areas of concern included in 2014 draft preliminary budget and work program.

SCA staff has requested that members share the following list of questions from slide 19 (Attachment A), presented at the May 30, 2013 Flood Control District Advisory Committee meeting, with city environmental staff in advance of the July 10, 2013 PIC meeting. Please come to the PIC with any additional feedback for the SCA KCFCDAC Caucus.

Background

The King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC) is charged with “providing the King County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors with expert policy advice on regional flood protection issues, including annual recommendations on the District’s work
program and budget.” (Ordinance 2006-0334) Ten cities (Tukwila, Auburn, Kent, Renton, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Carnation, Seattle and Bellevue) have their own permanent seats on the KCFCDAC. The remaining 29 cities in the county are represented by 4 members and 4 alternate members who are appointed by SCA. The Advisory Committee addresses policy priorities for district funding.

At the June 12, 2012 meeting of the PIC, SCA staff requested that members share a list of questions from slide 19 (Attachment A) presented at the May 30, 2013 Flood Control District Advisory Committee meeting with city staff prior to the July meeting of the PIC. These questions will help SCA caucus members address key policy issues the Advisory Committee has been debating this past year.

Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reached out to city staff that regularly attend KCFCDAC meetings, as well as King County Water and Land Resources staff. A memo summarizing the feedback received to date is included as Attachment B.

While reaching out to City and County staff a significant issue surfaced. In recent years, a substantial amount of policy input/direction has been provided to the Board of Supervisors by a Citizens Advisory Committee and the Basin Technical Committees, bypassing the Advisory Committee. City staff have expressed concerns about this process. PIC members are encouraged to provide feedback on this matter in addition to the questions presented in slide 19.

Next Steps
The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be on July 18, 2013. Recommendations will be forwarded to the King County Council with a full explanation of each of the vote categories (pro, con, undecided), so that the Council can derive full benefit from the nature of the debate.

Committee members will review and edit these recommendation submittals prior to their being forwarded to the King County Council. A report must be transmitted to the Flood Control District Board by August 31, 2013.

Attachments

A. Slide 19 – Basin Technical Committee Comments on Preliminary Draft
B. Summary Feedback From Cities/County
BTC Comments on Preliminary Draft

Operating: No concerns identified to date.

Capital:

1. If we are doing a corridor planning effort should we commit funding to specific capital projects in advance of completing the planning effort? Under what circumstances can actions move forward in advance of the larger planning effort?

2. Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time, and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration?
   - If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?

3. Should FEMA accreditation be a policy priority for District funding?

4. Should we have predetermined allocations for each basin from year to year, or adjust the CIP across the entire county?

5. Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?

6. How do we make sure that the CIP reflects the highest priority needs across the county?
MEMO

TO: SCA Public Issues Committee (PIC)
    SCA King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee Members

FROM: Monica Whitman, Senior Policy Analyst

RE: Feedback from the Cities of Auburn, Kent, and Kirkland, and staff from the King County Water Land Resources Division, regarding questions presented to the Basin Technical Committee (slide 19)

DATE: July 3, 2013

At the May 30, 2013 Flood Control District Advisory Committee (FCDAC) meeting, the committee had its first briefing on the 2014 Preliminary Draft Work Program and Budget. SCA caucus members requested feedback from the PIC regarding any specific areas of concern included in 2014 draft preliminary budget and work program. At the June 12, 2012 meeting of the PIC, SCA staff shared questions raised at the May 30, 2013 FCDAC meeting in slide 19 of a PowerPoint presentation, and sought feedback from the PIC. Following the meeting, SCA staff also sought feedback from City and County staff on those questions. The following feedback has been received to date.

Dennis Dowdy the City of Auburn Public Works Director and Mike Mactutis, the City of Kent Environmental Engineering Manager, submitted the following feedback:

1. If we are doing a corridor planning effort should we commit funding to specific capital projects in advance of completing the planning effort? Under what circumstances can actions move forward in advance of the larger planning effort?

There will always be exceptions to the rule; the primary factors that should be considered include the risk of failure if a project is delayed and the severity of consequences if a flood protection structure fails. Regarding structure failure, it is critical to know how much damage is expected, how ready is the project for repair, and if there is local knowledge or studies that make the planning effort redundant. These projects should be brought to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

2. Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration? If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?

New projects should be considered for the CIP when, based on new knowledge, it is apparent that if we do not act, the probability of a flood control feature failing is higher and the
consequences of a failure are significant. The District has already developed scoring criteria by which we evaluate risk. It would seem that we can apply such criteria on an annual basis as our knowledge of the threat allows us to be aware of an increased threat. Some believe we should wait several years for the update of the Comprehensive plan for each basin before adding new projects.

The first priority of the District is to protect the communities where there is flooding. While planning provides a long term perspective on how to invest in long term flood protection measures that are consistent with other district goals, if we know that a structure protecting a community is failing the Technical Committee and Advisory Committee should have an opportunity to consider the project annually, if not sooner.

3. Should FEMA accreditation be a policy priority for District funding?

Yes, certification & accreditation should be a goal for each flood control structural improvements where it is feasible to meet the FEMA certification requirements and obtain accreditation. The ramifications of non-accreditation in many urban areas makes this a non-question. The levees in these areas must be accredited to maintain economic viability and be able to survive. There are questions about long term safety and education of the public, and those can be addressed as well. Abandonment of regional residential and commercial centers should not be the option due to long term risk. There are other greater risks to our region, such as earthquakes, which are dealt with through higher design standards, education and emergency preparation.

The District has already made some commitments to designing and constructing repairs to meet federal safety standards and be able to be accredited. Due to the Flood District’s lead role in operation and maintenance of levees, it is reasonable for the District to assume the role of maintenance of accreditation status where it is deemed appropriate.

4. Should we have predetermined allocations for each basin from year to year, or adjust the CIP across the entire county?

Suggest we keep it simple – this could distract from the mission of the district. It may be appropriate to review the districts mission statement and include “Flood protection based on a risk based assessment”.

5. Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?

Not necessary.

6. How do we make sure that the CIP reflects the highest priority needs across the county?
County staff have developed the project list and scoring based upon the existing district criteria. However, it has not been reviewed by Basin Technical Committees for several years and many projects have not been scored at all. Basin technical staff should review the scoring for quality control and equitable considerations for presentation to the Advisory Committee. To get started we should first review the capital project scoring criteria with the Advisory Committee to assure we have agreement & consensus. Projects should then have their scoring done or updated and reviewed by the Technical Committees.

Jenny Gaus, Senior Surface Water Utility Engineer, from the City of Kirkland submitted the following feedback:

Kirkland’s views are more closely aligned with the views expressed by King County staff. Green River Basin cities may have opinions different from other cities on these issues.

Brian Murray from the King County Water Resources Division, River and Floodplain Management Section, submitted the following feedback:

1. **If we are doing a corridor planning effort should we commit funding to specific capital projects in advance of completing the planning effort? Under what circumstances can actions move forward in advance of the larger planning effort?**

Based on materials provided at the May 30 meeting, the preliminary draft recommendations for the 2014-9 CIP allocates funds toward implementation of corridor plans while also moving forward on construction of projects based on consequence, severity, and urgency. As an example: while there is funding for SWIF implementation, there is also funding for the Green River to construct the Briscoe floodwall in Kent (2013), Upper Russell secondary levee in Kent (2013-4), the Black River Pump Station in Renton (multi-year beginning in 2014), the Reddington Levee in Auburn (2013), as well as funding to address structural deficiencies identified by the Corps of Engineers at Horseshoe Bend in Kent (2013-4). Within the Snoqualmie basin, funding for Tolt levee construction is in 2016 following completion of the corridor study, while critical revetment repairs necessary to protect a regional water supply line and a state highway are scheduled for construction in 2014 (Sinnema Quaale) and 2015 (Winkelman).

King County staff were instructed by the District to inform the Advisory Committee that these are policy questions that have yet to be specifically considered by the Board, and answers to these questions will not be available in time to guide recommendations on the 2014 budget.

2. **Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration? If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?**
The King County Water and Land Resources Division were directed to not solicit new project proposals for 2014, and that new projects should come out of planning efforts rather than the budget process. This direction was received on March 26, 2013 and shared with the Basin Technical Committees at their joint meeting on April 3, 2013. The preliminary draft CIP recommendations reflect new information about flood risks – that is why the Dutchman Revetment is proposed for the CIP on the lower Snoqualmie, for example, and it is also why funding is included at Horseshoe Bend even though the levee has received conditional accreditation by FEMA for insurance mapping purposes.

Regarding Coastal Flooding, the Board has identified this as a policy issue and received comments from the Citizen Committee. King County staff were instructed by the District to inform the Advisory Committee that these are policy questions that have yet to be specifically considered by the Board, and answers to these questions will not be available in time to guide recommendations on the 2014 budget.

3. Should FEMA accreditation be a policy priority for District funding?

The Board has previously (2011, via motion FCD11-02) adopted a policy statement regarding District support for FEMA accreditation. The policy describes the conditions under which the District will take on the long-term operations and maintenance responsibility necessary for levee certification and FEMA accreditation. To date, levee certification for FEMA insurance mapping purposes has not been established as a policy priority for construction funding, although the project evaluation criteria do currently include regional economic benefits. The Board has identified FEMA accreditation as a policy issue and requested Citizen Committee input. This policy question will be considered by the Board.


For the Green River, FEMA accreditation and the appropriate level of service for levee design is also part of the scope for the System-Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF).

King County staff were instructed by the District to inform the Advisory Committee that these are policy questions that have yet to be specifically considered by the Board, and answers to these questions will not be available in time to guide recommendations on the 2014 budget.

4. Should we have predetermined allocations for each basin from year to year, or adjust the CIP across the entire county?
Since the formation of the District priorities have been evaluated across the county, without predetermined allocations for individual basins. Any project under-expenditures are assumed to return to the overall fund balance to meet countywide needs, rather than being reserved for a specific basin. King County staff were instructed by the District to inform the Advisory Committee that these are policy questions that have yet to be specifically considered by the Board, and answers to these questions will not be available in time to guide recommendations on the 2014 budget.

5. **Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?**

No response

6. **Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration? If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?**

WRLD staff a back ground paper (link [http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/flooding/flood-hazard-mgmt-plan-update-2012/issue-paper-capital-project-prioritization-06-12-12.pdf](http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/flooding/flood-hazard-mgmt-plan-update-2012/issue-paper-capital-project-prioritization-06-12-12.pdf)) which was considered by the Citizen Committee on this subject. In 2012, as part of the scope of work for the Flood Plan update, the King County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors directed King County to prepare a number of issue papers to facilitate potential policy development on a number of topics including Capital Project Prioritization. The attached issue paper was presented to the Citizens Committee. The Citizens Committee was established to serve as a "sounding board at key milestones" during the flood plan update. Members were identified by the King County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors and included floodplain property owners as well as professionals in the field of floodplain management. This policy question will be considered by the Board.
Item 10a:
Transportation 2040 Update - Decision Point B
PSRC Transportation Policy Board

*Informational Item*

---

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

**PSRC Transportation Policy Board Members**
Renton Councilmember Rich Zwicker (SCA Caucus Chair / alternate); Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen (SCA Caucus Vice Chair / alternate); Federal Way Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge; Sammamish Councilmember Don Gerend; Algona Mayor Dave Hill; Kirkland Councilmember Amy Walen (alternate).

**PSRC Executive Board Members**
Algona Mayor Dave Hill (SCA Caucus Chair); Duvall Mayor Will Ibershof; Redmond Mayor John Marchione; Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis (alternate); SeaTac Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson (alternate); Covington Councilmember Marlla Mhoon (alternate); Sammamish Councilmember Don Gerend (2nd alternate). SCA cities with their own seats: Kent Mayor Suzette Cooke; Renton Mayor Denis Law; Kirkland Mayor Joan McBride; Federal Way Mayor Skip Priest.

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on Transportation 2040 Plan update process to date. The PSRC Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board will be asked to take action at their July meetings on Decision Point B – Endorse Proposed Plan Strategies/Changes for Analysis. Please forward any comments, questions, or concerns to Monica Whitman monica@soundcities.org.

**Background**

Transportation 2040 was adopted in 2010. PSRC is required by federal law to update the plan every four years. In July, the Transportation Policy Board and the Executive Board will be asked to direct staff to proceed with analysis and preparation of the draft plan. This action is designated as “Decision Point B” of the planning process. Next steps will include analysis of plan scenarios, preparation of a draft plan and environmental document for public review, with a recommendation and approval slated for next spring at the General Assembly.

PSRC has been working with the Regional Staff Committee and the Prioritization Working Group to produce new material since “Decision Point A” (adoption of the scope of work), which was approved in October of 2012.
Decision point B has been characterized a “check in.” PSRC is seeking action from the Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board indicating whether they are comfortable with the plan moving forward. PSRC is working towards adoption of the T2040 update at the General Assembly in the spring of 2014. “Decision Point B” is focused on three core elements of the plan update:

(1) Prioritization;
(2) State of Good Repair – maintaining, preserving, and operating the system; and
(3) Updated Financial Strategy.

The following summary was included in the June 27, 2013 PSRC Executive Board agenda packet (www.psrc.org/assets/9761/EB_Agenda_062713.pdf):

Prioritization – Transportation 2040 directed staff to develop a process for evaluating projects and programs in the plan. Work on this element was coordinated by the Prioritization Working Group, which met 18 times over the past two years. The group was comprised of members from the Transportation and Growth Management Policy Boards, Economic Development District Board, Executive Board, and representatives from the Regional Staff Committee. Staff presented the Prioritization Working Group’s findings and recommendations to the Policy Board in May. In addition, the Regional Staff Committee has provided significant ongoing review and input to developing the Prioritization Framework, including a special meeting on May 31. The proposed prioritization process enables identification of projects that best implement VISION 2040 (see Appendix A of the Prioritization Report for more information about Using VISION 2040 in Decision-Making). The Draft Prioritization Report is here: www.psrc.org/transportation/prioritization.

While not providing the final answer, the prioritization process will inform decision-making using measures selected to assess how well projects implement VISION 2040 goals. Compared to past practices, this proposed decision-informing tool is more comprehensive in evaluating tradeoffs, and it applies to more types of projects and programs. It also is more closely linked to the region’s long-range financial strategy. At your June meeting, staff will provide an update on Prioritization, with a focus on how the prioritization process might be used in the future.

State of Good Repair (Maintain, Preserve, and Operate the system) – To provide oversight and facilitate this effort, staff convened a State of Good Repair Subcommittee which has met on an ad hoc basis since November. This committee has made significant contributions towards the development of methods that better capture future investment needs in four key areas: pavement preservation, stormwater investments, traffic operations and intelligent transportation systems (ITS), and transit capital and operations.
Improvements to the cost estimates for traffic operations, ITS, and pavement preservation more heavily rely on information provided directly by cities and counties. These levels of investment will be tied to future conditions of pavements and ITS/operational needs. Transit needs are also being addressed by using updated cost figures from local and regional transit agencies. This work is ongoing and is being coordinated through the Transportation Operators Committee.

Emphasis has been placed on refining the local stormwater investment need in ways that better reflect new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. This new information will better reflect local planning and assumptions, and will allow PSRC to develop general pavement and ITS scenarios that begin to allow the Board to discuss tradeoffs between investing in infrastructure renewal versus system improvements. The Executive Board will receive an update on State of Good Repair element at its June 27 meeting.

**Updated Financial Strategy** – Initial results of the Updated Financial Strategy show a reduction in forecast future revenue contained in the adopted Transportation 2040 plan. Much of this revenue shortfall is a result of the economic downturn of the past five years. Additional reasons for the shortfall include increased costs associated with the State of Good Repair (maintaining, preserving and operating) of the system, updated project costs, new stormwater requirements, and updates to the project list. The Sound Transit program experienced a significant decrease in anticipated revenues.

The updated financial strategy is being prepared with the help of the Regional Staff Committee and the Finance Working Group (comprised of board members and key staff from member agencies). Because the cost of State of Good Repair is large (approximately 50% of the plan cost), the financial strategy is being coordinated closely with the State of Good Repair element. In addition, the financial strategy work is being coordinated with the Transportation Operators Committee, which represents the region’s transit agencies.

Transportation 2040 Prioritization may also be used as part of the Financial Strategy Update. The newly developed Prioritization Scorecard Report contains information about how well projects implement VISION 2040. This information may be used as a method for identifying projects in Transportation 2040 to move to the un-programmed portion of the plan in order to balance the financially constrained portion of the plan.

The region’s transit agencies have endured the recession by implementing fare increases, staff cuts, and service reductions. Today’s transit agencies have a very different view of the future than they did five years ago. One additional cost savings that has been implemented by transit operators is to limit operating costs growth to inflation. This represents significant cost savings when compared with estimates contained in the adopted Transportation 2040 plan.
At this time it appears that the net reduction of revenues in the financial strategy is approximately $10 billion to $11 billion. This includes the cost increases described above as well as savings associated with adjustments to the transit costs. In the short term, staff will be examining possible scenarios for how to balance the financial strategy. Between now and late fall, staff will continue to work with the boards to complete the Financial Strategy for the Draft Plan, scheduled to be released for public comment in December.