Pre - PIC Workshop 6:00 PM
King County Strategic Plan Update – Help Shape the future of King County
SCA will be joined by Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, King County Executive’s Office; Michael Jacobson, Deputy Director of Performance and Strategy; and Megan Eliot, Strategic Plan Public Engagement Project Manager

1. Welcome and Roll Call – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac - Chair

2. Public Comment – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac

3. Approval of minutes – September 11, 2013 meeting
   Page 4

4. Chair’s Report – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac 5 minutes

5. Executive Director’s Report – Deanna Dawson, SCA 8 minutes

   ACTION ITEM
   Doreen Booth, SCA
   Kenmore Mayor David Baker, SCA Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Representative
   Page 32
   (5 minute update, 15 minute discussion)

7. Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review Update
   POTENTIAL FUTURE ACTION ITEM
   Deanna Dawson and Doreen Booth, SCA
   Page 42
   (5 minute update, 25 minute discussion)

8. Informational Items
   a) 2014 proposed budget – King County
      Page 47
9. Upcoming Events
   a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – Wednesday, November 13, Kirkland
   b) Next SCA Woman’s Leadership Breakfast – 7:30AM Puget Sound Skills Center - Burien
   c) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
      • Annual Meeting - Wednesday, November 20, 2013 5:30 PM Tukwila Embassy Suites

10. For the Good of the Order

11. Adjourn

---

Did You Know?

Over 5,000 unaccompanied youth and young adults in King County experience homelessness every year. On any given night, as many as 100 youth are sleeping in parks, abandoned buildings or under bridges. The *Comprehensive Plan to Prevent and End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness in King County* will seek to prevent and end youth homelessness in King County.

The plan represents a countywide community effort to create a more coordinated response system to help homeless young people – quickly connecting them back with family when it is safe and appropriate to do so, or providing connections to safe housing. Prevention and early intervention, safe housing, education and employment, and support with physical and emotional wellbeing are all key elements in the effort to reach and help homeless youth. The plan was developed as part of the Homeless Youth and Young Adult Initiative, an investment priority of the Committee to End Homelessness in King County.

The plan proposes the implementation of five priority action steps over the next 18 months, all of which are designed to bring about a measurable impact on youth homelessness. Implementing these priority action steps will require additional resources of approximately $1,470,000 over 18 months. The plan envisions a collaborative effort to identify funding from both public and private sources moving forward.

The Committee to End Homelessness Governing Board plan will be asked to formally endorse the plan at their November 20, 2013 meeting. For more information on the *Comprehensive Plan to Prevent and End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness in King County* contact Megan Gibbard megan.gibbard@kingcounty.gov or 206-263-2974.

[www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/ServicesAndPrograms/Programs/Homeless/HomelessYouthandYoungAdults.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/socialservices/Housing/ServicesAndPrograms/Programs/Homeless/HomelessYouthandYoungAdults.aspx).
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 7:01 p.m. 26 cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: Robin Mayhew, PSRC; Don Davidson, Bellevue; Maria Wood, Board of Health; Diane Carlson, King County; Kimberly Matej, Tukwila; Scott MacColl, Shoreline; Kevin Kiernan, King County Solid Waste; Charles Prestrud, WSDOT.

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 August 14, 2013 Minutes
Dave Hill, Algona moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the August 14, 2013 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chair’s Report
Chair Gregerson congratulated Representative Tana Senn, Mercer Island on her appointment to the Washington State 41st Legislative District.

Chair Gregerson also talked briefly about the ongoing work of the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) legislative committees and subcommittees. Gregerson encouraged members to get involved in AWC’s 2014 session policy planning www.awcnet.org/LegislativeAdvocacy/Legislativeissues.

5. Executive Director’s Report
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, requested that attendees take a moment of silence, in remembrance of September 11, 2001.

ED Dawson informed members that King County Councilmember Larry Gossett is recovering from a minor stroke. Dawson asked members to please keep Councilmember Gossett in their thoughts.

ED Dawson congratulated Representative Tana Senn on her appointment to the 41st District.
ED Dawson provided an update on the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) item from last month’s PIC. Four of the five SCA approved caveats for the Water Quality Assessment were included in the adopted motion and scope of work for the assessment. The fifth caveat, the cost benefit analysis, was addressed through a separate motion, unanimously approved, requesting it to be considered as part of the RWQC’s 2014 work plan.

ED Dawson distributed a handout from Washington Engage (Attachment B). Washington Engage is a coalition formed to prevent human trafficking in Washington State. They are hosting a summit on Saturday, October 5, at Seattle Pacific University. Washington Engage is looking for members and/or cities to sign onto a letter of support to eradicate human trafficking in our communities.

ED Dawson reminded members that SCA is compiling a list of upcoming ballot measures and levies for 2013/2014. Members were asked to send information to Monica Whitman at monica@soundcities.org.

ED Dawson provided an update on the King Conservation District (KCD). An email was forwarded to members (Attachment C) listing the City of Redmond’s feedback. The City of Snoqualmie responded as well, in support of Redmond’s comments. Cities are encouraged to provide additional feedback to members of the KCD Conservation Panel: (Councilmember Chris Eggen, Shoreline; Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila; Councilmember Jim Berger, Carnation) and/or staff serving on the KCD Task Force (Scott McCall, Shoreline; Carolyn Robertson, Auburn; Nicole Sanders, Snoqualmie), and to cc SCA staff on any feedback.

ED Dawson reported that the Senate Transportation Committee will be hosting two upcoming public forums: Tuesday, Sept. 17 in Bellevue at Stevenson Elementary School 6:00-9:00 PM and Monday, Oct. 14 at the King County Courthouse 6:00-9:00 PM.

Nomination forms for 2014 Regional Boards and Committees have been released. ED Dawson encouraged members to apply; there are a number of open seats in 2014. Dawson briefly explained how the process works. Applications are reviewed by the PIC Nominating Committee, which is comprised of one representative from each SCA Caucus (South, North, South Valley, and Snoqualmie Valley). The PIC Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors in making appointments. Dawson noted that there are a number of committee vacancies in the South this year. There will also be vacancies from the South on the SCA Board of Directors. The PIC will be appointing a new Vice Chair as well. Dawson encouraged members to begin attending committee and caucus meetings that they may be interested in applying for. Members were also encouraged to reach out to SCA staff if they have any questions regarding boards and committees.

ED Dawson reported that SCA staff is recommending to the Board that member dues assessments not be increased this year.
ED Dawson invited members to come by and see SCA’s newly remodeled office space, and meet with SCA staff and Board at SCA’s Open House on Wednesday, September 18, 2013 11:30 AM – 1:30 PM. All are welcome.

6. PIC Nominating Committee Recommendation
Hank Margeson, Redmond moved, seconded by Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, to appoint Mayor David Baker, Kenmore to the PSAP Recommendations Committee.

Mayor Lewis, Auburn, inquired about SCA’s representation on the Puget Sound Emergency Radio Network (PSERN). SCA staff offered to follow-up.

The motion passed unanimously.

Please note: As a follow-up, SCA staff reached out to Marlin Blizinsky, Government Relations Officer for King County Radio Communications. Blizinsky responded that SCA does not have an appointed representative on this committee. SCA cities are directly or indirectly represented (customers of one of the entities) on PSERN by either EPSCA, King County (King County contract cities) or ValleyCom. Representation includes: Fred Jarrett (Chair), King County; Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis, ValleyCom; Councilmember Mercer Island City Manager Rich Conrad, EPSCA; Bill Kehoe, Chief Information Officer, King County; Erin DeVoto, Chief Technology Officer, Seattle.

7. Support for Sound Transit 145th Street Station – City of Shoreline
Dave Hill, Algona moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the following public policy position:

The Sound Cities Association urges the Sound Transit Board to support the City of Shoreline’s preferred alternative for Lynnwood Link Extension light rail station locations at NE 145th Street and NE 185th Street. NE 145th street provides better connections throughout the region, is more closely aligned with Shoreline’s long term planning goals, and would prevent negative traffic impacts on Shoreline residents.

Chris Roberts, Shoreline reported that the Seashore Transportation Forum also took a position in support of a station at NE 145th Street.

The motion passed. There were two abstentions (Duvall and Covington). The members noted that they wished to abstain due to not being within the Sound Transit district.

8. Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review Update
Kevin Kiernan, Solid Waste Division, gave an overview of the Transfer Plan Review Process. It was noted that the correct date of Workshop #3 is September 27, 10:00 am – 2:30 pm at the Mercer Island Community Center.

The Solid Waste Division is currently conducting a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer Station Plan. Based on that review, the County will determine whether to proceed as proposed in the plan with constructing three additional transfer stations, or whether to
downsize and build fewer stations, and/or, to build smaller stations, and/or stations with fewer services than called for under the current plan. It is anticipated that SCA members may wish to take a position on a preferred alternative at a future PIC meeting. A draft position is not being proposed at this time, as the Solid Waste Division has not yet concluded its review. A draft report is due on October 9, 2013 (the date of the next PIC meeting) and a final report is due to the County Council on November 27, 2013.

Mayor Pete Lewis, Auburn stated that there was discussion regarding the solid waste transfer review plan at the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) earlier in the day. Financial analysis has not been presented at the workshops to date; however, at the August workshop, attendees present, mainly staff, were asked to take a straw poll on their preferred option. Lewis noted that taking a straw poll was premature. The RPC does not want the results of that straw poll to be taken into consideration. He also inquired about why a specific option the RPC requested is not being studied. The SCA RPC caucus requested analysis for transfer stations at Shoreline, Bow Lake and Factoria, with Algona to be used for self-haul and yard waste only, and for Houghton to be closed.

Mayor Lewis also noted that the division should be able to provide comparisons of the cost of fewer stations and more trips versus the costs for more stations (more capital costs) and fewer trips.

On a related matter, Lewis inquired about when the King County Council would be signing the solid waste interlocal agreement (ILA). He reiterated that cities were told there were risks if they didn’t sign. Cities have now been waiting for 7 months for the ILA to be finalized.

Rich Zwicker, Renton, noted Renton is concerned that we’re sending a different message to ratepayers regarding the decision to close or potentially not close transfer stations than what was communicated in 2006.

Penny Sweet, Kirkland, noted that Kirkland is taking action on a position on September 17. She provided Kirkland’s position paper for SCA members; Kirkland’s Position – Transfer Station (Attachment D).

Bernie Talmas noted that at the RPC, caucus members unanimously agreed that the County should proceed with construction of the Factoria Transfer Station.

Chris Roberts noted that some Shoreline councilmembers are reconsidering the City’s decision to sign onto the ILA, given that the County Council has not yet signed the ILA.

Dave Hill recalled that cities were told if they didn’t sign the ILA by a certain date, rates would be higher. He asked whether rates would be higher for Bellevue and other cities that did not sign the amended ILA. He also noted that the Environmental Impact Statement for the Southeast Transfer Stations is due soon.

Please note: Based on feedback from the PIC, Bellevue staff contacted SCA to clarify that Bellevue is currently in contract negotiations with Republic for its local collection only. This...
contract, once finalized, does not extend past 2028 and does not include any services for disposal of solid waste beyond local collection only.

9. **Product Stewardship Policy – Local Hazardous Waste Management Program**

Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst, provided an overview of the proposed Product Stewardship Policy:

*The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.*

The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program’s mission is to protect and enhance public health and environmental quality in King County by reducing the threat posed by the production, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials. LHWMP works with residents and businesses throughout King County to: (1) Reduce the production (upstream) of toxics and hazardous products and to promote stewardship of those products by their manufacturers. (2) Reduce the use of, and properly store, toxics and other hazardous products. (3) Ensure the proper disposal of toxics and hazardous waste.

Toxic and hazardous materials are found in a number of consumer products; the focus for SCA in this proposed policy statement is on products that contain toxic and hazardous materials and are at the end of their useful life and require disposal.

There was a robust discussion around the wording of the proposed position. While the proposed policy position states that SCA supports “requiring” manufacturers to handle the disposal of their products at the end of their useful life, some members suggested SCA should instead be working collaboratively with manufacturers. Some members also questioned whether SCA should be out in front on this issue, and/or whether SCA should be adopting a blanket position with regards to all products rather than focusing on a specific product (such as paint). Other members felt that the manufacturers have an obligation to provide opportunities for the safe recycling and/or disposal of their products. They were concerned about watering down the position. In the end, the PIC voted to bring back the proposed policy as drafted for additional consideration at the next meeting.

Amy Ockerlander, Duvall moved seconded by Kate Kruller, Tukwila to bring back to the PIC at the October meeting the following policy position: *The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.*

The motion passed with Auburn voting no.

10. **Balancing the T2040 Financial Strategy – PSRC Transportation Policy Board**

Monica Whitman, Senior Policy Analyst provided an overview of the T2040 Financial Strategy. In the audience were Robin Mayhew, PSRC, rmayhew@psrc.org and Charles Prestrud, WSDOT, prestrc@wsdot.wa.gov. They are both available to answer questions of PIC members.
Whitman noted that PSRC is required by federal transportation planning requirements to adopt a “fiscally constrained” long range transportation plan, and to update said plan every four years. “Fiscally constrained” means that there is a reasonable estimate of existing and future revenues available to cover anticipated investments. Due to the economic downturn, updated project costs, and updated preservation estimates, there is a substantial revenue gap that must be addressed in order balance the T2040 Financial Strategy.

PSRC staff is seeking direction from the Transportation Policy Board to proceed with scenario analysis, and has developed three scenarios for consideration at the September 12, 2013 meeting of the Transportation Policy Board, (TPB). Each of the scenarios has an associated project list with related project costs.

- Scenario 1: Prioritization – Lowest Quartile Projects. Move lowest quartile of Prioritization Scorecard results from the constrained to the unprogrammed portion of the Transportation 2040 Plan.

- Scenario 2: With input from local stakeholders, WSDOT will revise the highway project list to reflect recent developments regarding phasing and “right-sizing” of projects. Additional considerations included: prior commitments, system continuity, HOV system completion, urgency, and cost effectiveness.

- Scenario 3: Third Decade Projects. Focuses on savings that could be generated by moving projects currently listed in the third decade of the plan that are early in the project development process, with limited or no identified funding source, into the unprogrammed component of the plan.

- Hybrid: PSRC staff has also discussed the possibility that there be a “Hybrid” scenario. Since there are overlaps between the 3 projects lists associated with the scenarios described above, a hybrid that removes duplications between the lists could also be analyzed.

David Baker said that Kenmore had a project, a failing bridge that is not on the constrained list, and asked if the project could be funded by federal dollars? Robin Mayhew responded that projects in the programmed part of the plan can apply for planning funds but are not eligible for project right-of-way (ROW) and engineering funds, or construction funds.

Pete Lewis noted that projects once funded can be moved into the constrained plan.

Jeanne Burbidge, Federal Way, stated that Federal Way would find it acceptable to move their Military Road project out of the constrained plan but the Triangle project at I-5 / 18 / 161 is very important regionally and needs to be included in the constrained portion of the plan.
Rich Zwicker, Renton, TPB caucus chair, noted that there are four potential options, including a hybrid approach. The TPB caucus is seeking direction from the PIC. A hybrid approach will likely be proposed by TPB members. Members generally agreed that a hybrid approach was appropriate.

11. Board of Health 2014 Work Program – King County Board of Health
Doreen Booth provided an overview on the Board of Health’s 2014 Work Program. The Board of Health will be determining its 2014 Work Plan in the coming months. The SCA caucus of the Board of Health requested feedback from the PIC on work plan items that cities would like to include in the 2014 Work Plan.

The functions of the Board are to set county-wide public health policy, enact and enforce local public health regulations, and carry out other duties of local boards of health specified in state law. These duties, which are enumerated in RCW 70.05.060, include enforcing state public health statutes, preventing and controlling the spread of infectious disease, abating nuisances and establishing fee schedules for licenses, permits and other services.

Members proposed a number of items for consideration in the 2014 Board of Health Work Program including:

- Inspection services for cities for infestations of rodents, bedbugs, mold and enforcement of such violations. Members felt that these services were supposed to be provided by the health department and were not being provided.
- Incorporate the work of the Food Policy Board into health department regulations and programs.
- Address the issues of “food deserts.”
- Address childhood obesity and fitness.
- Address drug and alcohol use by minors.

Booth requested that additional items be emailed to Doreen@soundcities.org.

12. Informational Items
Chair Gregerson noted there are two informational items this month: Local Hazardous Waste Management Program – 2012 Highlights / Program Information and the 2014 SCA Call for Nominations to Regional Boards and Committees.

13. Upcoming Events
   a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – Wednesday, October 9, 2013 7:00 PM - Renton City Hall
   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
      • Annual Meeting - Wednesday, November 20, 2013 5:30 PM
14. **For the Good of the Order**

The Association if Washington Cities is hosting their regional meeting the second week of October. Members indicated that their preference is to maintain the same time/location for the next meeting of the PIC, Wednesday, October 9 at Renton City Hall.

ED Dawson announced that next month SCA will be hosting a pre-PIC workshop regarding the update to the King County Strategic Plan.

Councilmember Zwicker, Renton, invited members to attend Renton Seahawks 12th Man Flag-Raising Thursday, September 12 at 11:30am at Renton City Hall.

15. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
## 2013 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
### September 11, 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>Bill Peloza</td>
<td></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 Rheaueme</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 Iberson</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>Bill Boyce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Amy Walen</td>
<td>Penny Sweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Crispo</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td>Scott MacColl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Jim Haggerton</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Kimberly Matej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmus</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson Monica Whitman Doreen Booth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electeds present are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are bolded.
ONE VOICE!

Some things in this world are completely unacceptable. HUMAN SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING are at the top of that list. We were all recently shocked at the headlines about three innocent young girls held captive as sex slaves for over 10 years. Who could believe this was happening in an ordinary neighborhood in America? SEX AND LABOR TRAFFICKING IS HAPPENING IN AMERICA; IT IS HAPPENING AROUND US NOW UNAWARE, IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS AND TOWNS!

Human trafficking is a global and local challenge—dominated by organized crime—that requires a new response. Organized crime is well-organized, manipulative and deceptive in many ways. We need to be organized to fight it in sophisticated and impactful ways. And we are!

PLEASE JOIN the Engage for IMPACT Summit on Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at Seattle Pacific University. You will hear expert speakers on the collective impact approach now utilized by major corporations and nonprofits to solve complex social problems and even business challenges. You will understand Washington Engage’s work in your community and become a leader to inspire collective impact coalitions¹ to take the fight against modern day slavery to the next level.

We are inviting leaders like you to spend ONE DAY together with others to ignite Collective Impact Partnerships to fight the travesty of human trafficking in our communities. Specifically, we’re looking for ONE VOICE (one representative) from every local government (council, commission, etc.), every police department, every chamber of commerce, every association, every club and every business in your area. The Summit’s vision is to inspire your ONE VOICE to become a UNIFIED VOICE.

Please send ONE or more from your organization. Register today at www.waengage.com. Envision your ONE VOICE freeing one victim from slavery, and helping to PREVENT future victims from enslavement. A UNIFIED VOICE WILL INCREASE YOUR IMPACT!

We agree that human trafficking is a despicable and unacceptable reality in our society today. We commit at least one representative from our organization to attend the Engage for IMPACT Summit on October 5th, 2013 at Seattle Pacific University. Furthermore, we remain vigilant in seeking out more opportunities to engage and eradicate human trafficking in our communities.

Signed: ___________________________________ Name: ___________________________________

Title/Organization: ________________________________________________________________

¹ Washington Engage aims to create an environment to eradicate human trafficking throughout Washington by forming collective impact coalitions statewide. The locations of the seven coalitions and those in various incubation stages include the following city/counties: Federal Way, East King County, Whatcom County, SE King County, SW King County, Pierce County, Thurston County, Kittitas County, Kitsap County, Skagit County, Yakima County, and the Tri-Cities Area.
Dear SCA PIC Members and Representatives to the KCD Task Force and Conservation Panel-

I received the below feedback from Redmond in response to the email I forwarded earlier seeking input on an email circulated by the KCD with regards to jurisdictional grants.

The feedback from Redmond is consistent with what I have heard from other SCA members. I am sharing this email because I think that Councilmember Margeson did an excellent job of capturing where SCA cities are on this issue. (His comments regarding a lack of clarity as to exactly where the KCD is heading with this, and how they intend to get there, have also been expressed by others.)

We would welcome any additional feedback. If your city would like to weigh in, please email me, or share your city’s position at tomorrow’s PIC meeting.

Thanks,
Deanna

---

Deanna Dawson
Executive Director, Sound Cities Association (formerly Suburban Cities Association)
(206) 433-7170 (direct)
(206) 310-0599 (cell)
www.SoundCities.org

Follow us on Twitter @SoundCities

---

Hi Deanna,
Here is the feedback from Redmond...please note that I’m writing this from work prior to vetting it by the full Council so I’ll have to rely upon our past position in regards to the KCD.

As you are well aware Redmond has reservations with the governance and transparency with KCD, most significantly with the process whereby their members are elected! But that's not on the table today, so I'll try to stay focused.

We see the Grants program for KCD still in a bit of flux in that they appear to be agreeing to continuing the Jurisdictional Grant program, but yet they make a big deal about the non-profits process developed with Seattle. That would seem to be beyond the Jurisdictional program, which could be interpreted as an expansion of the competitive grant process the KCD has previously pushed with considerable angst from cities. Getting to specifics...here are our comments:
We look forward to a robust and inclusive review of this proposal.

On behalf of Redmond,

Hank Margeson
Redmond City Council
Subject: Additional Input on Jurisdictional Grants

Dear Task Force and Conservation Panel Members:

Attached is a revised draft of the Jurisdictional Grants write-up. We have received additional important input on this concern, and wanted you to have the latest recommendation to review and bring to the Task Force. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Ginny Ratliff

<<...>>

Click here to report this email as spam.
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Description: Cities have raised as a top concern the value of the Jurisdictional Grant Program and the need to preserve it going forward. Their concerns are two-fold. First, cities want assurance that the KCD Board of Supervisors will continue to fund the Grant Program into the future. Second, concerns have been raised that aspects of the program are burdensome, especially for small jurisdictions with few staff who are requesting relatively small amounts of money. KCD is concerned about carrying a disproportionate share of liability related to the grants and fulfilling its fiduciary responsibilities.

KCD Response to Task Force (8/14/13 letter): Jurisdictional Grant Program – The KCD recognizes the important role the grant program has played in funding city and county natural resource conservation efforts. We also recognize many cities and the county look forward to utilizing these cash investments and partnerships. The Board of Supervisors is willing to support a long term arrangement where the grant program administered by the KCD would continue to exist consistent with state law and recent court decisions.

Background: Recent litigation created sensitivities on the part of the KCD with regard to potential legal exposure regarding the use of Jurisdictional Grant money and the KCD’s risk if a jurisdiction were to misuse or if the entire program is challenged. In the past, remedies for the settlement of lawsuits included reimbursement of funds to rate payers out of KCD revenues. For a small agency like KCD, this represents a substantial risk.

Some city representatives characterize the Member Jurisdiction Grant Program processes as overly burdensome; especially for smaller amounts of money. Cities cite the Flood Control District Opportunity Grant Process as easier to use. Cities want the KCD to look forward to utilizing these cash investments and partnerships. They have allowed multiple cities to carry over those funds for multiple years, even though ILA language authorizes the KCD to make use of those old funds. Cities also question why the money can’t go directly to the cities as an allotment rather than going through a grant process.

KCD and the City of Seattle have worked together to develop a new grant application process that addresses some of the concerns raised by cities. Applications are solicited from nonprofits and city departments, a review committee comprised of city and citizen representatives reviews and recommends applications for funding to the KCD, and a KCD staff member attends the review meetings to answer questions and provide input regarding KCD policies and objectives. This process has attracted multiple unique projects and partnerships while jointly meeting both KCD’s and City’s objectives. Demand for grant revenues received by the City of Seattle is typically three times the available funding. Part of the development of this process involved incorporating the City of Seattle’s race and social justice objectives into the KCD grant funding criteria. In addition, the City and KCD worked to craft an improved grant application for Seattle proposals. This new process attracted interest from other cities.

The KCD grounds its grant approval process in its strategic plan, mission, and goals as well as in the state authorizing legislation (Chapter 89.08 RCW), which outlines the duties of conservation districts in Washington State. The framework for the KCD Member Jurisdiction Grant Program is posted on the KCD web page under Grant program overview, guidelines and policies (copy attached). The guidelines are intended to “direct District natural resource activities to improve natural resource conditions within the boundary of the district”. Proposals are required to be consistent with one or more of the KCD’s “Natural Resource Improvement Actions”. These include:

- Education and Outreach;
- Capacity Building;
- Pilot or Demonstration Projects
- Direct Improvement of Natural Resource Conditions

A KCD Board of Supervisors subcommittee reviews the applications and forwards its recommendations to the full Board of Supervisors which approve applications on a monthly basis between the months of February and October. Typically the entire process of review, award and payment takes between 3 and 7 months at most to...
Concern: Jurisdictional Grant Program
Last revised: 9.9.13

complete. Last year, the grant program changed from a 90/10 percent payment system to a reimbursement payment process based on the completion of proposed deliverables. This change reduces risk to the District and is more in line with how city finance departments operate. Some cities specifically requested that KCD move to a reimbursement payment system.

Task Force Recommendations:

Any grant program should include the following principles:

- Clear and concise eligibility criteria and application materials that give applicants clear guidance on assembling a successful submittal.
- An ongoing mutual commitment to transparency, accountability, and mutual defense.
- The grant process should be as efficient as possible (as few pages for the submittals as possible and including clear criteria and an associated rubric for eligible projects).
- Liability for the fund expenditure should be shared (with recognition that grantees are liable as in any contract for audit-proof completion of the stated grant purposes).
- Funds should be spent within the legal authorities and purposes of the funding source (in this case within the purposes of Chapter 89.08 RCW).

Before the final submittal of recommendations to the King County Council on October 15, 2013, a work group (comprising of KCD Staff, King County staff, and representatives from the suburban cities) will convene and draft final recommendations on an improved Jurisdictional Grant Program to be considered and acted upon by the reconstituted Advisory Committee in 2014. Areas of focus for the work group will be:

1. Examine Conservation District Member Jurisdiction Grants process side by side with King County Flood Control District process(es) and any other relevant grant programs to understand similarities and differences, likes and dislikes from the Cities’ perspectives, and the necessity or desirability of certain requirements from the granting agency perspective. Identify and recommend any opportunities for process improvements.

2. Review and revise grant criteria.

3. Examine the management of risk issues. Explore ways in which risk may be shared, reduced or managed differently. Analysis should include but not be limited to indemnification, reimbursement agreements, and other methods for reducing risk and burdens on both the District and its grantees.

4. The reconstituted KCD Advisory Committee should provide recommendations to the KCD Board of Supervisors by June 1, 2014, for inclusion in the KC/KCD agreement negotiated for the next agreement period beginning in 2015.
MEMORANDUM

To: Kurt Triplett, City Manager

From: John MacGillivray, Solid Waste Programs Lead
Pam Bissonnette, Interim Public Works Director

Date: August 22, 2013

Subject: KING COUNTY TRANSFER STATION PLAN REVIEW POSITION STATEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council receives a briefing on the status of the King County Solid Waste Division’s (KCSWD) review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan ("Transfer Plan") and provide comments on the draft resolution stating the Council’s position that the Houghton Transfer Station (HTS) should be completely closed to commercial and self-haul traffic upon the completed construction of the new Factoria Transfer Station or the new Northeast King County Transfer Station.

IMPORTANT NOTES

1) If the City Council wishes to pass a resolution taking a position on the closure on the Houghton Transfer Station, it should take action on or before its September 17 meeting so as to inform and influence the KCSWD’s plan review alternatives before the final Transfer Plan Review Workshop on September 27.

2) All documents associated with the Transfer Plan Review can be found at King County’s Transfer and Waste Management Plan Review website. Hyperlinks to specific documents are provided throughout the memorandum.

BACKGROUND

The KCSWD-owned and operated HTS in Kirkland has a long history and King County has been contemplating the closure of the facility for the past two decades.

The HTS property was first an open dump site between the 1940’s and 1960’s. In 1965, King County closed the dump and opened the HTS. In 1992, the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan ("Comp Plan"), proposed replacing the station with a new station at a different location. In 1995, the rate proposal submitted by the KCSWD was rejected and the KCSWD was directed to continue to operate the existing network of transfer stations which included the HTS remaining at its current location.
2005 Memorandum of Understanding

In 2004, the King County Council (KCC) directed the KCSWD via a budget proviso to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Kirkland to mitigate the impacts of the station on the surrounding neighborhood. The proviso prohibited the KCSWD from initiating its capital improvement project to replace the roof until an MOU was duly executed between the two parties that required the KCSWD to expend at least $150,000 on neighborhood mitigation projects.

In August 2004, the City formed a Solid Waste Subcommittee Task Force comprised of members of the Kirkland City Council, City staff, and Neighborhood Association leaders to negotiate the MOU with the KCSWD. In November 2004, the Kirkland City Council adopted the Revised Houghton Transfer Station Position Statement which stated Kirkland’s goal of closing HTS. The statement also listed several mitigation measures that the City expected the KCSWD to implement while the station remained open.

In October of 2005, an MOU between the City and the KCSWD was approved by the Kirkland City Council with the passage of Resolution R-4527. The non-legally binding MOU provided that the KCSWD would proceed with several mitigation projects and measures at the station to include:

1. Replacement of the transfer building roof
2. Installation of a gravity sewer line
3. Construction of a sound wall
4. Changes to traffic controls
5. Construction of an asphalt pathway on the north side of NE 60th St
6. Landscaping improvements
7. Reducing the solid waste at the station to a maximum annual tonnage of 135,000 tons/year over a ten year period (not met)
8. Prohibiting the overnight parking of full or partially full trailers

The MOU also stated the KCSWD’s commitment to close the HTS:

MOU Proviso 1

"King County Solid Waste Division agrees to abide by the [Solid Waste Transfer] Waste Export System Plan adopted by the King County Council approved by the King County Executive and codified in King County Code.” The 2006 Transfer Plan explicitly recommends Alternative 1 which calls for the closure of HTS after the KCSWD's transfer station capital improvement project is completed.

MOU Proviso 7

"King County shall honor the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan policy RTS-3, which states, ‘The county should focus capital investment in part to expand, relocate, or replace, or any combination thereof, transfer stations when safety, efficiency, capacity, or customer services needs cannot be met by existing transfer facilities’”. In the level-of-service criteria examination of the HTS, the station failed to meet
established safety goals, efficiency and capacity needs, and some key customer service standards. Accordingly, the Transfer Plan recommends the closure of the facility upon complete of the KCSWD’s transfer station capital improvement project.

2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export Plan

Concurrent with the MOU negotiations, the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) worked with the KCSWD on the development of the aforementioned Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan. MSWAC is an advisory committee composed of representatives from cities with Solid Waste Interlocal Agreements with King County. In February 2006, the KCSWD published its Transfer and Waste Export Facility Plan 4th Milestone Report as a precursor to the final Transfer Plan. In the milestone report, several Transfer System Packages for an updated transfer system were presented for consideration. Some of the alternatives called for keeping the HTS open as a self-haul-only facility. Ultimately, however, MSWAC and King County jointly selected Package 1 which is the final recommendation made in the Transfer Plan transmitted to the KCC in September 2006 and shown below in Table 1. The recommendation calls for new stations to be constructed on-site at Bow Lake and Factoria and new facilities to be sited and constructed in South King County (to replace a closed Algonia station) and in Northeast King County (to replace a closed HTS). This option also includes the closure of the Renton Transfer Station upon the completion of the Transfer Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Plan Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Transfer Station</td>
<td>Build New Station On-Site</td>
<td>Opened 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Lake Transfer Station</td>
<td>Build New Station On-Site</td>
<td>To Open October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factoria Transfer Station</td>
<td>Build New Station On-Site</td>
<td>Design – Begin Construction 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South King County</td>
<td>Site &amp; Build New/Close Algonia</td>
<td>In Siting Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast King County</td>
<td>Site &amp; Build New/Close Houghton</td>
<td>Begin Siting Process in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon Transfer Station</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Newer Facility – No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw Transfer Station</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Newer Facility – No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Falls</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Drop Box Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Drop Box Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonia Transfer Station</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Open Until South King County Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Transfer Station</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Open Until Northeast County Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton Transfer Station</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Open Until Plan Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2007 Third Party Review of the Transfer Plan

MSWAC conditionally approved the Transfer Plan pending the outcome of the Independent, Third Party Review of the Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export System Plan which was completed by consultant Gersman, Brickner, and Bratton (GBB) in September 2007. In general, the GBB review supported the Transfer Plan and supported the modernization of the transfer station system.
2011 King County Performance Audit

In 2011, the KCSWD underwent a performance audit by the King County Auditor which focused upon the KCSWD’s rate model/financial plan and its transfer system capital projects. The King County Performance Audit of Solid Waste Transfer Station Capital Projects audit concluded that the Transfer Plan was developed through a collaborative and iterative regional process and that some collective decisions, such as electing to construct new transfer stations in lieu of renovating existing stations, have resulted in increased systems costs. The audit also recommended that the KCSWD should update its 2006 Transfer Plan by including analyses of cost impacts of the number and capacities of the transfer stations; functionalities of the transfer stations; and an assessment of project financing and delivery methods.

**EVOLUTION OF THE TRANSFER PLAN REVIEW**

**2010-2012 Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement Background**

Over the course of 2010-2012, King County and MSWMAC worked together to negotiate an extension of the Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement of 1988 (original ILA), which every City in King County, excluding Seattle and Milton, had signed. In 2010, the City of Kirkland played a significant role in initiating the ILA renegotiation process as a means to ensure that the County’s capital improvement program would be fully funded and implemented and, consequently, the HTS would be replaced with a more appropriately-sized and modern transfer facility somewhere in northeast King County.

After intensive negotiations, a team of City and County representatives reached an agreement on the terms of a new ILA. This agreement extended the original ILA by 12.5 years, from June 2028 through December 2040, which will keep disposal rates lower by allowing for longer-term bonding for capital improvement projects. In March 2013, King County converted $75m in Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) to long-term General Obligation Bonds backed by the rate revenues from City’s with ILA’s through 2040 to pay for the Bow Lake Transfer Station construction. During the ILA City adoption process, the KCSWD assured MSWMAC that any city that decided not to sign the extended ILA would pay a rate differential of between $5 to $7/ton in order to pay off its share of the bonded debt by 2028 instead of 2040.

In February 2013, the Kirkland City Council voted to authorize the City Manager to sign the extended ILA through 2040. The aforementioned potential for a rate differential was presented to the Council and played a significant role in most cities’ decisions to sign the extended ILA. To date, 32 of the 37 King County cities have signed the new ILA. The cities of Bellevue, Medina, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, and Yarrow Point have elected not to sign and their agreements with the KCSWD will expire in 2028.

**The Factoria Transfer Station Project**

The Factoria Transfer Station in Bellevue currently serves the cities of Bellevue, Issaquah, Mercer Island, and the “point cities”. Under the current Transfer Plan, construction of the new station is scheduled to begin in early 2014 on a property adjacent to the existing station. The construction cost of the project is estimated to be about $66 million. The City of Bellevue, along
with the four other cities not extending their ILA’s, account for about 10% of the system-wide tonnage but about 50% of the tonnage is sent to Factoria each year. The new Factoria facility was designed with that assumption that Bellevue would extend its ILA and remain in the system through 2040. Given that Bellevue has opted to leave the system in 2028, the new Factoria facility, if constructed as currently designed, will be an under-utilized and over-built station in 2028.

When the City of Bellevue did not extend its ILA with King County, a number of cities and stakeholders began to call on the KCSWD to conduct a full review of the remaining Transfer Plan projects due to the anticipated 50% reduction in tonnage directed to Factoria after 2028 and in light of one of the key findings of the 2011 Performance Audit that concluded “…by the time the [new] stations reach the end of their expected useful lives, collectively they will be utilizing about 42 percent of their total capacity.”

The KCSWD took issue with this conclusion and countered that the King County Auditor wrongly calculated system capacity by assuming that two garbage compactors would be running 362 days per year at each new station, besides Shoreline, processing 100 tons per hour. The KCSWD also contended that the report’s conclusion did not factor in vehicle capacity, emergency storage, or services such as recycling or household hazardous waste collection. The KCSWD countered that it expected Factoria to be operating at 82% capacity, South King County at 91%, and the Northeast King County at 97% at the end of their useful lives. **However, this KCSWD operating capacity assessment assumes that Bellevue’s tonnage would remain in the system after 2028.** Given that 50% of the tonnage processed at Factoria is from Bellevue, Factoria if built as currently designed, would be operating at a fraction (~40%-50%) of its maximum capacity at the end of its useful life, potentially costing ratepayers millions of dollars in unnecessary construction.

In March 2013, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) adopted a policy position requesting that the KCSWD and MSWAC review and recommend appropriate updates to the Transfer Plan. Subsequent to this request, the King County Council (KCC) took preventative action and adopted **Ordinance 17619** which compelled the KCSWD to conduct a full review of the Transfer Plan before allocating any more than $750,000 in funding toward the Factoria construction project. Per the ordinance, the draft report must be delivered to stakeholders no later than October 9 with the final report delivered to the KCC by November 27.

At a minimum, the Transfer Plan review must include a review of:

- Garbage tonnage projections
- Revenue projections
- Overall costs of the region-wide transfer system upgrades
- Functionality and service alternatives at each transfer station (self-haul, recycling, compaction, etc.)
- Level of service criteria in the 2006 Transfer Plan
- Retention and repair of existing stations
- Systematic analysis of incremental cost impacts of the number, capacities, and functionality of the transfer stations
TRANSFER PLAN REVIEW WORKSHOPS

In response to the KCC action, the KCSWD scheduled three Transfer Plan Review Workshops. The first workshop was held on July 26 with the remaining two workshops to be held on August 22 and September 27. Kirkland was among seventeen cities in attendance at the first workshop. The KCSWD provided transfer system background similar to what is included in this memorandum and asked for input on station functionality and service alternatives to be considered when modeling the alternatives in the Transfer Plan review.

Transfer Plan Alternatives

The KCSWD is currently modeling four alternatives to the Base Plan as shown in Attachment 1, Transfer Plan Review Alternatives. In all of the alternatives, HTS is proposed to be closed to all commercial traffic. Under Alternative A, HTS would remain open only to self-haul garbage and recycling customers. Kirkland staff has reviewed the alternatives and believes that the KCSWD should consider an additional, hybrid alternative which includes:

1) Redesigning the functionality of the Factoria Transfer Station so that it is capable of handling the garbage tonnage from the Northeast King County cities (Kirkland, Bothell, Redmond, and Woodinville) as well as from Bellevue, Issaquah, Mercer Island and the “Point Cities” through 2028 when Bellevue is expected to leave the system.

2) Once the new Factoria Station is built, the HTS would be permanently closed to all traffic.

3) In the event Bellevue elects to extend its ILA before 2028, a new Northeast King County Transfer Station would be designed and built to process the Northeast King County cities’ tonnage.

General consensus was achieved among cities and the KCSWD on the following elements that should be built into each alternative model:

1) **Compactors should be used at new stations to increase efficiency.** Compactors are expensive (> $1.5 million each) but they increase the payload of each trailer, reduce the number of trips to the landfill, and the efficiencies gained make a compactor pays for itself within three to five years.

2) **Self-haul should continue to be provided but consideration should be given to limiting the hours, days of service, and transfer stations available to self-haulers.**

The efficient management of self-haul has historically been challenging for the KCSWD. Self-haulers are residents without curbside garbage service; residents with curbside service who make occasional trips to a transfer station to dispose of their excess waste; and businesses such as landcapers, small contractors, and independent haulers for hire, schools, and government agencies. Self-haulers currently account for about 84% of the system-wide transactions but only 23% of the garbage tonnage processed.
Within the current transfer system, providing self-haul at all stations costs the KCSWD about $1.3 million annually in staff, credit cards fees, and NSF checks. With new stations, the capital investment made to accommodate self-haul is disproportionate to the revenues received and the design concessions needed to accommodate the traffic such as having to construct separate entry points, building a larger tipping floor, and queuing space. For new facilities, the construction cost for self-haul ranges between $6 to $7 million per site. Self-haul customers need additional space, take more time than commercial haulers such as Waste Management to dump their loads and can cause queuing delays at the weigh station for commercial traffic.

Curbside garbage service is mandatory in 13 King County cities, including Kirkland. However, Kirkland abuts two relatively large communities (Bellevue and Redmond) that do not have mandatory service and whose residents and businesses regularly use both Factoria and Houghton to dispose of their garbage. Cities with mandatory service like Kirkland subsidize self-haul service with their rates paid to the KCSWD via their hauler. Similarly, Alternative 1 in which Houghton would remain open to self-haul only exacerbates the subsidy and imbalance as the likely primary users would be self-haulers from Bellevue and Redmond.

3) **Recycling service should continue to be provided.**

The 2001 and Draft 2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plans require that the KCSWD provide recycling services at transfer stations. The 2013 Comp Plan expands upon recycling by requiring the KCSWD to maximize recycling services at new stations and focus upon the diversion of priority materials such as organics, clean wood, scrap metal, and cardboard. In general self-haulers do not recycle as much as residents with curbside recycling service, so providing recycling opportunities at existing and new stations is an important service to help meet the recycling diversion goal in the 2013 Draft Comp Plan.

After the recycling services were expanded after the opening of Shoreline, 17% of the material brought to the facility was recycled. For existing facilities such as HTS with limited recycling service, the recycling rate is less than 1%. Additionally, when the KCSWD removed all recycling services from its transfer stations in 2011, public demand and outcry caused the KCSWD to reverse its decision and restore recycling service in 2012.

4) **The Transfer Plan’s drive time standard of 90% of the residents being within 30 minutes of a transfer station is not important.**

An analysis by KCSWD revealed that the drive time standard would be substantially met even if some stations were removed from the system. In the event that HTS was closed and construction of the Northeast Transfer Station was delayed or stopped, then Kirkland’s contracted hauler Waste Management would be directed to haul our waste to Factoria. The solid waste rate increase implication for this change is minimal and contemplated in our contract where “…Contractor is required to haul Garbage to an alternative County disposal location in excess of ten (10) miles from the intersection of
NE 112th St and 108th Avenue NE, the Contractor shall be allowed additional compensation at the WUTC rate per mile per truck trip above the ten (10) mile limit.” The distance from the geographical center of the City to the Factoria is 10.76 miles.

**STAFF POSITION STATEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based upon the previous discussion, staff recommends that the City Council considers the following position statements and the attached resolution.

1. **Houghton Transfer Station Position Statement:** Upon completed construction and opening of the new Factoria Transfer Station or new Northeast King County Transfer Station, the Houghton Transfer Station should be closed permanently to self-haul and commercial traffic.

2. **Self-Haul Position Statement:** The KCSWD’s Transfer Plan review should consider alternatives for limiting self-haul at existing transfer stations and in the design of new transfer stations.

3. **Rate Differential Position Statement:** Different customer classes should be established by King County to ensure system users do not pay a disproportionate share of the cost of improvements to system assets as a result of a decision not to sign an Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement through 2040. The rate differential should be established to account for the full pay-off costs incurred for development of KCSWD system assets prior to the end of the mid-2028 Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (SWIA) term. These rate differentials should reflect actual costs necessary for paying off construction bonds issued on behalf of the KCSWD, with costs apportioned to the solid waste tonnage originating in those cities that elected to end their SWIA in mid-2028. The KCSWD should put verification measures in place that ensure any rate differential applies only to solid waste originating in cities that elected to end their ILA’s in mid-2028, regardless if solid waste is self-hauled or delivered by a commercial carrier. The costs of any verification measures should be included in the overall rate differential applied to those cities that elect to end their SWIA in mid-2028 [policy draft as written by the cities of Kirkland and Federal Way and submitted to the MSWAC Financial Policies Subcommittee for further consideration].

**NEXT STEPS**

**August 22:** The KCSWD held its second Transfer Plan Review Workshop. The major elements of the Transfer Plan review discussed at the workshop included:

- The transfer system’s relationship to waste-to-energy
- Capacity issues (commercial versus self-haul speed, compactors, need for stalls, trailer storage, etc.)
- Construction cost drivers
- Review of the transfer system alternatives with preliminary cost information
Other upcoming milestones include:

**September 27:** Final Transfer Plan Review Workshop

**October 9:** King County to deliver draft Transfer Plan review to stakeholders. Start comment period.

**TBD:** End of Stakeholder Comment Period

**November 27:** Final Transfer Plan review to be delivered to King County Council

**Council Action Needed**

After review and discussion by the Council, staff recommends that the resolution be brought back to the Council for approval at the September 17 Council meeting. Kirkland’s resolution would then be provided as input at the September 27 Workshop as well as subsequent King County Council deliberations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Facilities</th>
<th>Base (Current Plan)</th>
<th>Alternative A (no Northeast)</th>
<th>Alternative B (no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative C (no South County and no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative D (no South County and no Northeast)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
<td>Bow Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closed Facilities</th>
<th>Base (Current Plan)</th>
<th>Alternative A (no Northeast)</th>
<th>Alternative B (no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative C (no South County and no Factoria)</th>
<th>Alternative D (no South County and no Northeast)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Algona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Renton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton*</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Factoria</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under Alternative A, Houghton would be analyzed as being closed completely, as well as being closed except to self-haul recycle and/or solid waste customers. Houghton would be closed to commercial traffic in all cases.
RESOLUTION R-____


WHEREAS, King County Solid Waste Division (KCSWD) has owned and operated the Houghton Transfer Station in the City of Kirkland for many years; and

WHEREAS, it has been the goal of the City to close this facility for many years; and

WHEREAS, with the assistance of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC), KCWSD has been formulating a Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Export Plan for getting to that point as well as considering alternative plans for handling solid waste in King County; and

WHEREAS, concurrently with this effort, the County was negotiating with a number of cities the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement (Amended ILA) that would extend the time during which the Cities using KCWSD facilities would continue to do so; and

WHEREAS, failure of some of the cities to agree to the Amended ILA will have disproportionate financial impacts on the cities that did sign; and

WHEREAS, the Council wishes to present a Position Statement to KCSWD as to its preferences in these matters,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Kirkland as follows:

Section 1. The City Council adopts the attached Position Statement, which is incorporated by reference, recommending 1) the Houghton Transfer Station be closed; 2) that King County Solid Waste Division’s Transfer Plan review should consider alternatives for limiting self-haul at existing and new transfer stations; and 3) different customer classes should be established by King County to ensure system users do not pay a disproportionate share of the cost of improvements to system assets as a result of other Cities decisions not to sign an Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement through 2040.

Section 2. The City Council authorizes the City Manager or designee to present the attached Position Statement to KCSWD at its
Final Transfer Plan Review Workshop on September 27, 2013, as well as for subsequent King County Council deliberations.

Passed by majority vote of the Kirkland City Council in open meeting this ___ day of ______________, 2013.

Signed in authentication thereof this ____ day of ______________, 2013.

______________________________
MAYOR

Attest:

______________________________
City Clerk
CITY OF KIRKLAND

KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE TRANSFER AND WASTE EXPORT PLAN POSITION STATEMENT

Regarding Houghton Transfer Station, Self-Hauling and Financial Impacts

September 3, 2013

1. Houghton Transfer Station Position Statement: Upon completed construction and opening of the new Factoria Transfer Station or new Northeast King County Transfer Station, the Houghton Transfer Station should be closed permanently to self-haul and commercial traffic.

2. Self-Haul Position Statement: The KCSWD’s Transfer Plan review should consider alternatives for limiting self-haul at existing transfer stations and in the design of new transfer stations.

3. Rate Differential Position Statement: Different customer classes should be established by King County to ensure system users do not pay a disproportionate share of the cost of improvements to system assets as a result of a decision not to sign an Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement through 2040. The rate differential should be established to account for the full pay-off costs incurred for development of KCSWD system assets prior to the end of the mid-2028 Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement (SWIA) term. These rate differentials should reflect actual costs necessary for paying off construction bonds issued on behalf of the KCSWD, with costs apportioned to the solid waste tonnage originating in those cities that elected to end their SWIA in mid-2028. The KCSWD should put verification measures in place that ensure any rate differential applies only to solid waste originating in cities that elected to end their ILA’s in mid-2028, regardless if solid waste is self-hauled or delivered by a commercial carrier. The costs of any verification measures should be included in the overall rate differential applied to those cities that elect to end their SWIA in mid-2028 [policy draft as written by the cities of Kirkland and Federal Way and submitted to the MSWAC Financial Policies Subcommittee for further consideration].
Item 6:
Product Stewardship Policy
Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP)

Action Item

SCA Staff Contact
Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst, doreen@saudcities.org; 206-433-7147, office; 425-275-7323, cell.

SCA Local Hazardous Waste Management Program Representative – Management Coordinating Committee (MCC) Kenmore Mayor David Baker

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

The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.

As a result of the discussion at the September PIC meeting and concerns raised by several cities after the meeting, there is additional information provided on existing product stewardship policies at King County and AWC in this report as well as responses to questions raised by members. The summary at the end of this report offers alternative positions that the PIC may wish to consider.

Background
At the September 11, 2013 Public Issues Committee (PIC) meeting, Kenmore Mayor David Baker, SCA’s representative on the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program’s (LHWMP) Management Coordinating Committee, brought forward the following position:

The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.

There was a robust discussion at the PIC meeting around the wording of the proposed position. While the proposed policy position states that SCA supports “requiring” manufacturers to handle the disposal of their products at the end of their useful life, some members suggested SCA should instead be working collaboratively with manufacturers. Some members also questioned whether SCA should be out in front on this issue, and/or whether SCA should be adopting a blanket position with regards to all products rather than focusing on a specific
product (such as paint). Other members felt that the manufacturers have an obligation to provide opportunities for the safe recycling and/or disposal of their products. They were concerned about watering down the position. In the end, the PIC voted to bring back the proposed policy as drafted for additional consideration at the next meeting. Subsequent to the PIC meeting, several SCA members and city staff raised concerns about the breadth of the position.

Questions Raised
A number of questions have arisen, included in this report:

1. What is King County’s position on product stewardship?
2. What is AWC’s position on product stewardship?
3. What is the purpose of SCA’s taking this position?

The following discussion provides additional information to assist members in their consideration of a product stewardship policy.

1. What is King County’s position on product stewardship?

King County has two general product stewardship policies codified in the King County Code, and a 2013 Statement of State Policy which contains support of product stewardship at the state level. In addition, the Solid Waste Division has a draft product stewardship policy that addresses toxic and hard to handle products. The Local Hazardous Waste Management Advisory Committee (LHWMP) has its own product stewardship policy, specifically addressing toxic and hazardous products consistent with LHWMP’s mission.

King County Code
King County has a waste reduction and recycling policy (KCC 10.25.030.B,WRR 1) that states in part, “the mission of King County’s waste reduction and recycling programs is to divert as much material as possible from disposal in a manner that reduces the overall costs of solid waste management to county residents and businesses, conserves resources, protects the environment and strengthens the county's economy”.

Two county policies supporting that mission related to product stewardship are: KCC 10.25.030.B.WRR-28, The county should develop and implement a regional product stewardship strategy, provide technical assistance to manufacturers in the use of recycled materials and the application of product stewardship principles; and KCC 10.25.030.B.WRR-29, The county should pursue product stewardship strategies to reduce costs of waste disposal, to place more responsibility on manufacturers to reduce toxicity of their products, to conserve energy and to plan for product reuse and recycling in product development.
King County Statement of State Policy
The 2013 King County Council Statement of State Policy, which sets out King County’s legislative agenda, includes the following statement:

Waste Reduction and Recycling
We support development of cradle-to-cradle product education, stewardship, recycling, and take-back programs for products for which improper disposal is likely to result in hazardous waste, water quality contamination or other solid waste impacts, including pharmaceuticals and medicines, computers and other electronics, carpet, telephone books, and mercury and fluorescent lighting sources.

King County Local Hazardous Waste Management Program
The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) addresses toxic and hazardous products. The LHWMP’s position paper is Attachment A. The LHWMP position paper defines product stewardship “as an environmental management strategy that means whoever designs, produces, sells, or uses a product takes responsibility for minimizing the product’s health and environmental impacts. Stewardship continues through all stages of the products' life cycle, including end-of-life management. The producer of the product has the greatest responsibility and ability to minimize adverse impacts. However, other stakeholders, such as suppliers, retailers, and consumers, also share responsibility.”

The LHWMP supports product stewardship legislative proposals that:
1. Will benefit the residents and businesses of King County;
2. Have been developed through stakeholder processes at the local or national levels that have strived to engage all stakeholders, including product manufacturers and waste management companies;
3. Are supported by a coalition of stakeholders, including other local governments; and
4. Align with policy principles developed and supported by the LHWMP and the Northwest Product Stewardship Council. These policies ensure:
   a) producers play a primary role in responsibility for end-of-life management of their products,
   b) a level playing field for producers and well-defined roles for stakeholders to ensure a fair and effective system,
   c) performance goals and standards to protect people’s health and the environment while addressing local needs, and
   d) sufficient oversight, reporting mechanisms, and transparency.

King County Solid Waste Division
Product stewardship is defined in King County’s Draft Final 2013 SWD Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan as “an environmental management strategy whereby producers take responsibility for minimizing a
product’s environmental impact throughout all stages of a product’s life cycle, including end of life management.”

The Solid Waste Division (SWD) has supported product stewardship for a number of years and is in the process of circulating and seeking input on a position paper on product stewardship, Attachment B. SWD staff recently presented information on product stewardship to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and they will be circulating the draft position paper to those bodies. SWD staff is also meeting with haulers to review the position. The position paper states in part, “King County, in partnership with the Northwest Product Stewardship Council, local businesses, and other stakeholders, will pursue product stewardship strategies through a combination of voluntary and mandatory programs for products that contain toxic materials or are difficult and expensive to manage, including, but not limited to, paint, carpet, fluorescent bulbs and tubes, mercury thermostats, rechargeable batteries, pharmaceuticals, mattresses, junk mail, and telephone books”.

The draft position statement also states that the SWD advocates for statewide legislated stewardship polices to achieve effective recycling and waste management programs when:

- There are insufficient collection, transportation or processing services for specific products
- The products contain toxic materials that require safe and transparent management
- The products are difficult to handle and/or expensive to manage and
- There is a desire to influence the management and design of the product.

The LHWMP position addresses toxic and hazardous products. The SWD draft position also addresses “hard to handle” products, though King County has not yet provided a definition of “hard to handle” products. Such products would likely include mattresses and carpet. Other products, such as latex paint, are considered toxic by some stakeholders and “hard to handle” by others.

2. What is AWC's position on product stewardship?

AWC has a general statement of support related to product stewardship in its 2012-2013 Statement of State Policy. AWC supports:

- Recognition of the diverse challenges facing cities across the state and the need for waste stream control and recycling options for cities.
- Exploring opportunities to rethink management of the waste and recycling streams to meet long-term challenges, including education, product stewardship, and other innovative opportunities.
• Establishment of secure medicine take-back programs.

AWC has also endorsed efforts by cities around product stewardship in the areas of battery recycling, paint and recycled carpet.

AWC staff has a request in to provide greater flexibility for the organization to support product stewardship efforts broadly without needing to bring in front of their committees each individual product. They are considering the following statement or something similar, “Product Stewardship for waste products: Support legislation to establish and improve producer-funded systems for convenient and environmentally-sound recycling of waste products, including paint and rechargeable batteries.”

3. What is the purpose of SCA’s taking this position?

The intent of the SCA caucus in bringing forward a proposed position on product stewardship is to provide documented support from SCA, on behalf of its member cities, to King County to support the County in their efforts to have product-specific statewide product stewardship legislation enacted. Recent product stewardship legislation proposals for small rechargeable batteries and paint (oil-based and latex) were both unsuccessful at the legislature, despite support from the majority of rechargeable battery manufacturers and the paint industry, respectively. AWC staff, King County staff and LHWMP’s MCC members felt that having documented support from local governments could be beneficial for product stewardship legislation in future legislative sessions.

Alternative Policy Positions
Based on the new information presented here, it may be the desire of PIC members to support an existing product stewardship position put forward by another entity or to support product by product stewardship efforts as an alternative to the proposed SCA policy brought forward at the September PIC. If the PIC did propose approving an alternative, the proposed policy could be considered at the November meeting to allow members the opportunity to take the revised policy to their city councils. Please note this matter is not time sensitive.

- Proposed SCA Caucus Policy

This was the position PIC members voted to move forward at the September meeting:

*The Sound Cities Association supports product stewardship approaches that enhance our existing reuse, recycling and waste management systems by requiring product manufacturers to be responsible for their products that contain toxic and hazardous materials.*

- Product Specific Product Stewardship Policy

An alternative to having one general product stewardship policy for all products is for members to consider supporting product stewardship on a product by product basis. Product stewardship
proposals that may be brought forward in the 2014 legislation session include proposals for small rechargeable batteries, and latex and oil-based paint and ensuring adequate financing for mercury lighting product stewardship.

In the cases of rechargeable batteries and paint, the manufacturers are in support of the product stewardship proposals. There are examples of successful paint stewardship programs in a few states. PaintCare (www.paintcare.org), an industry sponsored paint stewardship non-profit program was established to manage the reuse, recycling and proper disposal of unused architectural paint. PaintCare currently operates paint stewardship programs on behalf of paint manufacturers in states with paint stewardship laws (programs are in operation in Oregon, California and laws have been passed in Connecticut, Maine, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Vermont). In the case of mercury lighting, the legislature did enact a producer-funded take back program in 2010, but the limited financial participation requirements of the producers make the program unworkable on a statewide scale. Legislation addressing the funding shortfall is expected to be brought forward in 2014.

- **King County’s Waste Reduction and Recycling legislative position**

  SCA could support King County’s Waste Reduction and Recycling legislative position:

  We support development of cradle-to-cradle product education, stewardship, recycling, and take-back programs for products for which improper disposal is likely to result in hazardous waste, water quality contamination or other solid waste impacts, including pharmaceuticals and medicines, computers and other electronics, carpet, telephone books, and mercury and fluorescent lighting sources.

  This position was for the 2013 legislative session. King County staff may request the inclusion of paint and small rechargeable batteries in a 2014 position.

- **Local Hazardous Waste Management Program’s Policy**

  SCA could support the LHWMP’s Policy Position as set out in Attachment A. The LHWMP does not have a short policy statement on product stewardship. This policy recognizes shared responsibility for toxic and hazardous product stewardship; “The producer of the product has the greatest responsibility and ability to minimize adverse impacts. However, other stakeholders, such as suppliers, retailers, and consumers, also share responsibility.” This position only applies to toxic and hazardous products, not hard to handle products.

- **Solid Waste Division’s Draft Policy**

  SCA could support the Solid Waste Division’s draft Policy Position as set out in Attachment B. However, as this policy is draft, SCA could make recommendations to the SWD on the policy and adopt a position of support after the policy is finalized. The SWD does not have a short policy statement on product stewardship. This draft policy defines product stewardship as “an environmental management strategy whereby producers take responsibility for minimizing a
product’s environmental impact throughout all stages of a product’s life cycle, including end of life management.”

➢ AWC’s Policy

SCA could support a policy similar to the draft AWC policy: Support legislation to establish and improve producer-funded systems for convenient and environmentally-sound recycling of waste products, including paint and rechargeable batteries.

Attachments:

A. LHWMP Position Statement on Product Stewardship for Toxic and Hazardous Products
B. King County Solid Waste Division Draft Position Statement on Product Stewardship
The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County (LHWMP) focuses on reducing public and environmental exposure to hazardous materials, including promoting stewardship of toxic and hazardous products by their manufacturers. This position statement is a working document that will continue to evolve as LHWMP explores product stewardship policies and collaborates with stakeholders.

Product Stewardship is an environmental management strategy that means whoever designs, produces, sells, or uses a product takes responsibility for minimizing the product's health and environmental impacts. Stewardship continues through all stages of the products' life cycle, including end-of-life management. The producer of the product has the greatest responsibility and ability to minimize adverse impacts. However, other stakeholders, such as suppliers, retailers, and consumers, also share responsibility.

Taxpayers and ratepayers currently pay for the disposal and recycling of most products. Product stewardship policies shift responsibility from ratepayer-financed government programs to private sector systems that are financed, and in some cases provided, by product producers.

Effective product stewardship approaches will increase recycling and proper disposal of toxic and hazardous products to better protect the health of people, and the quality of our water and broader environment in the Puget Sound region.

Product stewardship programs can utilize and build on our existing waste recycling and management infrastructure to increase collection and recycling opportunities, and create new business opportunities for service providers.

Product stewardship policies can significantly improve management of hazardous and solid wastes in King County, and throughout Washington State, by:

- Increasing proper management of toxic materials to keep them out of garbage and landfills to reduce human exposure and environmental pollution;
- Increasing recycling and the quantities of recyclable materials that can be used in new products;
- Providing more convenient and equitably distributed collection services to benefit all users of the waste management system;
- Lowering waste management costs for local governments, which benefits taxpayers and ratepayers, by developing a more fair and equitable financing mechanism that internalizes the costs of recycling or disposal of the product in the price paid by consumers.
- Connecting manufacturers to the end-of-life management of their products to provide incentives for reducing waste, increasing recyclability, and reducing toxicity; and
- Adding jobs in our county’s and state’s waste management and recycling industries.

Product stewardship systems can utilize multiple collection options to increase convenience and effectiveness, including:

- Government-operated moderate risk waste facilities;
- Consumer drop-off at retail stores, with transport to central locations or processors;
- Product take-back at thrift and reuse stores;
- Increased curbside collection where provided by G-certificated and contracted collection companies or by municipalities through innovations in safe handling of toxic products;
- Resident drop-off at existing solid waste transfer stations and private recycling centers.

The Local Hazardous Waste Management Program supports product stewardship legislative proposals that:

1. Will benefit the residents and businesses of King County;
2. Have been developed through stakeholder processes at the local or national levels that have strived to engage all stakeholders, including product manufacturers and waste management companies;
3. Are supported by a coalition of stakeholders, including other local governments; and
4. Align with policy principles developed and supported by the LHWMP and the Northwest Product Stewardship Council. These policies ensure:

   (a) producers play a primary role in responsibility for end-of-life management of their products,
   (b) a level playing field for producers and well-defined roles for stakeholders to ensure a fair and effective system,
   (c) performance goals and standards to protect people’s health and the environment while addressing local needs, and
   (d) sufficient oversight, reporting mechanisms, and transparency.

   (See NW Product Stewardship Council policy principles: http://productstewardship.net/about/what-product-stewardship.)
Position Statement on Product Stewardship

Product stewardship is defined in King County’s Draft Final SWD Comprehensive Solid Waste Management plan as “an environmental management strategy whereby producers take responsibility for minimizing a product’s environmental impact throughout all stages of a product’s life cycle, including end of life management.”

Currently, most producers externalize disposal or recycling costs for their toxic and hard to handle products onto governments and their funders (taxpayers and ratepayers). Product stewardship policies shift responsibility from ratepayer-financed government programs to private sector systems that are financed and provided by product producers. This means that producers are given the authority to finance and provide for the collection, recycling and/or proper management of their products at the end of the product’s life cycle.

King County, in partnership with the Northwest Product Stewardship Council, local businesses, and other stakeholders, will pursue product stewardship strategies through a combination of voluntary and mandatory programs for products that contain toxic materials or are difficult and expensive to manage, including, but not limited to, paint, carpet, fluorescent bulbs and tubes, mercury thermostats, rechargeable batteries, pharmaceuticals, mattresses, junk mail, and telephone books.

Legislated Stewardship Policies
The SWD advocates for statewide legislated stewardship polices to achieve effective recycling and waste management programs when:

- There are insufficient collection, transportation or processing services for specific products
- The products contain toxic materials that require safe and transparent management
- The products are difficult to handle and/or expensive to manage and
- There is a desire to influence the management and design of the product.

Stewardship legislation should be developed in coordination with all stakeholders including producers, waste management companies, retailers, non-profit organizations and local governments and should:

- Require producers to finance and participate in the end-of-life management of their products
- Require collection/recycling/processing standards that protect human health and the environment
- Set performance goals and require regular reporting to ensure that the program is transparent to government and citizens
- Require oversight and enforcement by government

Benefits of Product Stewardship Policies
The SWD believes that well-crafted stewardship legislation and the resulting programs will:

- Increase the proper management of toxic materials
- Increase the types and quantities of recyclable materials that are recovered for use in new products
- Provide increased funding through an equitable financing mechanism where the costs of end-of-life management are internalized into the price of the product thereby shifting the cost from local governments and their taxpayers and ratepayers to the product consumer
- Utilize and enhance the existing infrastructure to provide more convenient and equitably distributed collection services
- Create new business opportunities and adds jobs to our recycling and waste management service sector including recycling and processing centers, thrift, reuse and retail stores, curbside collection programs, moderate risk waste facilities, and solid waste transfer stations.
- Connect producers to the costs associated with the end-of-life management of their products and provide incentives for reducing waste, increasing recyclability, and reducing the toxicity of their products.
Definitions: (TBD)

Hard to handle (or difficult to handle)

Toxic

i King County Solid Waste Division, Draft Final SWD Comprehensive Solid Waste Management, 2013, page xi.
ii King County Solid Waste Division, page 3-9.
iii King County Solid Waste Division, page 3-ii.
The Solid Waste Division (SWD) is currently conducting a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer Station Plan. Based on that review, the County will determine whether to proceed as proposed in the plan with constructing three additional transfer stations, or whether to downsize and build fewer stations, and/or, to build smaller stations, and/or stations with fewer services than called for under the current plan. A draft report is due on October 9, 2013 (the date of the next PIC meeting) and a final report is due to the County Council on November 27, 2013.

**Background**

On April 17, 2013, SCA adopted the following 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.” In July 2013, the King County Council amended Ordinance 17619, limiting expenditures for the Factoria Transfer Station until a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan was completed. The first meeting of the Transfer Station Plan Review was on July 26th; the second meeting on August 22nd, and the third meeting on September 7th. The Executive is scheduled to submit a draft plan to stakeholders on October 9th (the same date as the October PIC meeting) and submit the final report to the King County Council on November 27th.

Materials from the workshops can be found here: [http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp](http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/plan-review.asp)

The SWD is considering nine possible alternatives. These include a “base alternative” of building the transfer stations as called for in the 2006 plan. Details on these various alternatives can be found here: [http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Alternatives-Station-Detail.pdf](http://your.kingcounty.gov/solidwaste/about/Planning/documents/TWMP-Alternatives-Station-Detail.pdf)

While the draft report has not been released as of this writing, SWD staff has released the following “observations” based upon their review to date:
The Base Alternative is the most expensive option from a capital cost perspective, with an added cost of about $1.10 per month for the average household (estimated median cost of capital debt 2014-2040). The added cost for the average household for the other alternatives ranges from about $0.90 to $0.95 per month for Alternatives A and B to a low of about $0.35 per month for Alternative D***.

**Estimated Capital Cost**

*Added cost per month for the average household (estimated median cost of capital debt 2014-2040)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Monthly Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>$ 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$ 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>$ 0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$ 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$ 0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C**</td>
<td>$ 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$ 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D**</td>
<td>$ 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D***</td>
<td>$ 0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital costs are uniformly distributed among all system users, while collection costs are dependent on transfer system configuration. In some areas, lower capital costs would be offset or exceeded by higher collection costs. Areas that are not served by nearby transfer facilities would bear the brunt of increased collection costs resulting from longer hauling distances from their area. For example, based on information provided by the commercial haulers, the added monthly cost of collection for Alternative C would be about $0.95 for residents in the Bellevue area (estimated median cost 2021-2040) and about $1.20 for residents in the South County (Algona) area (estimated median cost 2017-2040).

Capital costs will be paid off – for this analysis we assumed 20-year bonds – while collection cost increases will continue to grow with inflation.
• Lower capital costs correlate with reduced service levels – the least expensive alternative, D***, fails to meet 14 of the 25 level of service criteria and subcriteria including recycling services, vehicle capacity, and impacts to local streets.

• The Solid Waste Division is committed to providing excellent customer service, and we have all, as a community, developed a recycling goal of 70 percent; alternatives that do not provide full recycling services will not help us meet that goal.

SCA staff have inquired as to whether the SWD has a “preferred alternative.” SWD staff responded that the SWD does not.

The potential impacts to service can be found here:

The “base plan” was designed to meet 17 level-of-service criteria. (When broken down into sub-criteria, there are 25 level-of-service targets.) The base plan is expected to add $1.08 in capital costs to the average household bill. In a conversation with SWD staff, they noted that all criteria were not considered equal and cautioned against just comparing the number of “Yes” responses in evaluating the alternatives. SWD staff also noted that an additional factor they will consider in their decision-making is social equity in terms of access to services for citizens throughout the County. In the discussion of the alternatives and the criteria below, all alternatives include the existing Shoreline and Bow Lake transfer stations.

In a conversation with SWD staff, SCA staff asked why SWD did not model an alternative with Factoria built as approved, with no new Northeast station and with a new South County station. SWD staff responded that the volume of waste at Houghton was too high to have the waste handled by an existing Factoria station (a small amount of waste would go to the Shoreline transfer station) without another new station in the Northeast or an expanded Factoria station.

- **Alternative A**
  Alternative A would build an expanded Factoria transfer station (expands to Eastgate site) and a new South County transfer station. Algonia, Renton and Houghton stations would be closed. The Transfer Plan Level of Service Criteria Applied to Alternatives List (Criteria List) shows Alternative A as meeting 16 of the 17 criteria; it shows Alternative A as not meeting criterion 17: Transfer station is compatible with surrounding land use. This is due to the zoning of the Eastgate property not permitting a transfer station as an allowed use, though it may be a conditionally permitted use. Bellevue staff has noted on various occasions that the city of Bellevue is not supportive of expanding the Factoria transfer station and that they have a plan for I-90 corridor, including the Eastgate property, and a transfer station is incompatible with that plan. Alternative A would add $0.92 per month in capital costs to the average household bill.

- **Alternative A***
  Alternative A* would limit Factoria self-haul to weekends only, would keep Houghton open for self-haul only and would build a new South County station. This alternative is listed as not meeting the following criteria: time standards and recycling services for self- haulers (2c, 4a,
4b); the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity (5a, 5b); 3 days storage requirements and space to expand on site (7a, 7b, 8); the ability to compact waste (11); meeting FEMA immediate occupancy standards (12b); and meeting goals for traffic on local streets (15a, 15b); meeting buffer requirements (16); and compatibility with surrounding land uses (17).

Alternative A* would add $0.66 per month in capital costs to the average household bill.

Alternative B

Alternative B is for an expanded Northeast station (larger than currently envisioned), a new South County station, and the closure of the Algona, Factoria, Houghton and Renton facilities. This alternative is shown as meeting all 17 criteria and assumes adequate sites can be located in the Northeast and the South County. Alternative B would add $0.93 per month in capital costs to the average household bill.

Alternative C

Alternative C limits self-haul at Bow Lake and builds only an expanded Northeast station. Algona, Factoria, Houghton and Renton would be closed under this alternative. This alternative does not meet the following criteria: estimated time to a transfer station within the service area for 90% of the users (1); standards for residential self-haulers and for recycling services (2c, 4a, 4b); and the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity forecasts (5a, 5b). Alternative C would add $0.56 per month in capital costs to the average monthly bill.

Alternative C**

Alternative C** builds a new expanded Northeast station and retains Algona for self-haul only. Factoria, Houghton and Renton would be closed in this alternative. This alternative does not meet the following criteria: standards for residential self-haulers and for recycling services (2c, 4a, 4b); the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity forecasts (5a, 5b); space for 3 days storage and space to expand onsite (7a, 7b, 8); FEMA immediate occupancy standards (12b); and goals for traffic on local streets (15a, 15b). Alternative C** would add $0.61 per month in capital costs to the average monthly bill.

Alternative D

Alternative D builds an expanded Factoria and limits self-haul at Bow Lake. Algona, Houghton and Renton would be closed under this alternative. This alternative does not meet the following criteria: estimated time to a transfer station within the service area for 90% of the users (1); standards for residential self-haulers and for recycling services (2c, 4a, 4b); the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity forecasts (5a, 5b); and compatibility with surrounding land uses (17). Alternative D would add $0.55 per month in capital costs to the average monthly bill.

Alternative D**

Alternative D** builds an expanded Factoria and retains self-haul at Algona while limiting self-haul at Bow Lake. Houghton and Renton are closed in this alternative. This alternative does not meet the following criteria: standards for residential self-haulers and for recycling services (2c, 4a, 4b); the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity forecasts (5a, 5b); space for 3 days storage and space to expand onsite (7a, 7b, 8); ability to compact waste (11); FEMA immediate occupancy standards (12b); goals for traffic on local streets (15a, 15b) and compatibility with
surrounding land uses (17). Alternative D** would add $0.60 per month in capital costs to the average monthly bill.

- Alternative D***

Alternative D*** retains Houghton and Algona for self-haul only, limits self-haul at Bow Lake, and builds the currently permitted Factoria station. Only the Renton facility is closed in this alternative. This alternative does not meet the following criteria: standards for residential self-haulers and for recycling services (2c, 4a, 4b); the capacity to meet 2027 and 2040 vehicle capacity forecasts (5a, 5b); space for 3 days storage and space to expand onsite (7a, 7b, 8); ability to compact waste (11); FEMA immediate occupancy standards (12b); goals for traffic on local streets (15a, 15b); 100 foot buffer requirement (16); and compatibility with surrounding land uses (17). Alternative D*** would add $0.34 per month in capital costs to the average monthly bill.

**SCA Potential Action**

Once the review is completed, the County will make a decision on whether to proceed with the “Base Plan” of the current Transfer Station Plan, or to construct fewer transfer station than the Plan currently calls for. The budget proviso adopted by the County Council requires the SWD to collect feedback from various stakeholders, including SCA. SCA may wish to adopt a formal policy position to give guidance to the Council. In addition, there will be a two-week review period during which written comments may be submitted to the SWD; written comments are due by close of business Wednesday, October 23, 2013. All written comments and a “responsiveness summary” will be included in an appendix of the final report submitted to the Metropolitan King County Council on November 27.
Item 8a:
King County 2014 Budget
*Informational Item*

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

Background

The 2014 Proposed Budget focuses on funds and agencies with annual budgets for 2013, including the General Fund, Public Health, the Parks Division of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks, and a few internal service agencies. King County is in the process of gradually moving to a biennial (two-year) budget. Most funds and agencies have biennial budgets for 2013/2014 that were adopted in November 2012. With few exceptions, no changes to these biennial budgets are proposed at this time.

2014 Revenue sources for general fund ($692 Million)
Regional economic conditions have substantial effects on King County’s revenues, notably the sales tax. King County receives sales tax revenues in several funds, with the largest amounts for the General Fund and transit.

Proposed Budget Highlights

• The total 2014 Proposed General Fund Budget is $714.4 million with 4,294 FTEs which includes the addition of 336 public defenders.
• The 2014 Proposed Budget funds most County programs at 2013 levels and includes a small number of service restorations and new initiatives.
• The long term financial outlook of the General Fund has improved over the past five years primarily as a result of reducing the cost growth curve from approximately 5.0 to 3.5 percent annually.

Some significant proposals in the 2014 budget include:

• **The Maple Valley Precinct is reopened.** This precinct, which serves the southeastern portion of King County, was closed two years ago as part of a new deployment approach for the King County Sheriff’s Office (KCSO). However, Sheriff John Urquhart requested that it be reopened because alternative facilities, including holding cells, have not been available.
• **Four additional uniformed staff are added to the KCSO.** Sheriff’s staffing has been significantly reduced over the last decade. The 2014 Proposed Budget includes funding for three new patrol deputies and a sergeant. It also includes funding for a public records manager to ensure the Sheriff’s Office provides timely and complete responses to such requests.

• **The next phase of the Health and Human Potential (HHP) transformation plan is implemented.** Health and human services are currently delivered in a decentralized manner that often requires clients to navigate a complex array of providers and locations. The HHP transformation effort is a joint endeavor of King County and many service providers to develop a more client-centric model for service delivery.

• **Several additional positions are included in the 2014 Proposed Budget to broaden the application of Lean.** A wide variety of Lean activities have been conducted in 2012 and 2013. Perhaps the most notable recent project was the psychiatric services array project conducted by the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) and the Jail Health Services Division of Public Health. Staff from these agencies collaborated to review how to best serve patients in the jail with psychiatric issues. The team determined that a net of about $1.2 million could be saved while actually improving service to the inmate-patients. Other Lean efforts have resulted in service improvements rather than cost savings, including faster processing of licenses and faster tabulation of election ballots.

• **Staffing is provided for the Regional Veterans Initiative.** King County is the home of about 127,000 veterans. Services for these veterans are often uncoordinated and hard to access. Earlier in 2013, Executive Constantine called for an effort to better link these services and asked three prominent veterans to lead a planning effort toward that end.

• **Several steps to advance the “Employer of the Future” work are funded.** Employer of the Future is an effort to develop human resources policies, employment practices, and labor contracts that reflect best practices in this era. This is an outgrowth of the KCSP’s “Quality Workforce” goal.

• **MIDD programs are continued.** The Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Fund is supported by a 0.1 percent sales tax. It funds a variety of human service and criminal justice programs to assist people with mental illnesses or drug dependency.

• **Courthouse services hours are restored.** As part of the significant budget reductions required in 2011, the Department of Judicial Administration (DJA) eliminated service counter hours during lunchtime. The 2014 Proposed Budget restores partial noontime services at the King County Courthouse and the Maleng Regional Justice Center.
King County Council
The Council's Budget Leadership Team is composed of Councilmembers: Joe McDermott, Chair; Kathy Lambert, Vice-Chair; Jane Hague, Member, and Larry Phillips, Member.

Since receiving the Executive’s Proposed 2014 Budget on Sept. 23, King County Council budget staff have been reviewing the proposal. On Tuesday, October 1, the King Budget Committee hosted the first of four night meetings to hear from constituents on budget priorities. The remaining three public meetings will be held:

- Tuesday, October 8, 6:30 pm, at Norm Maleng Regional Justice Center, 401 Fourth Avenue N, Kent
- Wednesday, October 16, 6:30 pm, at Si View Community Center, 400 SE Orchard Drive, North Bend
- Tuesday, October 22, 6:30 pm, at King County Courthouse, 10th Floor, 516 Third Ave., Seattle

Additional information:

- King County Council Budget Webpage www.kingcounty.gov/council/budget.
Item 8b:
King County Youth and Action Plan
**Informational Item**

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, (206) 433-7170, Deanna@soundcities.org

Background

Metropolitan King County Councilmember Rod Dembowski introduced a proposal on September 19, 2013 for the development of a Youth Action Plan to ensure that young people in King County have access to the resources and opportunities they need to become productive adults.

Over the last 50 years, King County has been a leader in supporting programs for children, youth and young adults – including developing sports fields in local neighborhoods, providing public health visits for low-income infants and children, establishing a Youth & Family Services Network to help at-risk teens and families, and assisting youth who have become involved with the criminal justice system to take a fresh path. However, the Great Recession reduced or eliminated County support for many programs, and the programs still receiving County funding are operated through many different agencies, too often with little coordination between them.

As part of an initiative adopted by the Council last year, a countywide task force has worked to develop a plan for an accountable and integrated delivery of social safety net services in King County. The Youth Action Plan proposal introduced by Councilmember Dembowski builds on that work.

The goal of the Youth Action Plan legislation is to ensure that King County’s Strategic Plan objective to “promote opportunities for all communities and individuals to realize their full potential,” is applied to the County’s young people and reflected across all County departments, programs and initiatives. The plan also seeks to ensure that King County is a strong partner with the state, cities, private sector, non-profit and philanthropic organizations.

The proposed legislation calls for the creation of a broadly-based task force to develop a Youth Action Plan that would include the following elements:

- Mission, vision, and defined outcomes that enable the County to advance its Strategic Plan and social justice and equity goals,
- A Bill of Rights for Youth,
• Whether a single point of accountability should be established to lead the County’s Youth Agenda and if so, it’s form, role and duties,
• Identification of reform efforts and efficiencies and recommendations to overcoming barriers to success,
• Prioritization of programs and methodologies and recommendations related to funding,
• Evaluation and reporting structure and implementation timeline.

The proposal calls on the County Executive to appoint members to a Youth Action Plan Task Force. The members of the task force would include elected officials (including a representative from the Sound Cities Association) and non-profit community partners that serve infants, children, youth and young adults. It would be charged with conducting information meetings with community members, stakeholders and consumers to keep interested parties informed on the development of the Plan.

The Youth Action Task Force is charged with preparing a Youth Action Plan for the King County Council by September 4, 2014.

The legislation has broad support. All nine members of the Council have signed on as sponsors, and it has garnered praise from cities, law enforcement, the courts, state leaders and human service providers. Councilmember Dembowski presented a draft of the plan and sought input from SCA staff and city elected officials prior to its release. Mayors Law and Lewis were quoted in Councilmember Dembowski’s press release regarding the proposal:

“Whether they live in Renton or Redmond, Kent or Kenmore, Shoreline or Seattle—all our kids deserve the same opportunities to succeed,” said Renton Mayor Denis Law, President of the Sound Cities Association. “I applaud Councilmember Dembowski for his leadership, and our cities look forward to working with him to make a difference on behalf of kids throughout King County.”

“When our cities partner with the County, we get results,” said Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis, Vice Chair of the County Council’s Regional Policy Committee. “I was proud to be a part of our successful effort to bring needed services to veterans. Just as we owe a debt of gratitude to the veterans who served us in the past, we owe it to future generations to invest in our kids today.”

SCA will continue to work with Councilmember Dembowski to develop the Plan.

Attachment

A. Youth and Action Plan Press Release
B. Ordinance
Ensuring that King County’s young people can reach their full potential: County leaders propose Youth Action Plan
Countywide Task Force would propose a “Youth Bill of Rights” and action steps

Together with his colleagues, Metropolitan King County Councilmember Rod Dembowski today introduced a proposal calling for the development of a Youth Action Plan to ensure that young people in King County have access to the resources and opportunities they need to become productive adults.

“As a kid growing up here, King County played an important role in my life. I played in our county parks, and received health care at our Public Health clinics. Today’s kids deserve our best efforts to ensure that they have every opportunity to grow up healthy, safe, and succeed in life,” said Dembowski. “This legislation brings together the broad spectrum of participants from throughout the region who help King County’s children and youth, to recommit our collective efforts and honor our obligations as adults to the next generation. I look forward to working with leaders to reform, renew and reinvest in our work to help King County’s kids achieve their full potential.”

“Economic stability, reliable health care, and a wide range of educational choices for all our youth are critical components for a healthy, livable community,” said Council Vice Chair Jane Hague. “It’s exciting to know that some of the most committed public servants in King County will be working to ensure that all our children have the opportunity to seek their full potential.”

“Helping our youth realize their full potential is one of the best investments a society can make,” said Councilmember Larry Phillips. “King County services can make a difference in the lives of our youth, and developing a youth action plan can help us deliver those services more effectively.”

Over the last 50 years, King County has been a leader in supporting programs for children, youth and young adults – including developing sports fields in local neighborhoods, providing public health visits for low-income infants and children, establishing a Youth & Family Services Network to help at-risk teens and families, and assisting youth who have become involved with the criminal justice system to take a fresh path. However, the Great Recession reduced or eliminated County support for many programs, and the programs still receiving County funding are operated through many different agencies, too often with little coordination between them.

As part of an initiative adopted by the Council last year, a countywide task force has worked to develop a plan for an accountable and integrated delivery of social safety net services in King County. The Youth Action Plan proposal introduced by Councilmember Dembowski builds on that work.
The goal of the Youth Action Plan legislation is to ensure that King County’s Strategic Plan objective to “promote opportunities for all communities and individuals to realize their full potential,” is applied to the County’s young people and reflected across all County departments, programs and initiatives. The plan also seeks to ensure that King County is a strong partner with the state, cities, private sector, non-profit and philanthropic organizations.

“Our youth are the future leaders of King County,” said Reagan Dunn. “Creating a Youth Plan is a sensible approach that will better serve the needs of children throughout the county.”

The proposed legislation calls for the creation of a broadly-based task force to develop a Youth Action Plan including the following elements:

- Mission, vision, and defined outcomes that enable the County to advance its Strategic Plan and social justice and equity goals
- Bill of Rights for Youth
- Whether a single point of accountability should be established to lead the County’s Youth Agenda and if so, it’s form, role and duties
- Identification of reform efforts and efficiencies and recommendations to overcoming barriers to success
- Prioritization of programs and methodologies and recommendations related to funding
- Evaluation and reporting structure and implementation timeline

The proposal calls on the County Executive to appoint members to a Youth Action Plan Task Force. The members of the task force would include elected officials, leaders from Seattle and suburban cities, and non-profit community partners that serve infants, children, youth and young adults, and is charged with conducting information meetings with community members, stakeholders, and consumers to keep interested parties informed on the development of the Plan.

The Youth Action Task Force is charged with preparing a Youth Action Plan for the King County Council by September 4, 2014.

The legislation has broad support. All nine members of the Council have signed on as sponsors, and it has garnered praise from cities, law enforcement, the courts, state leaders and human service providers.

“The Sheriff’s Office is proud to participate in King County’s Youth Action Plan,” said King County Sheriff John Urquhart. “Devoting more attention and resources to our youth will pay dividends in the long run by helping them to succeed and keeping kids out of the criminal justice system.”

“As a former member of the King County Children and Families Commission, I am pleased to see King County leaders renewing their commitment to focusing on our community’s children and youth,” said State Representative Ruth Kagi, Chair of the House Early Learning and Human Services Committee. “The proposed legislation offers fresh hope for prioritization and investment in our kids, and I urge the Council’s quick passage.”

“Whether they live in Renton or Redmond, Kent or Kenmore, Shoreline or Seattle- All our kids deserve the same opportunities to succeed,” said Renton Mayor Denis Law, President of the Sound Cities Association. “I applaud Councilmember Dembowski for his leadership, and our cities look forward to working with him to make a difference on behalf of kids throughout King County.”
“Our county has long born the costs of young people who struggle. They show up in our juvenile system, our prisons, our emergency rooms, and yes, even at my shelter,” said Kristine Cunningham, Executive Director of Rising Out of the Shadows (ROOTS), an agency that provides shelter and other essential services to homeless young adults. “This county council ordinance reflects a desire to look at whole systems and create accountability with the young people in mind. I see this as a new, exciting perspective shift in effective policy making.”

“The success of our community is directly linked to the success of our kids,” said Dan Satterberg, Prosecuting Attorney. “This proposal will help coordinate multiple efforts designed to help young people grow up healthy, safe and smart.”

“This opportunity to improve services offered to our youth, including those involved in our criminal justice and dependency systems, is invaluable,” said the Hon. Richard McDermott, Presiding Judge, King County Superior Court. “Creation of the Youth Action Plan Task Force, and the development of a Youth Action Plan, fills a significant need here in King County. We have no more valuable resource in our community than our youth. We thank the Council for this progressive and much needed plan.”

“When our cities partner with the County, we get results,” said Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis, Vice Chair of the County Council’s Regional Policy Committee. “I was proud to be a part of our successful effort to bring needed services to veterans. Just as we owe a debt of gratitude to the veterans who served us in the past, we owe it to future generations to invest in our kids today.”

Read more about this legislation on the King County Council’s LEGISEARCH system at http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov and type in “2013-0420”

Follow the Council’s deliberations through Facebook and Twitter by signing up through the King County Council Web site at: www.kingcounty.gov/council

Watch all Council proceedings held in chambers LIVE on King County TV on Comcast and Wave Cable on channel 22, or online at: www.kingcounty.gov/KCTV

# # #
AN ORDINANCE relating to the development of a youth action plan that sets King County's priorities for serving infants through young adults.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. Since the 1960s, King County has participated in and funded programs aimed at assisting children and young adults. This work includes but is not limited to federal fund distribution, as well as local programming and funding.

2. Today, King County spends over seventy-five million dollars annually on a wide range of programs that influence children and youth at all stages of development from birth to young adult. These services and programs for youth and children are provided across King County government by several departments and agencies. While most of these programs may be successful individually, it is not clear whether they operate at a scale or collaboratively to make a difference in improving overall outcomes for infants, children, youth and young adults. There is no single point of accountability or unified policy vision for coordinating the county's wide array of children and youth services or programs.

3. King County's various departments and agencies contract with dozens of community-based organizations and local nonprofit organizations that work in collaboration with each other, the county and other governments
to serve children, youth and their families. The community-based
organizations and local nonprofit organizations include: geographically
focused organizations; organizations focused on serving specific cultural
and ethnic populations; organizations serving gay, lesbian and transgender
youth and young adults; and organizations targeting justice-involved or at-risk youth.

4. King County has adopted policies to directly guide or substantially
influence services and programs aimed at the children and youth
population such as the Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan, the
Human Services Framework Policies and the Strategic Plan.

5. In 1992 King County established the children and family commission,
to define King County's mission, role and goals in provision of services to
children, youth and families. Ordinance 13811, adopted in 2000, further
defined the role and duties of the commission, noting that the commission
acted in an advisory capacity to the county executive, superior court and
the county council. The children and family commission was defunded
and dismantled in 2011, due in part to declining revenues and the county's
constrained fiscal environment.

6. The absence of the children and family commission has left a
significant gap in advising the executive, superior court and the county
council on matters related to children, youth, and families, especially as
related to building linkages between the county's service systems,
communities and schools. In a 2011 letter, the exiting commission
members stated that they were "deeply concerned with the county's lack of transparency and accountability," especially around decision making involving revenue historically supporting the work, outcomes and reports of the children and family commission.

7. King County government has been developing and implementing a performance and accountability system that focuses on results. The purpose of this system is to improve King County government's ability to measure how it is operating and performing, plan for the future and report on its performance across all of the services delivered to citizens.

8. A cornerstone of that performance and accountability system is the county's Strategic Plan, adopted by the council in July 2010 via Ordinance 16897. The plan calls for improved customer service, greater efficiency in government and more robust partnerships across the region.

9. The King County Strategic Plan states that it embodies the priorities of the residents of King County and the values of all of the separately-elected officials in King County government. It furthers states that the purpose of the Action plan is to guide decisions in times of fiscal challenge, as well as in future prosperity. The plan also represents King County government's commitment to deliver county services that meet and exceed the standards of professionalism, efficiency, quality and customer service as appropriate to the current funding and policy environment.

10. The Strategic Plan contains specific goals related to the county's functions and lines of business. For health and human services-related
areas, a health and human potential goal was established to "promote opportunities for all communities and individuals to realize their full potential."

11. Led by the committee to end homelessness, King County has been actively working with a wide array of stakeholders, including nonprofit community agencies, government leaders, private philanthropy and homeless and formerly homeless young people, on a homeless youth and young adult initiative. The purpose of the community-wide initiative is to prevent and reduce youth and young adult homelessness in the county.

12. In November 2012, the council passed Motion 13768 requesting the executive, in collaboration with the departments of public health and community and human services and a community stakeholder panel informed by local and national expertise, to develop and submit a plan for council review and approval for an accountable and integrated system of health, human services and community-based prevention in King County.

13. In January 2013, the executive convened a thirty-member community stakeholder panel, referred to in this ordinance as "the health and human services transformation panel," that included representatives from the healthcare, human services and prevention sectors, the business community, the geographic subregions of King County and local and national experts in system transformation and innovation. The health and human services transformation panel met between February and May 2013 to advise staff on key design elements of the transformation plan.
14. On June 26, 2013, the executive transmitted the requested transformation plan. It recognizes various populations and diversity of those in need of services throughout the county. The transformation plan is individual, family and community centered, and takes a whole-person approach where the preferences, strengths, needs and goals of individuals and families come first. The transformation plan includes integration efforts and interventions that occur at two levels: the individual and family level, which assures that individuals and families can access an array of person-centered, integrated, culturally competent services; and the community level, which creates community-level improvements because health is most deeply influenced by where people live, work, learn and play. The transformation plan establishes a path to achieve an outcome-driven system where providers, consumers, funders and policy makers are called to work together collectively and are mutually accountable through contracts and compacts that include shared priorities, strategies and measurements for assuring health and human service outcomes.

15. On June 19, 2013, King County council's committee of the whole received a briefing entitled "implementation of the action plan goals," where the executive outlined priorities related to specific goals of the action plan. In that briefing, the executive identified a number of priorities for 2015-2019 related to the health and human potential goal area.

16. In that briefing, the executive also stated that King County will develop a youth agenda that defines outcomes, priorities, and actions for
pursuing the proposed vision that all infants reach adulthood healthy and
safe, academically or vocationally succeeding and socially and civically
engaged.

17. There is a need to provide continuing direction regarding the
development and implementation of a youth action plan to ensure that the
county's existing adopted policy goals, as included in the Juvenile Justice
Operational Master Plan, Human Services Framework Policy, Equity and
Social Justice Initiative and Strategic Plan, are reflected throughout the
process and that work undertaken by the county, such as the homeless
youth and young adult initiative and the health and human services
transformation plan, are taken into consideration. The development and
implementation of the youth action plan needs to be accomplished
transparently, collaboratively and strategically, in partnership with
children and youth serving community providers, consumers,
philanthropy, separately elected officials including the council, other
jurisdictions and school districts.

18. It is the policy of the county that citizens and policy makers be able to
measure the effectiveness of the investment of public funds.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a youth action plan task force that will
develop a youth action plan. The task force shall be composed one representative from
each of the following:

1. The King County Youth and Family Service Associations;
2. A provider of youth homeless services;
3. A provider of before and after school care and youth recreation services;
4. A provider of culturally specific children, youth and family services;
5. A children and youth justice organization;
6. An organization serving gay, lesbian and transgender youth;
7. A provider of both mental health and chemical dependency services to children and youth;
8. An organization serving foster youth;
9. A provider or expert on early childhood learning and/or development;
10. A youth focused philanthropic organization
11. The city of Seattle;
12. The city of Bellevue;
13. The Sound Cities Association;
14. Puget Sound Educational Service District;
15. King County systems integration initiative, which is an ongoing work group established by the executive for addressing juvenile justice matters;
16. The executive;
17. The council;
18. Superior court;
19. The sheriff;
20. The department of adult and juvenile detention;
21. The department of natural resources and parks;
22. The prosecuting attorney;
23. The department of public defense;
24. Public Health – Seattle and King County;
25. The department of community and human services;
26. The Committee to End Homelessness in King County; and
27. The department of judicial administration.

SECTION 2. The members of the task force shall be appointed by the executive and submitted to the council with a motion for confirmation no later than November 14, 2013.

SECTION 3. The executive shall ensure that the youth action plan is developed with input from the departments of community and human services, public health, adult and juvenile detention, judicial administration, natural resources and parks and public defense. In the process of youth strategic development and revision, the task force shall also consult with boards and commissions that address matters involving children, youth and families, including the mental illness and drug dependency oversight committee, the committee to end homelessness and the veterans and human services levy citizen oversight boards.

SECTION 4. A. The task force shall make recommendations to the executive and the council in a youth action plan that shall be submitted to the council by September 4, 2014. The youth action plan shall contain recommendations on the following matters and the rationale for each recommendation shall be detailed and included in the youth action plan:

1. Identification of the mission and vision of the youth action plan, and whether the executive's stated vision of "infants reach adulthood healthy and safe, academically or
vocationally succeeding, and socially and civically engaged" reflects the
recommendations of the task force;

2. A bill of rights for King County's youth akin to the youth bills of rights that
many jurisdictions in California and elsewhere around the country have adopted;

3. Whether King County should establish a single point of accountability for
children and youth services, programs and policy in the county and what model or
structure that point of accountability should take, such as a special advisor, an office or
department, a board or commission and/or some other form;

4. Recommendations regarding the role and duties of a special advisor, office or
department or board or commission, with special attention paid to the role that the special
advisor, office or department, or board or commission or other form, would have with
respect to the health and human services transformation plan activities. The
recommendations shall also address whether the special advisor, office or department, or
board or commission or other form, would be time-limited or ongoing;

5. Identification of what age range the proposed youth action plan will address
and/or serve, and whether families are included in the youth action plan;

6. Identification of improvements, efficiencies and areas for integration or
coordination, or both, of services, programs and policies for children and youth within
and outside of King County government;

7. Identification of the barriers within and outside of King County government
that prevent children, youth and families from realizing their full potential and
recommendations on how the county might proceed eliminating those barriers;
8. Identification of specific outcomes that the proposed youth action plan will call for that enable furtherance of the county's Strategic Plan and social justice and equity goals;

9. Identification of the children, youth and family programs, methodologies and service models that the county should prioritize to achieve outcomes and meet policy goals;

10. Recommendation on the county's funding of services and programs for youth, including the prioritization of existing and potential new resources to achieve recommended outcomes; and

11. Identification of an evaluation and reporting structure, process and implementation timeline for the youth action plan.

B. The youth action plan required in subsection A. of this section shall be filed with the clerk of the copy in the form of a paper and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the paper copy and forward an electronic copy to all councilmembers.

SECTION 5. The task force shall conduct community, stakeholder and consumer information meetings throughout the development of the recommendations and proposed youth action plan in order to keep interested parties informed and up-to-date on the work of the task force.