SCA Public Issues Committee

AGENDA
July 8, 2015 – 7:00 PM
Renton City Hall

1. **Welcome and Roll Call** – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair 2 minutes

2. **Public Comment** – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair 10 minutes

3. **Approval of minutes – June 10, 2015 meeting**
   Page 5 2 minutes

4. **Chair’s Report** – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair 5 minutes

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

6. **Committee to End Homelessness Coordinating Board Appointment**
   ACTION ITEM
   Page 19 5 minutes
   Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair
   (5 minutes)

7. **Best Starts for Kids Levy**
   POTENTIAL ACTION ITEM
   Page 21 20 minutes
   Deanna Dawson, Executive Director
   (5 minute update, 15 minute discussion)

8. **Road to 70% Recycling**
   DISCUSSION ITEM
   Page 33 15 minutes
   Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute update, 10 minute discussion)

9. **Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan**
   DISCUSSION ITEM
   Page 51 10 minutes
   Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute update, 5 minute discussion)
10. **Service Guidelines Task Force**  
**DISCUSSION ITEM**  
Page 59  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
(5 minute update, 5 minute discussion)

11. **2015 Legislative Session Update**  
**DISCUSSION ITEM**  
Page 63  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
(10 minute update, 5 minute discussion)

12. **Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**  
**DISCUSSION ITEM**  
Page 69  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
(2 minute update, 3 minute discussion)

13. **SCA Issues for 2015**  
**DISCUSSION ITEM**  
Page 71  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
(2 minute update, 3 minute discussion)

14. **Informational Items**  
**Regional Water Quality Committee Update**  
Page 73

15. **Upcoming Events**  
   a. SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, August 12, 2015 – 7:00 PM – Renton City Hall

16. **For the Good of the Order**

17. **Adjourn**
Did You Know?
The legislature (finally!) passed a transportation package, the first in a decade. Many legislators have indicated that advocacy from the Sound Cities Association (SCA) was key to its passage. Take a moment to congratulate yourselves, and to celebrate this important victory for our cities and our local, regional, and state economy!

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
PIC Chair Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM. 20 cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s Office; Leslie Miller, City of Kirkland; Mark Putnam, Committee to End Homelessness; Michael Hursh, City of Auburn.

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

3. Approval of the May 13, 2015 Minutes
Chair Talmas reported that he received one correction to the minutes on page 18 of the meeting material packet, under the “for the good of the order” section. The number of SCA member cities participating in MSWMAC should be 28, instead of 27.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, to approve the May 13, 2015 meeting minutes with the correction as noted by Chair Talmas.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chair’s Report
Chair Talmas reported that SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson, SCA President Matt Larson, and SCA Vice President Nancy Backus are currently in Chicago attending an Intercity Study Mission with the Seattle Chamber. Chair Talmas also reported that due to scheduling conflicts, the SCA leadership did not meet with Executive Constantine since the last meeting of the PIC.

5. Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan
Chair Talmas explained that the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan had been before the PIC several times. In March, the PIC voted to request that CEH extend their deadline for plan adoption in order to give time for cities to provide comment on the plan. The PIC received an update in April on the work that SCA and cities were doing to ensure that cities’ comments were incorporated into the plan. In May, the PIC voted unanimously to bring the item back this month for a position endorsing the plan. The position of support brought forward last month included contingencies, and, as reported in the staff report, those contingencies have now been satisfied.
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, summarized the contingencies that were contained in the position the PIC considered in May and reported on how those contingencies are fulfilled by the final language of the plan. First, the endorsement was conditioned on the PIC reviewing the final language of the plan. Wilson-Jones stated that the version before the PIC had been recommended unanimously by the CEH Interagency Advisory Council (IAC), which includes three representatives from SCA, on June 1, 2015 and is the language that will be considered for adoption by the Governing Board June 30, 2015.

Second, the endorsement was conditioned on the plan including recognition of the public safety responsibilities of local governments. Wilson-Jones reported that language put forward by SCA is included in the plan and that prior language mischaracterizing the efforts of local cities as the “criminalization of homelessness” has not been included. The version of the plan before the PIC recognizes the public safety responsibilities of local governments, and all edits made since May are consistent with the description of the then likely, but not yet finalized, revisions Wilson-Jones discussed with the PIC in May.

The final contingency was that the revised governance structure of CEH include adequate representation for SCA and ensure CEH decision makers are connected with public sector staff. In response, the revised CEH Charter, included in the packet, includes even more representation for SCA than had been previously discussed with the PIC. Specifically, SCA will receive one new seat on the existing Executive Committee, which will oversee the transition to the new governance structure and appoint members to the new Coordinating Board. As previously discussed with the PIC in May, the new Coordinating Board, which will replace the existing IAC and Governing Board, will contain two seats for SCA. Additionally, SCA will gain three new seats on the Funders Alignment Group. This is additional representation for SCA and was not part of earlier drafts of the plan. SCA currently has no seats on the Funders Alignment Group. Finally, the plan calls for public sector staff to be included in CEH subcommittees. This is also a new addition that will allow for an expanded local government voice.

Wilson-Jones next summarized CEH developments since the PIC last met. The work groups formed by the IAC to address issues of governance and criminal justice system involvement/public safety reached consensus. Wilson-Jones and IAC Member Colleen Kelly, City of Redmond, participated in both those work groups, which also included representatives from the King County and the cities of Seattle and Bellevue, as well as advocates for the homeless and leaders from faith organizations and service providers.

Wilson-Jones thanked the PIC, members of the Governing Board and IAC, and other city staff for their involvement in reviewing, critiquing, and redrafting the plan. Wilson-Jones acknowledged IAC Member Michael Hursh, City of Auburn, and Leslie Miller, City of Kirkland, both in attendance, who were particularly involved. CEH Director Mark Putnam, also in attendance, has also devoted substantial time to working with SCA staff and member cities. Wilson-Jones noted that Putnam, his staff, and SCA staff have presented to city councils in the cities of Auburn, SeaTac, Snoqualmie, and Renton since the PIC last met and thanked the PIC membership for making time on their council agendas.
Wilson-Jones concluded her report by stating that the SCA appointees to the IAC believe the contingencies set out by the PIC have now been fulfilled. For that reason, the recommended position before the PIC is to endorse the plan.

Chair Talmas asked whether there was a motion to put the recommended action before the PIC.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, to recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) shares the vision of the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), which is that homelessness is rare in King County, racial disparities are eliminated, and if one becomes homeless, it is brief and only a one-time occurrence. SCA endorses the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan, and its goals of making homelessness rare, making homelessness brief and one-time, and creating a community to end homelessness.

Discussion on the motion ensued.

Margeson stated that the plan has evolved to a point where his city can now wholeheartedly support it. He thanked Wilson-Jones, Colleen Kelly, and Mark Putnam for their involvement. Margeson stated that he appreciates that the Funders Alignment Group will include geographically representative SCA membership.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, questioned whether the Coordinating Board, which would have two representatives from SCA, two representatives for King County, two representatives from the City of Seattle, and one representative from the City of Bellevue provides SCA and city governments, more generally, enough say in the process. Hill also expressed concerns about the relationship between the plan and Algona’s camping ordinance.

Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Burien, stated that she would be abstaining in the vote because her City Council has not yet considered the version of the Strategic Plan before the PIC. She stated that there have also been concerns expressed in Burien regarding camping.

Councilmember Dini Duclos, Federal Way, stated that Federal Way shares concerns about camping and that she would be abstaining because her council has not taken a position on the plan.

Chair Talmas stated that he would be abstaining because his council has not provided direction.

Councilmember Bill Boyce, Kent, stated that he was still awaiting feedback from his council with regard to the current version of the plan. However, later in the meeting Boyce received confirmation that the Kent City Council supports the motion.

Margeson stated that the City of Redmond also has an ordinance that bans camping but that his city is comfortable with the language included in the plan. The plan does not suggest camping
or similar ordinances should be altered or repealed. He stated that after speaking with the Redmond Police Chief and IAC Member Colleen Kelly, City of Redmond, he is confident that his city’s camping ordinance will not be impacted by the plan. He clarified for the PIC that prior drafts of the plan did call for the repeal of such ordinances but, as a result of the efforts of SCA, the version of the plan now under consideration does not contain that language.

Marts stated that he has consulted with his administrator and police chief about the plan. He said his city likes the range of options they currently have to address homelessness, which allows for compassionate and human responses and that nothing in the plan conflicts with this approach.

Tosta stated that, while she will need to abstain because of timing issues with her council’s approval, she believes the plan has indeed come a long way.

Chair Talmas acknowledged Auburn Director of Administration and IAC Member Michael Hursh and provided him with an opportunity to comment. Michael Hursh addressed the question posed earlier by Hill, explaining that the combining the existing IAC and Governing Board into one, more streamlined, Coordinating Board, will allow for a more effective governance structure. He stated that SCA will have more representation in the new governance structure than the present status, including three seats, North, East, and South, on the Funders Alignment Group, which influences important funding issues for our region. He said the new governance structure ensures the city perspective will be considered in CEH policy making.

Margeson stated that it will be important to have the voice of SCA member city staff on the Funders Alignment Group and that is the new governance structure that will provide SCA this expanded representation.


Chair Talmas stated that the position will be brought back to the PIC in July so that city councils have further time to review the finalized language of the Strategic Plan.

6. **Best Starts for Kids Levy**
Chair Talmas reported that Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, wrote the PIC packet staff report and Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives for King County Executive Constantine, is present to answer questions.

Chair Talmas noted that the recommendation from staff is for PIC members to both consider the position stated on page 71 of the packet, and that members also give any feedback tonight so that SCA staff can work with King County staff on refinements to the ordinance proposed by the Executive. Talmas stated that when PIC returns in July for a possible position of support to the Board, the PIC can evaluate whether the feedback from cities had been incorporated sufficiently.
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that Mayor Backus and Mayor Larson had wished they could have been here tonight to personally speak to the Best Starts for Kids levy. Kuciemba noted that discussion and analysis of the Best Starts for Kids levy is now occurring at the County Council level where staff have raised a number of questions. Best Starts of Kids is expected to be moved out of the County Council Budget and Finance Management Committee by late-June, and the Council will need to act by no later than July 20, 2015 in order to place the matter on the November ballot.

Kuciemba explained this still gives SCA time to take a streamlined position at its July Board meeting in support of the Council placing the matter on the ballot. However, this is a critical time for SCA to provide feedback on refinements or changes to the Best Starts for Kids levy ordinance prior to the next PIC meeting in order to be effective.

Kuciemba noted that SCA staff has identified several key areas in the Best Starts levy that were called out in the PIC packet: public health funding, homelessness prevention, and governance and oversight. In each section, SCA staff has made observations where PIC may wish to direct SCA staff to work with Councilmembers and staff. Feedback should be given to the County Council by SCA and member cities to the extent possible by June 24.

Chair Talmas asked whether there was a motion to put the recommended action before the PIC.

Councilmember Bob Keller, Sammamish, moved, seconded by Councilmember Janie Edelman, Black Diamond, to bring the following policy position back to the next PIC meeting for possible action:

>In order to support the healthy development of children and youth, families and communities across King County, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for consideration by the voters.

Discussion on the motion ensued.

Councilmember Bill Boyce, Kent, began the discussion by inquiring if the Best Starts for Kids levy will be a presented to the Kent City Council. Carlson, King County Executive’s Office, confirmed that a briefing has been scheduled.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, requested clarification on the length of the levy. Carlson responded that it is a six year levy. Hill commented that 25% of the funding will be used in the first year.

Chair Talmas suggested that the electorate may have a higher level of confidence with the measure if a fuller identification of specific projects and plans was provided in the Best Starts for Kids levy.
Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, stated that Best Starts for Kids does not have ongoing funding appropriations but expires much like Automated Fingerprint Information Service (AFIS) and the Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD). Margeson went on to state there is a critical need to strengthen the governance portion of the levy ordinance which currently identifies two advisory boards. However, the ordinance does not explain the membership of the advisory committees, it does not give a meaningful role to cities, and it does not indicate if the committees will have approval authority. At a minimum, Redmond believes that each geographic area of King County should have a seat.

Margeson stated that the Best Starts for Kids levy does not provide enough specificity. He encouraged the King County Council to identify specific goals and outcomes which will give the public a better understanding, leading to increased support. Further, Margeson stated that a definition of success will help to ensure that community partners will have the record needed to implement the levy.

Margeson stated that the levy ordinance should include a review process for the distribution of levy funds based on geographic area, similar to the Veterans Levy or the MIDD levy. Without geographic balance, there is no assurance that cities will see value.

Margeson added that accountability is critical. At the very least, Margeson felt that the Regional Policy Committee should receive an annual report that reviews how the levy proceeds are being spent by geographic area, by age group, or by program.

Councilmember Shelley Kloba, Kirkland, reminded PIC of the budget cuts that the Northshore Public Health Clinic experienced last year. Kloba expressed that the ordinance should have stronger language that specifically dedicates funding to public health.

Councilmember Rich Wagner, Auburn, shared Kloba’s concerns, and suggested clarification within the levy that public health clinic operations would be funded. Wagner would also like to see a work plan identifying specificity on the levy budget and spending.

Having experience in developing educational bonds and levy ballot measures, Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, added perspective that the levy will be more successful with the electorate if it is extremely clear and provides specificity.

Councilmember Dini Duclos, Federal Way, echoed concerns raised that dedicated dollars be used to fund public health.

Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, referenced the funding distribution overview on page 72 in the PIC packet and questioned why nearly $24 million is dedicated to studies.

Hill suggested the addition of non-supplantation language to the levy explicitly stating that current WIC funding would not be redistributed should the levy receive voter approval.
Councilmember Erin Weaver, Maple Valley, stated the need for balanced representation in recognition of the growing suburbanization of homelessness and poverty.

Carlson responded that most of the comments and questions raised by PIC could be addressed during ongoing development of the Best Starts for Kids levy package. Currently, Council staff is working to address the specificity PIC is looking for regarding governance and reporting, with the intent that the County Council will have approval authority of the implementation plan. Carlson stated that Executive Constantine supports the Regional Policy Committee having reporting oversight. Regarding public health, Carlson stated that the County would like to memorialize the intent to stabilize clinic services and funding at the 2014 level. She indicated that she would follow up on the non-supplanting language that Hill suggested. Carlson referenced PIC materials that included information about public health funding and the outcomes that have been identified. It was confirmed by Carlson that the County plans to engage directly with local communities, including cities, to identify specific needs to be addressed by the levy.

Vice Chair Marilla Mhoon, Covington, commented that the specificity requested may not be entirely realistic if the intent of the levy is to have an application process for fund distribution. Mhoon reflected on Covington’s experience with reviewing applications, mandating quarterly reports, and thorough review to ensure that goals are being met and residents are being best served. In Covington, funding has been reallocated if goals were not met by the successful applicant.

Bob Keller added that the Best Starts for Kids levy must be written in a way that the public understands to help maximize support.

Margeson stated that he is looking for the outcomes to be well-identified and suggested that a set of parameters be included identifying how program can achieve those outcomes.

Chair Talmas noted that there should be a number of changes to the proposed ballot measure with the feedback provided by PIC and member cities. Talmas restated that there was a motion and a second to bring the policy position back to the July, 2015 PIC meeting for possible action.

The measure passed with a unanimous vote.

7. Service Guidelines Task Force
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that PIC has been briefed on the Service Guidelines Task Force previously. Kuciemba reminded PIC members that some Task Force members have expressed that service reductions and investments need to be felt more equitably throughout the county and have reflected upon the SCA Metro Transit Principles from June 2014.
Kuciemba reported that the focus of the Task Force’s fourth meeting on May 21st was a discussion about geographic value and service allocation. Geographic value indicators establish how well corridors preserve connections and service throughout King County.

Kuciemba explained that a geographic value score is awarded in an “all or nothing” manner based upon connections between transit activity centers and connections between regional growth or manufacturing/industrial centers. Task Force members have suggested that points could be awarded on a sliding scale, perhaps depending on the size and density of the centers. Task Force members also suggested that points could be awarded to secondary connections between centers, as an “added value” consideration. Other suggestions related to geographic value included developing minimum service standards for each service type.

Kuciemba reported that the fifth meeting of the Task Force was held on June 3, 2015. The agenda included a discussion of alternative services and potential modifications to service types.

Kuciemba provided a brief overview of Metro’s Alternative Services program which focuses on community partnerships and initiating demonstration projects. In general, Task Force members have expressed that Alternative Services could help in providing mobility options at a lower cost, while providing enhanced services that meet social equity and geographic value priorities.

Also on June 3rd, a robust conversation centered on service types. Currently, there are two service types: Seattle core (routes serving the densest areas in the City of Seattle from anywhere in King County) and Non-Seattle core (routes serving all other areas of the county). Some Task Force members – including some SCA members – feel that the current service types are too simplistic. Some SCA members have suggested that Metro could take into account density (ex: dense urban, urban core, urban/dense suburban, suburban, rural) but also could take into consideration peak, frequent, local and alternative services.

Kuciemba stated that other issues important to SCA members of the Task Force are the role of park-and-rides and the desired outcome of mobility, including connectivity to key centers that attract riders.

Kuciemba reported that the next meeting of the Service Guidelines Task Force is Tuesday, June 16, 2015 where there will be a discussion of draft recommendations.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, inquired if there has been any discussion by the Service Guidelines Task Force on the measurement of productivity. Specifically, Hill stated that Metro should measure productivity from the first stop to the last stop and expressed concerns about deadheading and the location of bus barn puts the Non-Seattle Core services at a disadvantage. Kuciemba stated that these issues have been raised by Service Guidelines Task Force members and that she would share tonight’s comments with SCA members of the Task Force.

8. King Conservation District Advisory Committee Update
Chair Talmas introduced the item.
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, presented an overview of SCA’s position on the King Conservation District Work Program and corresponding budget. She noted SCA did take a position on this item and the practice is that when SCA takes a position, staff comes back and reports to you on the outcome of that position. She also noted two members of the KCD Advisory Committee were present at the meeting; Mayor Jim Berger, Carnation and Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Burien.

Booth noted that in July, 2014, the PIC took a position supporting the draft work plan of the KCD. The KCD receives its funds from a per parcel assessment. The assessment for 2015 was $5.14 per parcel. SCA supported an increase to $9.43 per parcel to implement a greatly expanded workplan; that increase was approved by the King County Council in November 2014 and is effective January 1, 2016.

Booth briefly walked members through the elements of the work program for 2015. In the area of Urban Agriculture; KCD will work in expanding soil fertility testing and education, partnering with cities and others on demonstration projects that support food access and urban agriculture and working with cities on farm friendly policies and regulations. In the Urban Forestry area, KCD will work with 3 cities a year to build an urban forest health management program that increases street trees, tree canopy and green infrastructure. In the Urban Shorelines and Riparian habitat, KCD will work with landowners and jurisdictions to implement habitat projects. KCD will also be expanding educational opportunities for property owners, including along freshwater creeks and wetlands.

In the Regional Food System area, KCD is granting $235,000 for early actions and has developed a grant program for $665,000 to fund projects that provide direct support or benefit to King County producers and farmland. Booth noted one of the early actions was the purchase of a mobile chicken processor. Booth noted that earlier in the day, KCD held a kickoff event for people / agencies interested in applying for those grants and that Deputy Mayor Tosta spoke at the event. In future years, one program of $900,000 will be competitively awarded. Lastly, KCD has increased its support of rural farmers, increasing the number of farm plans developed and providing other services.

Booth also noted that KCD is looking for 3 SCA members to serve on different review teams related to the elements discussed. If you are interested in serving on the Urban Forestry Initiative review team, reviewing and ranking jurisdictions’ applications; or the Urban shoreline and Riparian Habitat team, working on curriculum needs and ensuring a geographic distribution of educational opportunities or lastly, on the grant review team for the regional food system grants. Contact Doreen Booth, Doreen@soundcities.org, by June 19, 2015 if you’re interested in serving on a review team.

Discussion on the KCD item followed.

Vice Chair Marilla Mhoon, Covington, noted that the mobile chicken processor would be good for some of her constituents.
Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, brought up SB 3522, a bill that passed this session that set the maximum conservation assessment for counties with a population greater than 1,500,000 at $15 per parcel. Margeson noted that he was disappointed that KCD didn’t share the information about the bill and their support for it with SCA.

Carnation Mayor Jim Berger, SCA caucus chair for the King Conservation District Advisory Committee agreed that KCD did advocate for the Snohomish and Pierce County bill. They supported the bill as a potential increase in revenues for the two adjacent counties could lead to increased regional partnerships. He noted that KCD has no plans to ask for an increase to $15 per parcel.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, noted that the King County Council set the levy and that there could not be an increase by KCD themselves.

Council President Margeson noted that there was a disappointing level of transparency missing by KCD not keeping SCA apprised of the legislation.

Deputy Mayor Tosta noted she attended the kickoff for the regional food grant program earlier in the day. She reviewed the application process and the timeline and discussed the desire on the part of KCD to have collaborative projects.

Mayor Berger thanked KCD staff for taking the work elements given to them and putting together a comprehensive program in a very timely manner.

9. 2015 Legislative Session Update
Katie Kuciema, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the Governor called the Legislature back for a second 30-day special session in late-May to complete work on a two-year operating budget, capital budget, a comprehensive statewide transportation package. The Legislature must reach an agreement on the Operating Budget prior to July 1, or some state government services will face shut down.

Following the start of the second special session was the announcement that the state is on track to collect $327 million more in the 2015-17 cycle than previously projected. It is projected that additional $79 million more in the current 2013-17 budget cycle.

Budget negotiators are continuing to work toward agreement on the size of the operating budget. However, the more time it takes to arrive at a final operating budget, the less time there is focus on priority legislation to SCA.

Kuciema provided an update on legislation that SCA is closely monitoring including House Bill 2156, promoting the fiscal sustainability of cities and counties, which was passed out of the House Finance Committee on June 8th. House Bill 2156 allows cities to recover nuisance abatement costs through a first priority lien; contains reforms for commercial public records requests; and, allows cities and counties to participate in the PEBB system. However, the legislation no longer removes the cap on liquor profit revenues.
Receiving significant support at a House Finance Committee hearing was House Bill 2263, which allows local governments to increase sales taxes to fund housing and other programs for mentally ill and developmentally disabled. Kuciemba reported that HB 2263 also allows local governments to create cultural access programs with funds coming from increased local property taxes.

Kuciemba reported that House Bill 2136, marijuana excise tax revenue sharing, is expected to advance without substantial changes to the negotiated legislation. The current proposal allocates $6 million per year ($12 million for 2015-17) to cities and counties, distributed based on the sales conducted in the jurisdiction. This retail-sales based formula was advanced to incentivize jurisdictions to remove bans.

Kuciemba stated that the House and Senate are currently negotiating a Transportation Package that raises $15 billion over 16 years. Reports indicate that negotiations are going well; however, an outstanding issue continues to be the low carbon fuel standard. Sound Transit is expected to receive the full $15 billion taxing authority with added language mandating for affordable housing on surplus property.

While there appears no movement on removing the 1% property tax limitation this legislative session, Kuciemba reported that there is a proposal calling for a study to evaluate the impact of the property tax levy limitation on local jurisdictions in the form of House Bill 2258.

Kuciemba encouraged SCA members to contact their legislators to stress the importance of passing a transportation package this session.

Chair Talmas concluded that the next networking dinner is on July 1, 2015 which will include a recap of the legislative session. Confirmed guests include: Senators Fain and Mullett; Representatives Springer, McBride, Clibborn, Senn, Rodne, Magendaz, Kochmar, and Gregerson. Chair Talmas encouraged PIC members to attend the event.

10. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County
Chair Talmas stated that at the January 14, 2015 PIC meeting, members were asked to provide information on upcoming levies or ballot measures in their cities or the county. He invited members to provide feedback on whether other items should be added to the list. This will be a recurring item on the PIC agenda. Members can also provide feedback directly to SCA staff.

11. SCA Issues for 2015
Chair Talmas stated that at the January 14, 2015 PIC meeting, members were asked to provide issues the PIC should consider this year. He invited members to provide feedback on whether other items should be added to the list. This will be a recurring item on the PIC agenda. Members can also bring items directly to SCA staff.

12. Informational Items
Chair Talmas reported that there is one informational item: an update on the work of the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP).
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, mentioned that the United States Supreme Court denied writ of certiorari in a challenge to a pharmaceutical take back program enacted in Alameda County, California. King County’s pharmaceutical take back program will be in place in January 2016.

13. Upcoming Events
There is a SCA Networking Dinner featuring a legislative session recap on Wednesday, July 1, 2015, at 5:30 PM at the TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club Banquet Center.

The next Public Issues Committee Meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 8, 2015, at 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall.

14. For the Good of the Order
Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, asked a procedural question in regards to the Committee to End Homelessness item. He inquired if there should be a date certain for the cities that abstained from the vote to discuss at their council meetings and provide feedback to the SCA Board of Directors prior to its next meeting. Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, stated that in the past, new information from cities had been shared at the following Board meeting. Chair Talmas indicated that there would need to be a new motion at a future meeting. It was noted the next SCA Board meeting is on June 17, 2015.

15. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 PM.
### 2015 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting  
**June 10, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Dawn Dofelmire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Tris Samberg</td>
<td>Andy Rheame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Nancy Tosta</td>
<td>Stephen Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td>Kim Lisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto/Jeff Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Mike Sando</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Joseph Sabey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Eileen Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Allan Van Ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Bill Boyce</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Shelley Kloba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Michael Luis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Dan Grausz</td>
<td>Benson Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Carol Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Doug Osterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>Vic Kave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td>Armondo Pavone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Bob Keller</td>
<td>Don Gerend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Verna Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Kuciema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting members are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are **bolded**.
**Item 6:**
Committee to End Homelessness Coordinating Board Appointment

**Action Item**

---

**Staff Contact**
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, elli@soundcities.org, 206-433-7167

**SCA PIC Nominating Committee Representatives**
Chair Hank Margeson, Redmond Council President; Ed Prince, Renton Council President; Leanne Guier, Mayor of Pacific; Ross Loudenback, North Bend City Councilmember.

**Potential Action:**
To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of two members to the Committee to End Homelessness Coordinating Board.

**Background**
SCA staff issued a call for nominations on June 30, 2015 with a deadline of July 7, 2015. The PIC Nominating Committee is scheduled to meet before the July 8, 2015 Public Issues Committee (PIC) in order to consider and recommend applicants. Due to the timing of the nomination period, the recommended applicants will be announced at the PIC meeting.

**Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Coordinating Board**
SCA has two vacancies on the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Coordinating Board for three-year terms.

The Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) adopted a new Strategic Plan and Charter on June 30, 2015. Pursuant to the new plan and Charter, a newly-formed Coordinating Board will be the primary decision-making body for CEH. The Coordinating Board replaces the previous Interagency Advisory Council and Governing Board, which were dissolved by the new Charter. Appointment terms to the Coordinating Board are for three years.

The Coordinating Board will provide oversight and leadership for the implementation of the Strategic Plan, while ensuring accountability for results. In addition to the two SCA appointees, the membership of the up-to 30-member Coordinating Board will include representatives from King County and the cites of Bellevue and Seattle as well systems leaders, philanthropy and faith organizations, nonprofit homeless providers, and individuals who have experienced homelessness.
Item 7
Best Starts for Kids Levy

POTENTIAL ACTION ITEM

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

SCA Executive Board Members:
Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, President; Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, Vice President; Councilmember Don Gerend, Sammamish, Treasurer; Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, Member at Large; Mayor John Marchione, Redmond, Past President

Potential Action:

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

In order to support the healthy development of children and youth, families and communities across King County, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for consideration by the voters.

Background:
At the June PIC meeting, the PIC voted unanimously to bring back for consideration a position urging the County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for consideration by the voters.

Materials from the May PIC meeting can be found here, see page 70. Materials from the June PIC meeting can be found here.

To summarize, the King County Executive has proposed that a “Best Starts for Kids” levy (BSK) be placed on the November 2015 ballot. The ordinance was co-sponsored by County Councilmembers Dembowski and McDermott. As proposed, BSK would be a six-year levy lid-lift at a rate of 14 cents per $1,000 of assessed valuation, which would raise approximately $392.3 over the life of the levy (an estimated $58 million in the first year, and an average of $65.4 million through 2021). The cost to the average King County homeowner would be approximately $56 per year.

The BSK levy was developed with three specific outcomes for the region in mind:

1. Babies are born healthy and establish a strong foundation for lifelong health and well-being;
2. King County is a place where everyone has equitable opportunities to progress
through childhood safely and healthy, building academic and life skills to be
thriving members of their community; and
3. Communities offer safe, welcoming, and healthy environments that help improve
outcomes for all of King County’s children and families, regardless of where they
live.

The ordinance proposes that levy proceeds be allocated as follows:

- 50% of the revenue generated by the levy would be invested in strategies that focus on
  children under the age of five, and on pregnant women. This would include funding for
  Public Health Centers;
  - Specifically, 11% of the levy ($43 million) would be devoted to sustaining Public
    Health services serving women and children. These include maternity support,
    family planning services, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women,
    Infants and Children (WIC), and the Nurse Family Partnership;
- 35% of the levy would be invested in strategies focused on youth ages five through
  twenty-four;
- 9% of the levy would be invested in expanding the Communities of Opportunity
  partnership between King County and the Seattle Foundation; and
- 6% of the levy would be devoted to “evaluation, data collection and improving the
  delivery of services and programs for children, youth and their communities.”

Extensive additional materials on the BSK levy can be found here.

Issues raised by SCA members:
To date, cities have been generally supportive of the levy in concept, but have raised issues for
potential refinement on the levy. Since the date of the last PIC meeting, staff from the County
have given presentations on the proposed levy to several SCA cities including Duvall, Issaquah
Des Moines, Lake Forest Park, Tukwila, Woodinville (scheduled for 7/7), Federal Way
(scheduled for 7/7), Kent (scheduled for 7/7), Maple Valley, Covington, Renton, and Kirkland,
and have a presentation scheduled later in the month for SeaTac. County Executive staff have
prepared written responses to questions raised by the cities of Issaquah and Duvall. Those
responses are included as Attachment A. The questions raised by those two cities are very
similar to the questions raised at the last PIC meeting.

Specificity on outcomes, programs to be funded by the levy:
SCA members have generally supported the concept that the County should move toward being
“outcomes based,” and have agreed that this method of allocating funding is a more efficient
use of public dollars. With that said, cities have also wanted to have more specificity on the
types of outcomes that the levy would fund. (Concerns about who will be making these
determinations, and how, have also been raised, and are discussed below.)
The levy was drafted with 3 high level outcomes:

1. Babies are born healthy and establish a strong foundation for lifelong health and well-being;
2. King County is a place where everyone has equitable opportunities to progress through childhood safely and healthy, building academic and life skills to be thriving members of their community; and
3. Communities offer safe, welcoming, and healthy environments that help improve outcomes for all of King County’s children and families, regardless of where they live.

The proposal is to work toward these outcomes and to fund programs that are proven or promising toward achieving the outcomes, rather than starting out with specific programs in mind. The idea here is to have flexibility, and to develop an implementation plan that will respond to the specific needs of the various diverse communities throughout the County. The strategies that will ultimately be funded will be developed through the implementation planning process that will involve comprehensive community outreach to identify what programs, interventions and approaches will be funded and what the specific and quantifiable outcomes will be.

The implementation planning process will be conducted by the Department of Community & Human Services and will include other County departments. Sheila Capestany has recently been hired by King County as the Strategic Advisory for Children and Youth and she will oversee the community outreach and implementation plan process.

The community outreach process will be started this summer. The outreach will be conducted in three different ways – geographic to inventory specific needs in those areas (Seattle, North King, South King, Urban Eastside, Rural Eastside); outreach to diverse ethnic and cultural communities; and then after the November vote, convening expert panels on different facets of the Best Starts for Kids strategies. The goal will be to complete the implementation planning process by mid-2016.

During this time, the proposal places $16 million of the property tax collections that accrue in a fund to prevent families and youth from becoming homeless.

Attachment B includes some of the specific strategies that may be funded by the levy. These include:

- Expansion of the Nurse Family Partnership Program
- Maternity support services
- Treatment services for children who have experienced trauma
- Flexible assistance to families to avoid homelessness
- Expansion of access to preventative health services
- Support to youth and family services programs
More detail on these and other strategies can be found here. See also the June PIC staff report and accompanying materials.

SCA members have asked questions about where the funds will be spent. In response to a question from the City of Duvall, Executive staff provided the following response:

Best Starts for Kids will follow an approach called “targeted universalism”—meaning that certain components of Best Starts for Kids will be available to all children across King County, including Duvall; and other components will focus on bringing programs, interventions and approaches to those children with the greatest need. The large majority of Best Starts for Kids funding will be competitively bid in outcomes-focused contracts to community-based organizations. King County recognizes small and culturally diverse non-profit organizations may have limited resources to participate in RFP processes and that the processes often have barriers for small organizations. During the comprehensive community planning process, a detailed Implementation Plan will be developed that identifies what types of programs, interventions and approaches will be funded and what the specific and quantifiable outcomes will be. This process will include reaching out to organizations on a geographic basis to learn about the needs, limitations and programs in different areas across the county.

Governance and Oversight:
The Executive recommends that the County Council create an advisory Board for the levy consistent with the recommendations of the Youth Action Plan (YAP), that “an advisory body be created that can assist the Executive and Council as they consider outcomes, policies, and investments for children and families and youth and young adults.” The Executive has recommended that SCA have seats on the committee, and that there be geographic balance on the committee. Additionally, the Executive has recommended that the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) have an oversight role for the levy, and that regular reports be provided to the RPC. The County Council is working on details of the makeup of the advisory committee at this time. More detail on the makeup of the committee will be provided as it becomes available.

Next Steps:
Consideration of the levy is currently in the County Council’s Budget and Fiscal Management (BFM) Committee. The BFM is expected to consider possible amendments to the levy ordinance on July 8, 2015 (the same day as the PIC meeting). Those amendments will be provided to PIC members as they become available.

The Council would need to act on the proposed ordinance no later than July 20, 2015 to place the levy on the November 2015 ballot. (This date would require expedited 10-day processing of the ordinance.) The Council could act as late as August 3, 2015 as an emergency.
At the July 8 PIC meeting, the PIC will discuss whether they support a position urging the County Council to place the levy on the ballot. SCA will continue to work with County staff on details of the levy.

Attachments

A. Issaquah-Duvall BSK questions
B. BSK strategy examples
Follow up questions to Issaquah Best Starts to Kids Briefing

1. Does the 6 year estimate of revenue include new construction?

Yes, based on March 2015 the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis (OEFA) forecasts of new construction

2. How did we arrive at 14¢? What is it based on?

This proposal is based on an outcome approach and is not primarily built up by program. The actual strategies that will ultimately be funded will be developed during the implementation process. One key consideration in identifying the proposed level of funding for the Best Starts for Kids initiative was to generate a reasonable level of funding to be able to show progress on the outcomes and indicators. During the six-year life of the levy, King County will show progress in reaching the outcomes by setting indicators and establishing goals. The indicators will be at both the community and individual levels. A second important consideration in selecting the level of funding was to avoid having a prorating impact on junior districts. Based on the March 2015 OEFA forecasts, 14¢ would have no impact on junior taxing districts.

3. The proposal needs more specificity. This is not sufficient funding to completely eliminate child and family poverty, so what goals will be used to evaluate grant proposals and ultimately achieve success? What does success look like? What are the steps to get to success, and what are the benchmarks/parameters to measure the progress towards success?

This proposal is based on an outcome approach and is not primarily built up by program to allow flexibility to respond to specific needs in the diverse communities across the county. The strategies that will ultimately be funded will be developed through an implementation planning process that will involve comprehensive community outreach to identify what programs, interventions and approaches will be funded and what the specific and quantifiable outcomes will be.

In as much as we would like to end poverty, that is not the goal of Best Starts for Kids. Best Starts for Kids is built on two significant bodies of scientific research about what helps babies and children become successful adults and how can one help a child build resiliency after experiencing trauma, whether it is divorce, neglect having a parent who is an alcoholic, etc. None of those issues are tied to income. These issues know no income, geographic or cultural bounds. University of Washington Institute of Learning and Brain Sciences (ILABS) shows that having an adult interact with a child increases brain activity and stimulates development of neuropathways at the time when 92% of the brain is being developed. A goal of Best Starts for Kids is to make the information from ILABS available and accessible to all caregivers.

For children who have experienced trauma, the seminal study was on 17,000 individuals who were primarily white and middle class. That study, with a link below, showed that left unaddressed, early childhood traumatic events could dramatically increase a person’s likelihood of having certain chronic disease, or having a mental illness. However, as many later studies have shown, having “trauma informed schools” and other, often simple, interventions can reduce the likelihood of greater harms.
Many of the benchmarks the county will use are those in the Healthy Youth Survey, which is comprehensive a survey of 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th graders conducted across the state every two years. A link is below: http://www.doh.wa.gov/DataandStatisticalReports/DataSystems/HealthyYouthSurvey

4. More work is needed to define the governance model. The body needs appointments by region of the county. It also should have a charter, clearly defined roles, and authorization power not just an advisory role.

The Executive concurs that the governance body should have regional representation, clearly defined roles and a charter—like the Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) advisory body and the Veterans and Human Services levy advisory body. These two bodies have been working successfully to help advise the county on the programs as they have been implemented over the years. Additionally, the Regional Policy Committee would receive regular reports, as they do with both the MIDD and Veterans and Human Services levy.

5. In terms of accountability, annual reports are needed with statistical breakdowns of money spent by region, age group, program, and location on the preventative / crisis services spectrum.

Reporting components will be developed through the implementation process and would include input from the advisory body.

6. 6% for “evaluation, data collection and improving the delivery of services and programs for children, youth and their communities” doesn’t sound like a lot of money, but (a) it begs the question of if the County is ready to start granting on a six year budget of $392m if it still needs to spend a sizable amount of money just to determine the path forward,

Because this is an outcome based proposal, it is essential that there are funds set aside to ensure that strategies that are receiving funds are contributing to achieving community and individual outcomes and indicators. This funding is not intended solely for research to determine the path forward, but to ensure that the path chosen is achieving the desired outcomes.

7. 6% of $392m is still $24m dollars, which is a lot of money for research given the number of human services organizations that have been operating in this space for many years. KC needs to make more clear what sorts of specific programs would be recipients of this $24m.

One of the intentions of Best Starts for Kids is to build on existing successful programs provided by cities, school districts, human service and community organizations and non-profit providers and not to duplicate or replace these programs. Still, it is important that we have robust evaluation of the dollars spent to assure the public that the funds are successfully moving indicators towards the desired outcomes. Best Starts for Kids will also to evaluate “promising practices” so that they can become proven practices. Oftentimes research is conducted only on certain segments of the population and different programs may be more successful with some children and families than others. Evaluating different approaches to solving the same or similar problems can help us determine which programs are working best and for whom.
8. KC needs to stress that the proposed public health dollars are to maintain certain critical programs for children and families at 2014 levels- this is not an expansion of “big government.”

The proposed funding for public health would maintain MSS/WIC at current levels, expand NFP by restoring services back to the 2014 levels and expand health education by restoring services to 2014 levels. It is not a large expansion in government services, since services for the latter two programs were reduced in the 2015/2016 budget.

9. KC needs to be ready to explain BSK in the context of other levied services, as some municipalities may be close to their $5.90/TAV limit, and exceeding this limit will cause prorating of KC Library System, EMS, and KC Flood Zone levy revenues.

Based on projections completed by King County’s Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget, the addition of the Best Starts for Kids levy proposal would not result in new prorating for any taxing jurisdictions across the county. Thus, there is no projected impact on municipalities or junior taxing districts. Note: there are two taxing jurisdictions that are currently pro-rationed and are projected to remain pro-rationed for a portion of the levy period (Si View Metropolitan Park District would be pro-rationed through 2018 and Fall City Metropolitan Park District would be pro-rationed through 2019).

10. It is very troubling that even during this time of relative prosperity, KC and the State of Washington seem to be in perennial budget shortfalls. What will happen in the next recession, when sales tax revenues and housing values sag? This levy defines success for public health, for instance, as getting back to the 2014 funding levels on certain critical programs. Why not 2011, when funding was even higher? What happens in 2021 when the levy runs out? KC needs to discuss long term structural reform in parallel with the levy development process to help convince voters that there is a long term in addition to short term solution for children & family social service funding.

See response to question #6 above regarding the public health services. King County has many different funds that are devoted to specific services. Some are financially healthy and some are not. The two most relevant to Best Starts for Kids are the County General Fund and the Public Health Fund. Each faces chronic long-term financial challenges.

The County’s General Fund is heavily dependent on property tax revenues, the growth in which is limited by State law to 1% per year plus the value of new construction. As a result, property tax revenue growth typically does not keep up with inflation and population growth, making it difficult to maintain existing service levels, let alone provide new programs. The County gets relatively little sales tax for its General Fund because less than 4% of taxable retail sales occur in the unincorporated area. Within cities, the County’s General Fund sales tax rate is only 0.15%. Unlike the State and cities, counties cannot levy utility taxes or business taxes.

The Public Health Fund’s financial situation is even more dire. Much of the funding for Public Health comes from federal and state funds. Flexible federal funding has declined in recent years. State support for basic public health programs has not increased in about 15 years. As a result, Public Health has had to reduce services and rely increasingly on General Fund support. For the 2015 budget, closure of four health clinics was avoided only by obtaining support from cities and non-profit organizations. This funding likely is not sustainable.
Long-term solutions to these problems are not possible without changes in State law. King County and other counties have sought changes in property tax revenue growth limits and/or the ability to use additional revenue sources. To date, the Legislature has not approved any of these requests. Without these additional tools, the County is forced to rely on voter-approved levy lid lifts to sustain services.
Duvall Questions

1. **Prorationing**: Is there any prorationing impact to the local fire district?

   Based on projections completed by King County’s Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget, the addition of the Best Starts for Kids levy proposal would not result in new prorationing for any taxing jurisdictions across the county. Note: there are two taxing jurisdictions that are currently pro-rationed and are projected to remain pro-rationed for a portion of the levy period (Si View Metropolitan Park District would be pro-rationed through 2018 and Fall City Metropolitan Park District would be pro-rationed through 2019).

2. **Advisory board**: Question on how to make sure they are represented on the advisory board.

   The proposal for the advisory body was modeled on the Youth Action Plan recommendation and allows the Council to determine what the composition of the advisory body for the children and youth programs would be. The Executive supports having cities and geographic representation on the advisory bodies. Additionally, it is anticipated that the Regional Policy Committee would receive regular reports. Duvall is represented on the Regional Policy Committee through the Sound Cities Association.

3. **Services for Duvall**: Concerns of how communities will get access to funds. Their non-profits have been closing because of lack of funds.

   Best Starts for Kids will follow an approach called “targeted universalism”—meaning that certain components of Best Starts for Kids will be available to all children across King County, including Duvall; and other components will focus on bringing programs, interventions and approaches to those children with the greatest need. The large majority of Best Starts for Kids funding will be competitively bid in outcomes-focused contracts to community-based organizations. King County recognizes small and culturally diverse non-profit organizations may have limited resources to participate in RFP processes and that the processes often have barriers for small organizations. During the comprehensive community planning process, a detailed Implementation Plan will be developed that identifies what types of programs, interventions and approaches will be funded and what the specific and quantifiable outcomes will be. This process will include reaching out to organizations on a geographic basis to learn about the needs, limitations and programs in different areas across the county.
Best Starts for Kids Strategies

### Strategies Aimed at Pregnancy and Early Childhood

**Support for Parents, Families and Caregivers**
- Providing moms and families key information and support services during pregnancy and after the child arrives (examples – Maternity Support Services, information and referral organizations)
- Support for parents and caregivers if babies and toddlers are facing a challenge (examples - expanding parent-to-parent support groups)
- Home-based visiting for new moms and babies (examples – expand Nurse Family Partnership program)

**Cultivate Caregiver Knowledge**
- Outreach, resource and referral coordination (examples – information and referral organizations)
- Providing information on healthy child development in a variety of languages and formats, including information on what the latest neuroscience is telling us about child development (examples - Maternity Support Services, Nurse Family Partnership)

**Support High Quality Child Care (in home & in agencies & licensed & unlicensed)**
- Assist providers in creating positive, healthy and safe child care environments (examples - work with and provide training for providers to incorporate best practices related to nutrition, physical activity, and safety)
- Training and tools for all child care providers (examples - provide equitable training resources and coaching so providers in a home, at a child care agency or school are able to address the developmental needs of a wide range of children)
- Expanding consultation and technical assistance resources for child care providers (examples)

**Screen Children to Prevent Likely Problems, Intervene Early and Effectively Link to Treatment**
- Expanding developmental screening to all young children (examples- educate and promote use of developmental screening tools)
- Identification and early intervention programs specifically for children who have experienced traumatic stress (examples – treatment services for kids experiencing sexual assault at early age)
- Prevent family homelessness via a client-centered flexible fund (example - provide assistance to families such as paying for a few months of child care)

### Strategies Aimed at School-Aged Children & Youth and their Families & Caregivers

**Build resiliency of youth and reduce risky-behaviors** (examples – youth and family service organizations)

**Helping youth stay connected to their families and communities** (examples - assistance to build coping mechanisms and encouragement to reach out for support)

**Creating healthy and safe environments for youth** (examples - assisting places such as schools, youth programs and community centers to implement prevention-focused practices and policies related to nutrition, physical activity, substance abuse)

**Meeting the health and behavior needs of youth** (examples – expand access to preventive health services in schools; enrolling in healthcare)
Best Starts for Kids Strategies

- Helping young adults who have had challenges successfully transition into adulthood (examples – support during transition out of foster care)
- Flexible fund to prevent youth from becoming homeless (examples - prevent youth from living on the streets)
- Stopping the school to prison pipeline (examples - strategies to divert youth from the juvenile justice system, prevent incarceration and address disproportionality)
- Outreach, resource and referral (examples – help caregivers to find the right resources)

### Strategies Aimed at the Community (Communities of Opportunity)

- Create opportunities for residents, including youth, to engage and participate in efforts to improve the physical and social conditions of their community (examples - work together to create more opportunities for physical activity in the community, such as street designs that support walking and biking; establishing safe routes to school; and creating better access to recreation facilities and programs, such as buses home for after-school sports and recreation programs)
- Working together on a comprehensive community approach to increasing access to healthy and affordable food, particularly in low income communities (examples - increasing the amount of local fruits and vegetables available through local food banks or nutrition incentive programs through local farmers markets, farm stands, and retailers)
- Support and enable work to happen collaboratively within and across sectors by focusing on a common agenda (examples – Roadmap Project, Eastside Pathways)
- Build community capacity to implement changes in policies, systems, and environments that lead to improved community conditions (examples – community organizations, Global to Local)
**Item 8:**
Road to 70% Recycling

*Potential Future Action Item*

**SCA Staff Contact**
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, [Doreen@soundcities.org](mailto:Doreen@soundcities.org), 206-495-3525

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Members:**
Councilmember Stacia Jenkins, Normandy Park; Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline

---

The King County Solid Waste Division (SWD) is proposing significant changes in how recycling is addressed in King County, with the goal of reducing the amount of recyclable materials that are disposed of at the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill (Landfill). At the July PIC meeting, staff will update the PIC on changes in recycling policies recommended by the SWD and how the changes would impact citizens and cities. SCA Representatives on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) have asked that SCA consider adopting a policy position related to a recycling policy target goal and related policies in the draft Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. The discussion at the July Public Issues Committee (PIC) will help to inform what could be included in a potential draft SCA position.

**Summary**
Solid waste collected in King County, except in Seattle and Milton, is sent to the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill (Landfill). According to the SWD’s analysis, landfilling our waste at the county-owned facility is currently the most cost effective and environmentally responsible manner of disposing of our waste. Extending the capacity of the Landfill for as long as possible will ensure that the low disposal rates and the environmental benefits of using the Landfill are maximized. It is important to note though that tip fees, the cost per ton to dispose of solid waste at the Landfill, are the main revenue source for the Solid Waste Division (SWD). Therefore, decreases in tonnage disposed at the Landfill will, under the current fee structure, lead to an increase in tip fees necessary to cover the cost of SWD operations, including recycling and stewardship programs. The current tip fee is $129.40/ton. The SWD is currently in the early stages of consultant selection in a Sustainable System Financing RFP, a process that will determine sustainable rate system options.

King County has an enviable recycling rate of 53%, about a third more than the 2013 national average of 34.3%. However, SWD staff estimate that 63% of the total waste stream is still made up of readily recyclable, marketable materials, with food waste and compostable paper accounting for 29% of the waste stream. An additional 15% of the total waste stream is potentially recyclable, with limited markets for such materials (plastic film, textiles, etc.). It is worth noting that limiting consideration to currently marketable materials means that we are not considering the extremely hard to recycle materials that can have high recycling costs.
SCA’s SWAC members would like to see more currently marketable, recyclable materials taken out of the waste stream and treated as a commodity instead of buried as trash. However, to do this at a scale that will make a difference in the Landfill capacity, cities and King County would need to take deliberate actions.

The central questions before the PIC today are:

- Is maximizing the life of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill a priority for cities?
- Are cities willing to take actions needed to maximize the life of the Landfill? Actions could include enacting single-family material bans such as banning food waste from the garbage and requiring it to be put in yard waste bins; repurposing grant dollars; amending the frequency of bin pickup; requiring waste separation at multi-family and commercial buildings; revising multi-family and commercial building codes to require space for waste separation.

If cities are willing to take action, do they want to take collective action in one area first to make the biggest impact on the Landfill capacity and then consider other policies that require city actions? Or do cities want to first work on their own on increasing their recycling rates, using a menu of options? It should be noted that a menu of options approach has not led to an increased recycling rate in the past eight years.

For example, the focus could be a multi-year campaign to reduce food waste in the waste stream, beginning with infrastructure and education and continuing on to ban food waste in the waste stream in a manner similar to how yard waste was addressed. This is discussed in the \textbf{Collective Action} section further in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard Waste Recycling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1989 – early 1990’s – Yard waste collection programs begin curbside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1989-1994 – Yard waste recycling education is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1992-1993 – Jurisdictions individually ban yard waste at the curb in the garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1993 – Enforcement occurred with tags and notices at the curb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2014 – Capture rate of 97% for single family yard waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{(97\% of yard waste that is generated is captured in the yard waste cart)}

\textbf{Solid Waste Committee Work}

The SWD and its advisory committees, the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC) and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) are updating the draft \textit{2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan}. Chapter 3 of the Plan, Waste Prevention and Recycling, is the subject of this staff report. Background material, including city MSWMAC representatives to MSWMAC and a matrix detailing questions the SWD asked cities to answer in an effort to determine how to move forward on the development of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, can be found beginning on page 65 of the \textit{March 11, 2015 Public Issues Committee Packet}.  
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The draft 2013 Plan called for a 70% recycling rate to be achieved by 2020 and the SWD has been working towards that goal in recent years. If a 70% recycling rate was achieved by 2020, it is estimated there would be capacity at the Landfill until 2030. The King County solid waste system is not on track to meet that goal and it is therefore likely that the Landfill’s capacity will be reached earlier than 2030. The SWD is currently working on a project to update the estimate of when the Landfill will reach its full capacity; SCA staff will share that with the PIC when it is available. The SWD is also considering capital improvements to extend the life of the Landfill an additional 10 years, but the life of the Landfill is still finite and efforts to extend the capacity through decreased waste disposal would lead to maximizing the Landfill’s capacity.

Recycling rates have been relatively flat since about 2008, not increasing as needed to meet the recycling goal. In the update of the 2013 Plan, there is a renewed effort by the SWD to substantially increase the likelihood of a 70% recycling goal being achieved by 2030 in order to increase the life of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. The new target date of 2030 came from a straight line projection: a recycling increase of 1% a year would result in achievement of the goal by 2030. According to SWD staff, the cost of using another disposal method, such as exporting waste to an out-of-county landfill or waste-to-energy, would cost, at minimum, an additional $10 - $15 million per year over current costs.

**Solid Waste Division Options**

The SWD has proposed two options for system partners to achieve the 70% recycling goal: **Collective Action** or **Individual Action**. These options have been shaped by SWAC and MSWMAC member feedback.

In the **Collective Action** option, recycling is maximized at the curb and transfer stations by all partners adopting the same strategies. The 5 key principles of **Collection Action** as proposed by the SWD are:

- System partners from multiple jurisdictions adopt a common set of policies and practices for managing waste and resources. Consistency across the region is key to success.
- Separation of garbage, recyclables, and organics is mandatory.
- Materials added to recycling collection programs are supported by adequate processing capacity, capability, and markets.
- A robust enforcement program is in place to support separation of materials in curbside programs (garbage, recyclables, organics).
- The Solid Waste Division has adequate recovery and processing capability to harvest resources present at its facilities.

In the **Individual Action** model, cities and the county would pursue their own strategies and if, by the year 2020, jurisdictions had not achieved an average 61% recycling rate, on a path to 70% recycling, then new strategies would need to be implemented. The SWD has suggested that if **Individual Action** is chosen and the 61% target by 2020 is not met, either mandatory separation would be implemented or cities would pay an incentive-based disposal fee. It is
unclear at best, however, that the SWD would have the authority to pursue this option under the current Interlocal Agreement (ILA).

The following materials may be helpful for members to review.
Attachment A, Summary of 2014 Single-Family Collection Services Including Disposal and Recycling Rates
Attachment B, The Road to Zero Waste of Resources Presentation, MSWMAC, April 10, 2015
Attachment C, Roadmap to Zero Waste of Resources, 70% Recycling Subcommittee information

There have been mixed reactions at both SWAC and MSWMAC meetings to the proposal for Collective Action. Many members have expressed concerns with recycling policies that have, at their core, a need for cities to impose mandatory requirements on the collection and separation of solid waste and recyclables. On the other hand, some members also expressed support for a Collective Action approach. Some of the challenges with mandatory requirements expressed include cities’ desires to provide services their citizens want, need to revise existing hauler contracts, and political realities in cities potentially preventing legislation from being adopted. Members, however, still want to increase the recycling rate to maximize capacity at the Landfill in order to keep costs for waste disposal as low as possible for as long as possible. Other benefits of Collective Action discussed are that consistent countywide policies will be less confusing for business and residential customers, that only collective action has had a dramatic increase in recycling rates in the past, and that cities can share expertise and policy development experience when working together to reduce costs in their own jurisdictions.

The SWD and its advisory committees have discussed many different ideas to increase recycling rates. Some of the ideas are: to create financial incentives to encourage recycling, including lower tip fees if goals are met and higher tip fees if goals are not met; to redirect Waste Reduction and Recycling (WRR) grant dollars from existing programs where diversion rates are low to new programs with more opportunity for waste diversion; to focus efforts on cities where the impact would be the greatest; to focus on a collective multi-family effort; to use education as a tool; and to create a new competitive grant program for cities to encourage cities to implement new policies to drive diversion from the waste stream. It should be noted that there has been no data provided to directly support any of these measures having a solid impact on recycling rates, in the manner that material bans have demonstrated impact in SWD modeling.

Some of SCA’s members on a joint MSWMAC/SWAC Road to 70% Recycling Subcommittee are coming together to make a draft recommendation to SCA’s Public Issues Committee (PIC) members on a path forward that is palatable to cities and moves the needle on increasing the recycling percentages. That recommendation is still a work in progress. The discussion at the PIC meeting will help to develop that recommendation. The members of the Subcommittee present on conference calls, including SCA’s SWAC members and staff from Redmond, Kirkland, Sammamish, Federal Way, and Shoreline and a councilmember from Woodinville, generally felt a collective approach would be the more appropriate path forward but expressed numerous concerns about requirements on cities.
Other Issues
Cities have raised a number of questions with the MSWMAC and in communications with the SWD. One of those issues relates to the data needs for commercial and multi-family recycling. SCA staff will work with cities and the SWD to answer those questions and any questions that arise at the PIC meeting. It is also expected that updated information on Landfill capacity will be available in August; that information will be provided to members.

Next Steps
SCA’s SWAC members are proposing to take the input from PIC members and continue to work with MSWMAC members to draft a potential future action item for the PIC to consider in the coming months (likely in September). The discussion at the July PIC will begin to frame a position, though there are many other questions that must be addressed over the coming months. The SWD’s advisory committees will continue working on the solid waste comprehensive plan update in the fall of 2015. It is likely that other aspects of the comprehensive plan will be brought back to the PIC for consideration and input.

Attachments

A. Summary of 2014 Single-Family Collection Services Including Disposal and Recycling Rates
B. The Road to Zero Waste of Resources Presentation, MSWMAC, April 10, 2015
C. Roadmap to Zero Waste of Resources, 70% Recycling Subcommittee information
D. Background Information
### Table 4-1. Summary of 2014 single-family collection services in King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Unincorporated Area</th>
<th>2014 Collection Company</th>
<th>Cart Size (gallons)</th>
<th>Collection Frequency</th>
<th>Fee Structure</th>
<th>Disposal and Recycling Rates (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Collection</td>
<td>Cart Size</td>
<td>Frequency of Recycle</td>
<td>Recycling Included in Garbage Fee</td>
<td>Recycling Rate (including organics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>WM RS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>RS UTC</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>RS UTC</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>WM/RE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>RE C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>RE C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>RS UTC</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>RE RS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>RS UTC</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>WM/RE RS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>RS UTC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>WM C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>RS C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>WM C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>WM C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>WM RS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>WM RS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>EOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-1. Summary of 2014 single-family collection services in King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Unincorporate Area</th>
<th>Type of Collectiona</th>
<th>Cart Size (gallons)b</th>
<th>Collection Frequencyc</th>
<th>Fee Structure</th>
<th>Disposal and Recycling Rates (2014)d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal in Garbage Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garbage Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>RS/RE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>EOW EOW EOW</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>EOW EOW EOW</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64 96 W W W</td>
<td>X 27</td>
<td>42% 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>EOW W EOW X</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>EOW EOW EOW</td>
<td>X 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern County</td>
<td>RS WM</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>W E OY W E OY E OY X</td>
<td>28 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern County</td>
<td>RS WM</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td>W E OY W E OY E OY X</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon Island</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>4-bin NS E O Y NS NS E O Y NS NS</td>
<td>31 7%</td>
<td>29% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Pass</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS</td>
<td>28 48%</td>
<td>30% 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Collection Companies:
   RS - Republic Services
   RE - Recology / CleanScapes
   WC - Waste Connections
   WM - Waste Management

b Cart sizes listed are the most commonly distributed; other cart sizes are available in many jurisdictions.

c Collection Frequency:
   EOW - every other week
   M - monthly
   W - weekly
   NS - no service

d Recycling and disposal rates include an adjustment to remove estimated contaminant tonnage from recycling totals and add it to disposal totals.
e Pacific’s Pierce County areas are served by Waste Connections (Murrey Disposal).
f Bothell’s primary hauler changed from Waste Management to Recology on January 1, 2015.
g Burien’s hauler changed from Waste Management to Recology on June 1, 2014; embedded organics was not included before June 1.
h Renton has every-other-week garbage collection in areas served by its primary hauler, Waste Management.
i SeaTac’s hauler changed from Republic Services to Recology on June 1, 2014; embedded organics was not included before June 1.
j Maple Valley’s primary hauler changed from Waste Management to Recology on September 1, 2014.
k Clyde Hill’s new contract effective April 1, 2015 includes organics service in the basic garbage fee.
## One Road to 70% Recycling

### Modeled Expected Increase in Recycling Rate

4.4%

### Single Family Generator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Status / Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection</td>
<td>Available county-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food collection</td>
<td>Available county-wide, mixed with yard waste. 72% participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded YW</td>
<td>35% of cities have adopted. YW banned at curb in City/County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every-other-week</td>
<td>Renton - only city to have implemented EOW garbage collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/City/County/Hauler</td>
<td>Focus has been on voluntary efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional education</td>
<td>Many efforts implemented to try and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of recyclables</td>
<td>Determine who enacts: City/County @ curb or County @ stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of organics</td>
<td>Determine who will enforce: Hauler or City/County staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforce Ban</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New education focus</td>
<td>Implement and enforce ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- warnings, tags, fines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Color Status

- Universally Implemented
- Marginally Implemented
- Not implemented
- Next Steps

---

Road to 70% Subcommittee Meeting  
February 13, 2015
**One Road to 70% Recycling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-family Generator</th>
<th>Modeled Expected Increase in Recycling Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess current code requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amend code as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On site assessment City/County/Hauler:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space, container capacity, frequency, signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Collection</td>
<td>Minimal infrastructure in place. Build infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issaquah and Bellevue only cities to embed rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkland and Redmond programmatic emphasis and/or subsidization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Focus has been on voluntary efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County outreach</td>
<td>MF targeted efforts implemented with mixed results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional education</td>
<td>Develop stepped regional 2-5 year campaign leading to ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of recyclables</td>
<td>Determine who enacts: City/County at curbside or County at stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of organics</td>
<td>Determine who will enforce: Hauler or City/County staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of organics</td>
<td>Determine enforcement funding mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce Ban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New education focus</td>
<td>Implement and enforce ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- warnings, tags, fines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color Status**
- **Universally Implemented**
- **Marginally Implemented**
- **Not implemented**
- **Next Steps**

---

**Road to 70% Subcommittee Meeting**

**February 13, 2015**
# One Road to 70% Recycling

## Non-Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Status / Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Collection</td>
<td>Services widely available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49% of cities include in their recycling contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Collection</td>
<td>Developing infrastructure. Rely largely on private sector to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellevue only city to embed in recycling contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City outreach</td>
<td>Focus has been on voluntary efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler outreach</td>
<td>Some outreach and technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional technical assistance</td>
<td>Implement regional/local Business Resource Venture outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional education</td>
<td>Provided to their customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop stepped regional 2-5 year campaign leading to ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of recyclables</td>
<td>Determine who will enforce: Hauler or City/County staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban disposal of organics</td>
<td>Determine enforcement funding mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforce Ban</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New education focus</td>
<td>Implement and enforce ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- warnings, tags, fines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Modeled Expected Increase in Recycling Rate

- **Non-Residential**: 7.9%

## Color Status

- Universally Implemented
- Marginally Implemented
- Not implemented
- Next Steps

---

Road to 70% Subcommittee Meeting  
February 13, 2015
## One Road to 70% Recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Status / Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection where feasible</td>
<td>Yardwaste (BL, CF, E, SH), wood (BL, E, SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metal ((BL, E, SH, V), cardboard (all except A, Fac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>Recovery of wood, metal, cardboard at Shoreline, Enumclaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand collection</td>
<td>Additional materials - Styrofoam, mattress, tires at new and existing facilities where there is capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New infrastructure</td>
<td>Yardwaste, wood, metal, cardboard at Factoria, SC, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County outreach</td>
<td>Low level outreach to self-haul customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County outreach</td>
<td>Enhance education with self-haul customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Support training</td>
<td>Train all SWD staff on recycling to enhance interaction with self-haul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Education</td>
<td>Develop station by station education campaign for ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Phase 1 materials</td>
<td>Wood, organics, curbside materials, metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Phase 2 materials</td>
<td>Mattress, carpet, asphalt shingles, tires as stations come on line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforce Ban</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New education focus</td>
<td>Implement and enforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- warnings, fines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Modeled Expected Increase in Recycling Rate

4.9%

### Color Status

- **Universally Implemented**
- **Marginally Implemented**
- **Not implemented**
- **Next Steps**
Outline

- Solid Waste Division Director’s Message and 5 Key Principles
- Background – Generator info and what has been done to date
- Which Path?
  - Collective action
  - Individual action
- Thoughts, reactions?

Solid Waste Division Director’s Message:

- The region needs to collaborate on key policy decisions to achieve our environmental and service goals
  - How do we maximize capacity and lifespan of Cedar Hills?
  - How will we increase stalled recycling rates from 52% to 70% by 2030?
  - How do we capture and recover resources from the waste stream?
  - How will we be the best environmental stewards of our wastes and recovered resources?
  - What is the appropriate rate strategy for sustainable funding of desired services?
  - How do we create a positive customer experience at the curb, at the Transfer Station and as a neighbor?
  - How do we optimize the efficiency of our system given it is delivered by a combination of actions taken by customers, cities, haulers, county and other disposal/recycling companies?

5 Key Principles

- System partners from multiple jurisdictions adopt a common set of policies and practices for managing waste and resources. Consistency across the region is key to success.
- Separation of garbage, recyclables, and organics is mandatory.
- Materials added to recycling collection programs are supported by adequate processing capacity, capability and markets.
- A robust enforcement program is in place to support separation of materials in curbside programs (garbage, recyclables, organics).
- The Solid Waste Division has adequate recovery and processing capability to harvest resources present at its facilities

Which Path?

- Collective Action
  - Recycling is maximized at the curb and transfer stations by all partners adopting same strategies
- Individualized Action
  - Cities & county pursue their own strategies and if by 2020 not on a 70% path new strategies would need to be implemented

Municipal Solid Waste Generated in King County 1988-2013
(excluding Seattle & Milton)
Attachment C to the July 8, 2015 PIC Agenda Item 8

**Top 12 Recyclable Materials Disposed at Cedar Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/soiled paper</td>
<td>239,042</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable Paper</td>
<td>87,776</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Wood</td>
<td>52,273</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid Packaging (TAPG)</td>
<td>39,329</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Waste</td>
<td>39,002</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrap Metal</td>
<td>35,788</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Film &amp; Bags</td>
<td>29,677</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard</td>
<td>29,224</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet &amp; Carpet Padding</td>
<td>11,759</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles: Clothes</td>
<td>9,423</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>9,390</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsum Wallboard</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What has been done to get to 52%**

**Single Family**
- Collection Infrastructure
  - Do not recycle
  - Yard waste
  - Food waste
  - Edible Garbage
- Incentive
  - $5 million city grant
  - Reserves
  - Municipal contracts
  - Paythrow fees
- Policy
  - Outside year
  - Transfer Station
  - Electronics
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines
- Education
  - Single Family
  - Embedded recycling
  - Yard waste
  - Food waste
- Incentive Policy
  - $1 million city grant
  - Revenue sharing
  - Municipal contracts
- Product Stewardship
  - Recycling fees
  - Electronic
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines

**Multifamily**
- Collection Infrastructure
  - Contact recycling
  - Limited food waste
  - X Regional
  - X Local
  - X Hauler
- Incentive
  - $5 million city grant
  - Reserves
  - Municipal contracts
- Policy
  - X Recycling space
  - Transfer Station
  - Electronics
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines
- Education
  - Multi-Family
  - Embedded recycling
  - Limited food waste
- Incentive Policy
  - X City & Hauler education efforts
  - X Municipal contracts
- Product Stewardship
  - Recycling fees
  - Electronic
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines

**Non-Res**
- Collection Infrastructure
  - Contact recycling
  - Limited food waste
  - X City & Hauler education efforts
  - X Municipal contracts
- Incentive
  - Outside year
  - Transfer Station
  - Electronics
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines
- Policy
  - Recycling fees
  - Electronic
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines
- Education
  - Non-Residential
  - Embedded recycling
  - Limited food waste
- Incentive Policy
  - X City & Hauler education efforts
  - X Municipal contracts
- Product Stewardship
  - Recycling fees
  - Electronic
  - Fluorescent tubes/bulbs
  - Unwanted medicines

**Doing well**
- Not widespread
- Mixed results
Which Path?

• Collective Action
  – Recycling occurs at the curb and transfer stations by all partners adopting the same strategies (education, incentives, embedded rates, EOW, mandatory separation)

Summary of Collective Actions to Reach 70%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generator/Strategy</th>
<th>Impact on 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Res. Mandatory Separation - Food</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Mandatory Separation - Food</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Haul Mandatory Separation - Wood, metal, cardboard, paper, yard</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Res. Mandatory Separation - Recycling</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Mandatory Separation - Food</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Every-other-week Garbage</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Mandatory Separation - Recycling</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Haul Mandatory Separation</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which Path?

• Individualized Action
  – Cities & county pursue their own strategies and if by 2020, city or county is not on a 70% path, new strategies would need to be implemented

Rates/Dates Path

• Cities & county each implement strategies of choice to increase recycling: education, collection frequency, rate incentives, etc.
• By 2020 city and unincorporated single family recycling rate must be 61%, to be on path to 70% recycling
• If rate is less than 61% either:
  – Implements mandatory separation or
  – Pays an incentive based disposal fee

Rates/Dates Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Impact on 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting rate/date options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More education</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduce single family food waste by 30%</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Every-other-week garbage</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Embed yard waste</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 70% not met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Require separation</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which Path?

• Collective Action – presented in 5 key principles
• Individualized Action – presented in “Rates/Dates” chart
**Background Information – Solid Waste Planning**

Washington State law delegates authority to a county to prepare a comprehensive solid waste management plan in cooperation with the cities in its boundaries, requiring interlocal agreements for any joint city/county plan, RCW 70.95.080(3). King County prepares such plans together with its two advisory committees, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) and the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC). The adopted plan in King County is the 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan; a revised plan, 2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (2013 Plan) was developed beginning in 2008 but was not moved forward for action to the King County Council and cities. There have been many significant developments, since the 2013 Plan was drafted, necessitating a redraft of the plan be developed. It is that plan, the draft 2016 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (2016 Plan), that is under discussion in this report.

The entire solid waste system is addressed in a comprehensive plan, including Solid Waste System Planning, Waste Prevention and Recycling, Collection and Processing, Solid Waste Transfer System, Landfill Management and Solid Waste Disposal, and Solid Waste System Financing. The focus of this report is the Waste Prevention and Recycling Chapter; other aspects of the plan may be addressed in future reports to the PIC.

**Existing Solid Waste Planning Documents**

Below is a summary of solid waste planning documents and how they are related to or feed into the 2016 Plan.

The current work at the SWD and its advisory committees will result in a Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan that will replace the Final 2001 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (2001 Plan), the adopted solid waste plan for King County.

**Draft 2013 Comprehensive Plan**

In the mid-2000s, work began on updating the 2001 Plan. As noted above, that update was not transmitted to the King County Council but exists as the Draft 2013 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (2013 Plan) that is the starting place for the current update. The 2013 Plan set out a recycling rate goal of 55% by 2015 and 70% by 2020. The 2013 Plan also set out a list of possible actions cities and King County could take to meet the recycling goals. As of 2013, the overall recycling rate in King County was 53%. That rate has remained relatively flat since 2008. In order to achieve the 70% recycling rate by 2020, incremental progress was needed. It is mainly that lack of progress in continual improvement in the recycling rate that led the Solid Waste Division to propose much more aggressive strategies in the draft comprehensive plan discussions currently going on at MSWMAC and SWAC.

**Transfer System Plan Update**

Currently, the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan (Transfer Plan) is a standalone document; it is anticipated that an updated plan will be incorporated into the Transfer System chapter of the 2016 Plan. The Transfer Plan has been the subject of two recent
reviews. The outcome of the Transfer Plan Part 2, transmitted to the King County Council on June 30, 2015 can be found here, Transfer Plan Part 2. As noted in the final report, a series of actions are recommended by the SWD in order to achieve optimal use of the transfer stations. Some of those actions are also under consideration by SWD to achieve the 70% recycling rate.

**Sustainable Solid Waste Study**

The 2013 Plan proposed that SWD commission a study to evaluate operational and strategic planning options and to develop an implementation approach to expand these efforts. This is in part an effort to increase recycling opportunities. Towards that end, the SWD commissioned a Sustainable Solid Waste Management Study in July 2014. The study focused on five areas: resource recovery at division facilities; construction and demolition (C&D) debris management; organics processing; disposal alternatives and technologies; and sustainable system financing. A number of the efforts evaluated could lead to increased recycling rates in the short term, and are recommended for early action including:

- Institute policies, staff training, and staffing level revisions to support greater diversion of recyclable materials at transfer stations where space and facilities are suitable for enhanced diversion
- Promote on-site processing of organics (e.g., composting, digesting, dehydration, other hybrid technology) at the generator using a rate structure and/or grants, matching grants, low interest loans and discounts
- Ban disposal of organics, in mixed waste, at transfer stations where recycling options exist

Other actions that are listed as promising but needing more in depth study by the County or private industry before recommending. The County will be soliciting interested agencies, companies, organizations to make proposals to King County on how they would manage a portion of the county’s waste stream. The county may select one or more proposals as pilot projects; these could then potentially be scaled up if found to valuable. The successful development of many of the proposed practices could help in increasing the recycling rate in King County.

**Comprehensive Plan Approval Process**

At some point the draft plan will be sent to the County Executive. In accordance with the Amended and Restated Solid Waste Interlocal Agreement, the plan will be sent to the Regional Policy Committee, acting as the Solid Waste Interlocal Forum, called the SWIF, for review and to the King County Council for action. After review by the SWIF, the plan will be sent to cities for adoption. The SWIF can send a plan out to cities with or without a recommendation and before King County Council Action. Adoption of the plan requires approval by cities representing three-quarters of the population of the incorporated population of jurisdictions party to the interlocal. The three-quarters only considers those jurisdictions taking formal action to approve or disapprove the comprehensive plan within 120 days receipt of the plan.
Item 9:  
Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan  

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

SCA Staff Contact  
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, elli@soundcities.org, 206-433-7167

CEH Members:  
Councilmember Doreen Marchione, Kirkland; Councilmember Lydia Assefa-Dawson, Federal Way

Interagency Council (IAC) Members:  
Michael Hursh, Auburn; Colleen Kelly, Redmond; Jennifer Henning, Renton

Summary  
After extensive consideration of the [2015-2019 Committee to End Homelessness Strategic Plan](#) by the PIC, the SCA Board of Directors adopted the following policy position on June 17, 2015:

> The Sound Cities Association (SCA) shares the vision of the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), which is that homelessness is rare in King County, racial disparities are eliminated, and if one becomes homeless, it is brief and only a one-time occurrence. SCA endorses the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan, and its goals of making homelessness rare, making homelessness brief and one-time, and creating a community to end homelessness.

Subsequently, the CEH Governing Board adopted the Strategic Plan and a [revised CEH Charter](#) on June 30, 2015. CEH is now implementing a new governance structure, as called for by the revised CEH Charter.

**Background**

The Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) – a broad coalition of government, business, faith communities, nonprofits, and homeless advocates – was formed in 2005 and adopted a 10-year strategic plan, “[Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness – A Roof Over Every Bed](#)” However, ten years after the adoption of the original plan, homelessness remains a crisis in King County.

CEH staff and committee members began drafting a new plan, titled the [2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan](#) (Strategic Plan), in 2014. The Public Issues Committee (PIC), received briefings about the new Strategic Plan in January, February, March, April, May, and June 2015. Most recently, at June 10, 2015 PIC meeting, members received a staff report about the final language of the Strategic Plan and considered the following policy position (see [June 10, 2015 PIC Packet](#), page 22):
The Sound Cities Association (SCA) shares the vision of the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), which is that homelessness is rare in King County, racial disparities are eliminated, and if one becomes homeless, it is brief and only a one-time occurrence. SCA endorses the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan, and its goals of making homelessness rare, making homelessness brief and one-time, and creating a community to end homelessness.

The PIC was scheduled to take final action on the policy position at the June meeting to ensure SCA input was heard and considered prior to June 30, 2015, when the CEH Governing Board was to adopt the Strategic Plan and CEH Charter. However, a number of PIC members were unable to attend the June PIC meeting or abstained from the vote, resulting in a vote tally just shy of a supermajority of those attending (13-2-5).

**SCA Endorsement and Strategic Plan Adoption**
Following the June PIC meeting, several cities that were not at the PIC meeting and cities that had previously abstained from the vote informed the SCA Board of their support for the CEH plan. At the June 17, 2015 Board meeting, PIC Chair Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, urged the Board to move forward with consideration of the policy position to ensure timely adoption before the June 30, 2015 CEH Governing Board meeting. The Board voted to approve the policy position. SCA President Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, subsequently updated SCA members about the Board action, Attachment A, and announced SCA’s endorsement of the Strategic Plan to the CEH Governing Board by letter on June 26, Attachment B.

On June 30, 2015 the CEH Governing Board voted unanimously to adopt the Strategic Plan and revised CEH Charter.

**Implementation of the CEH Strategic Plan: Governance**
The new CEH Charter calls for revisions to the CEH Governance Structure, and work is now underway to make these structural changes.

**CEH Coordinating Board**
With adoption of the new CEH Charter, the CEH Interagency Council and Governing Board have been dissolved and will be replaced by a single Coordinating Board. The PIC will consider appointments to the Coordinating Board at this month’s PIC meeting under Agenda Item 6.

**CEH Executive Committee Appointment**
The new CEH charter creates a seat for SCA on the existing Executive Committee, which will select the non-governmental members of the Coordinating Board. Upon selection of the Coordinating Board membership, the existing Executive Committee will be dissolved and a new Executive Committee will be formed from and by the Coordinating Board membership.

At the June 17, 2015 Board meeting, the Board appointed Councilmember Doreen Marchione to serve on the existing Executive Committee for this Coordinating Board selection process. Subsequently, the CEH Governing Board voted June 30 to approve Councilmember Doreen Marchione’s appointment.
CEH Funders Alignment Committee
The new CEH Charter also creates three seats for SCA (East, North, South) on the Funders Alignment Committee, which works to align funding for homelessness toward the goals of the CEH. This committee existed under the past CEH governance structure and has been continued under the new CEH Charter. SCA staff will issue a call for nominations for the three new staff appointments.

Implementation of the CEH Strategic Plan: Strategies and Action Steps
The Strategic Plan consists of three core goals broken down into implementation strategies and accompanying action steps for 2015-2016. With the transition to the new governance structure underway, the various committees, subcommittees, and staff of CEH (collectively “CEH”) will begin implementing these strategies and action steps. CEH will also look to community partners, such as nonprofit organizations and local governments, designated as action step “Leads” to shepherd this work. Strategies and action steps most-closely tied to the work of local governments are discussed below.

Human Services and Public Safety Collaboration
The Sound Cities Association is designated as the co-lead, with CEH, for one action step (Strategic Plan, Strategy 2.2, page 20):

*Host a convening, and disseminate case studies on best practices for collaboration between first responders and service providers to increase housing stability for those experiencing homelessness. As a potential outcome of the convening, a toolkit for local neighborhoods may be created. (Leads: SCA, CEH; Quarter 4 2015)*

SCA staff will be working with member cities over the coming months to solicit information about the innovative approaches they are taking to foster such collaboration. The PIC will be updated as this information is gathered and a convening is planned.

Impact Analysis
Member cities interested in evaluating the impact policies, practices, and ordinances have on people who are unhoused, may wish to partner with CEH on the following action step (Strategic Plan, Strategy 2.2, page 20):

*Pilot a voluntary impact analysis of policies, practices, and ordinances in one to two communities. Through this analysis, local governments will be able to identify policies, practices, and ordinances that create barriers for those experiencing homelessness and implement changes to support housing stability for all residents (housed and homeless) in their communities. (Lead: CEH; Quarter 1 2016)*

CEH staff are soliciting volunteers for this action step, which will be limited to one or two cities at this time.
Criminal Justice System Involvement
Additionally, local governments are named as a co-lead for two action steps related to reducing criminal justice system involvement and recidivism and may wish to participate in those efforts:

Strategic Plan, Strategy 1.3.A, page 18: Support efforts to secure sustainable funding for pre-adjudication programs and sentencing alternatives programs that help individuals avoid a criminal history while reducing recidivism. (Leads: King County, City of Seattle and local governments; 2015-16)

Strategic Plan, Strategy 1.3.A, page 18: Collaborate with Therapeutic Courts, Mainstream Courts, Familiar Faces, LEAD, and others partners, including partnerships identified and created under Strategy 2.2 to better integrate referrals and services among people experiencing homelessness. (Leads: King County, City of Seattle and local governments; 2015-16)

Affordable Housing
Finally, local governments have not been named as the lead for, but may wish to become involved in, action steps related to Strategy 1.2 (Strategic Plan, page 17). Under this strategy and accompanying action steps, the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance (WLIHA) and Housing Development Consortium (HDC) will be engaging government leaders at the local, state, and federal in discussion about preservation of, creation of, and access to affordable housing. The strategy and accompanying action steps list a number of approaches local governments can pursue, including changes to their comprehensive plan housing element and adoption of “source of income discrimination ordinances,” which bar landlords from discriminating against potential tenants who receive rental subsidies.

Next Steps
SCA staff will continue to update the PIC and member cities as implementation of the Strategic Plan proceeds. Members may contact SCA or CEH staff to learn more about how their cities can participate in the strategies and action steps listed above or otherwise align their efforts with the work of CEH.

Attachments
A. Sound Cities Association (SCA) Board Update from SCA President Matt Larson, June 19, 2015
B. SCA Endorsement Letter to CEH Governing Board from SCA President Matt Larson, June 26, 2015
Sound Cities Association (SCA) Board Update from SCA President Matt Larson:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) Board held its monthly meeting on June 17, 2015.

Committee to End Homelessness Strategic Plan:
The primary topic of discussion at the meeting was the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan. The SCA Public Issues Committee (PIC) had been briefed on the plan in January, February, March, April, and May, and was expected to take final action on the plan in June. At the June PIC meeting, a number of members (including myself) were not able to attend and there was some confusion over the timing of PIC action, and the effect of abstentions on the vote. In the end, the PIC vote was 13 in favor of endorsing the plan, 2 opposed. 5 members abstained, so there was no supermajority at the PIC.

At the urging of PIC Chair Bernie Talmas, we moved forward on Board consideration of the CEH plan this week, due to the fact that the CEH will be adopting a final version of the plan at its meeting on June 30th. Following extensive discussion, the Board adopted the following position:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) shares the vision of the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), which is that homelessness is rare in King County, racial disparities are eliminated, and if one becomes homeless, it is brief and only a one-time occurrence. SCA endorses the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan, and its goals of making homelessness rare, making homelessness brief and one-time, and creating a community to end homelessness.

Board members agreed that addressing homelessness is one of the most significant challenges facing cities today, and that we need to work together as a region on this important issue. The Board thanks the many elected officials and staff who have worked hard over the past several months to ensure that cities’ concerns were addressed in the plan, including CEH members Doreen Marchione of Kirkland and Lydia Assefa-Dawson of Federal Way, Interagency Council members Michael Hursh of Auburn, Jennifer Henning of Renton, and Colleen Kelly of Redmond, and SCA policy analyst Ellie Wilson-Jones.

SCA Bylaws:
The SCA Board is preparing a number of procedural bylaw amendments for consideration by the membership at the SCA Annual Meeting on December 3, 2015. These include:

- An amendment to allow the Board to make exceptions to the 6-year term limits for external boards and committees in “extraordinary circumstances” and with the recommendation of the PIC Nominating Committee and PIC;
- An amendment to have annual board and committee appointments finalized by December 31, rather than December 1;
- An amendment to have the annual SCA budget forwarded to the Board from the SCA Finance Committee;
- An amendment to clarify the procedures for electing board members; and
- An amendment to clarify the effect of abstentions on a vote at the PIC.

Proposed bylaw amendments, and proposed 2016 SCA dues, will be sent to all cities this fall in advance of the December Annual Meeting.

**SCA Board Policies – Networking Dinners:**
The Board adopted new policies regarding Networking Dinners, to conform with our ability to accept credit cards and register online. Our new policy on payment for dinners is as follows:

1. Attendees are strongly encouraged to register online and pay in advance via credit card or check. Attendees paying at the door are encouraged to pay via check.
2. Attendees not paying in advance or at the door will be invoiced. A convenience charge may be added for invoiced guests.
3. Registered members and guests who do not attend and who do not cancel prior to the posted deadline will be charged the full registration amount.
4. SCA staff and invited speakers will not be charged for attendance. All other attendees will be charged, whether or not a meal is consumed.

We hope you will be able to join us for our next Networking Dinner, which will be held on July 1, 2015 at the TPC Golf Course in Snoqualmie. We will be joined by a panel of legislators- and we hope that the session will have concluded by then!

**Other:**
The Board also had a discussion on the recent Intercity Study Mission to Chicago, and an update on the Service Guidelines Task Force. I look forward to updating you soon on the work of this Task Force, and seeking your feedback on next steps.

It is my pleasure and privilege to serve as your SCA Board President. If you have any questions about these or other items, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Matt Larson
President, Sound Cities Association
Mayor, City of Snoqualmie
June 26, 2015

The Honorable Mayor Ed B. Murray
Co-Chair CEH Governing Board
City of Seattle
PO Box 94749
Seattle, WA 98124-4749

Dan Brettler
Co-Chair CEH Governing Board
401 5th Avenue
Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mayor Murray, Mr. Brettler, and members of the CEH Governing Board:

We are writing to you on behalf of the Board of Directors and the 36 member cities of the Sound Cities Association (SCA) to express our support for the 2015–2019 Committee to End Homelessness’ Strategic Plan.

As you know, the Sound Cities Association (formerly the Suburban Cities Association) was founded in the 1970s to help cities in King County act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities through advocacy, education, leadership, mutual support, and networking. Collectively, our 36 member cities represent nearly one million constituents in King County.

With more than 10,000 people experiencing homelessness countywide as of the last One Night Count, and almost 3,800 of them surviving on the street, homelessness remains one of the most significant issues facing our cities. Homelessness touches every function of city government, and addressing this crisis goes to the heart of the SCA mission—creating vital, livable communities.

Every community is impacted by homelessness, with residents of each and every zip code of our county experiencing homelessness over a recent one-year span. Clearly, homelessness will not be solved within the borders of a single community. Instead, it must be addressed through the collective efforts of many partners that share the same vision for our region. To that end, our Board voted to adopt the following position:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) shares the vision of the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), which is that homelessness is rare in King County, racial disparities are eliminated, and if one becomes homeless, it is brief and only a one-time occurrence. SCA endorses the 2015–2019 CEH Strategic Plan, and its goals of making homelessness rare, making homelessness brief and one-time, and creating a community to end homelessness.
We thank you and the more than 500 people who participated in this strategic planning process and are grateful for the opportunity to provide input. By extending the schedule for adoption and allowing additional time for the plan to be honed, we have, together, developed a more robust Strategic Plan. As a result, this plan is reflective of the vision of the Sound Cities Association and other CEH partners, meaning we can now move forward to implementing this plan and ultimately solving the regional crisis of homelessness.

We look forward to working with CEH staff, the new Coordinating Board, members of the CEH subcommittees, and the broader community to implement this plan.

Sincerely,

Matt Larson
President, Sound Cities Association
Mayor, City of Snoqualmie

c.c. SCA Board of Directors
SCA Public Issues Committee
Mark Putnam, Director, CEH
Doreen Marchione, CEH Governing Board Member
Lydia Assefa-Dawson, CEH Governing Board Member
Jennifer Henning, IAC Member
Michael Hursh, IAC Member
Colleen Kelly, IAC Member
Item 10:
Service Guidelines Task Force

Discussion Item

SCA Staff Contact
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst, katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

SCA Representatives to the Service Guidelines Task Force
Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn; Mayor Fred Butler, Issaquah; Mayor Suzette Cooke, Kent; Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline; Mayor Jim Ferrell, Federal Way; Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie; Mayor John Marchione, Redmond.

Background
The adopted 2015-2016 King County Biennial Budget included a proviso requiring the Executive to transmit a motion establishing a regional stakeholder transit Service Guidelines Task Force. The Task Force is tasked with considering the varied purposes and performance characteristics of different types of transit service. Target service levels on transit corridors are identified through a scoring system, with points assigned for 50 percent productivity, 25 percent social equity, and 25 percent geographic value. The Task Force will review how the geographic value and social equity standards have been incorporated into the adopted guidelines.

More background on the Service Guidelines Task Force objectives and membership can be found in the SCA staff memo from the April 8, 2015 PIC meeting, page 52.

The Service Guidelines Task Force will do this work in the first part of 2015 so that it can influence development of both Metro’s long-range plan, scheduled to be complete by mid-2016, and its service guidelines update, scheduled to be complete by April 2016.

Timeline
The Service Guidelines Task Force held its first meeting on March 4, 2015 and will continue to meet thru late-September/early-October, as schedule has been extended based on a request from Task Force members to see analysis on potential service type changes. The Service Guidelines Task Force is expected to submit a report with its recommendations for changes to Metro's service guidelines to the King County Executive and King County Council after their final meeting. Updates to Metro's strategic plan and service guidelines are expected to be transmitted to the County Council in December.

Previous meetings and topics were as follows:
1. Wednesday, March 4: Regional Transit Task Force recommendations and introduction to the service guidelines (Presentation material)
2. Wednesday, April 1: Performance measurement and geographic value in Metro’s planning process (Presentation material)
3. Thursday, April 30: Social equity in Metro’s planning process (Presentation material)
4. Thursday, May 21: Geographic value, service types and reduction/investment decisions (Presentation material)
5. Wednesday, June 3: Alternative Services and Services Types (Presentation material)
6. Tuesday, June 16: Potential Changes to the Guidelines (Draft Principles and Recommendations)

Future meetings are as follows:
7. August 12 or August 13: Technical workshop to describe analysis on service types and outcomes from higher level recommended changes to the service guidelines (Seattle location to be determined)
8. September 17: Task Force meeting on preliminary recommendations (Mercer Island Community and Events Center, 3 – 6pm)
9. October 7: Task Force meeting on final recommendations (Chinook Building, Seattle – 3 – 6pm)

Service Guidelines Task Force Meeting 6 – June 16, 2015
The sixth meeting of the Task Force was held on June 16, 2015. The agenda included a discussion of draft principles and preliminary recommendations from the Service Guidelines Task Force. The meeting also included a short discussion about policies for financial partnerships.

The meeting opened with a discussion on changes to schedule to account for further analysis of service types. As noted in previous PIC meetings, Service Guidelines Task Force members – and SCA members in particular – have expressed interest in seeing how new services types could affect service decisions. As a result of this request, Metro staff will be conducting a comprehensive analysis in the coming months on the following service types: Seattle core (existing), Non-Seattle core (existing), Demand Response (Dial-a-Ride Transit and community shuttles with variable routing), and Express (peak-only routes). Also at the request of SCA members on the Task Force, as well as other members, Metro will be conducting analysis on an additional service type, which could take account for density/market served and mobility/function. The service types will be analyzed to demonstrate and compare outcomes of the baseline system with systems with additional service types in reduction and investments scenarios.

The majority of the June 16 meeting consisted of a review of Mr. Howell’s Preliminary Draft Principles and Recommendations handout. The draft is intended to initiate conversations among Task Force members and is drawn from conversations which have occurred during Task Force meetings to date. Below is a high-level overview of the handout, which is linked above and below.

Draft Principles:
- Different parts of the county have different travel demands.
• Measure performance of routes against similar services.
• Right-size service and seed new markets.
• Create better connections between centers.
• Maintain and improve productivity of the system.
• The demands for transit service far outweigh current available resources.

Draft Recommendations:
• Make changes to the Service Guidelines, including modifying service types, developing a minimum service standard for each service type, and creating a point system that allows for scaling for social equity and geographic value.
• Make changes to the planning process to include addressing origin and destination data, better identify the needs of transit users or potential users of (including youth, disabled and elderly populations), and increase transparency via a public process.
• Enhance the alternative services program, including increase funding support and delivery more services where fixed-route services is not cost effective, exploring public-public or public-private partnerships, creating a new metric for measuring performance, consider modifications to increase van pool subsidy.
• Make changes to partnerships and land-use initiatives, including identifying new community partnerships to support low-income worker transit options and increase management of park-and-ride utilization and future investments.
• Support new funding to support the growth of transit services.

Service Guidelines Task Force members made the following comments that are expected to be reflected in an updated draft of the principles and recommendations:
• Suggestions to add a language in principles regarding social equity/geographic value, transparency in reporting, and opportunities for supportive public-private infrastructure.
• Suggestions to add language in recommendations to enhance planning process, expand on alternative services, and be more explicit about partnerships.

Concluding the meeting was a short discussion reviewing policies for financial partnerships in the purchase of service. Task Force members discussed that partnerships could be identified in a host of different ways, including land use zoning, signalization timing, or infrastructure to support BAT lanes.

The Preliminary Draft Principles and Recommendations handout drafted by John Howell, facilitator from Cedar River Group, can be found here.

Next Steps
The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on either August 12 or August 13, which will be a technical workshop to describe analysis on service types and outcomes from higher level recommended changes to the service guidelines. SCA staff will continue working with SCA Task Force members and Metro staff to better understand how the suggested changes to service types could affect service during times of reductions or growth.
On September 17, the Task Force will meet to discuss preliminary recommendations, taking the requested analysis into consideration. A final meeting will be held on October 7, 2015.

SCA staff will continue to attend Task Force meetings and provide briefings to members of the Public Issues Committee (PIC). SCA Task Force members have begun to develop proposed set of principles related to Metro’s service guidelines that will be used to convey SCA’s input into, as well as help lead into Metro’s long range plan efforts in 2015. More information on the Service Guidelines Task Force can be found here.
Item 11:  
2015 Legislative Session Update  

DISCUSSION ITEM

SCA Staff Contact  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst, katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

Discussion Item:  
SCA staff will provide an update on issues from the 2015 legislature, specifically focusing on SCA’s legislative priorities of a comprehensive statewide transportation package, sustainable public health funding, and providing cities with adequate tools to provide needed municipal services. This includes preserving a viable Public Works Trust Fund and obtaining a long-term commitment to share new marijuana tax revenues.

Background:  
The Governor called the Washington State Legislature back for a second 30-day special session on May 29 to complete work on a two-year operating budget, capital budget, a comprehensive statewide transportation package. While progress was made on negotiating legislation, the Legislature was unable to pass the budgets or the transportation package before the second special session ended. Therefore, the Governor called the Washington State Legislature into a third special session on June 28, 2015.

The Legislature passed – and the Governor signed – the operating budget and the capital budget minutes prior to July 1, when some state government services would have faced shut down. The Legislature was able to pass SCA’s priority Transportation Package in the early hours of July 1 after intense political negotiations.

Below is a table of legislation and/or appropriations that SCA had been tracking during the 2015 session (more detailed background after the table):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation/Issue</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Package (SB 5987)</td>
<td>Passed 7/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Package Bonds</td>
<td>Passed Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>Passed 6/30/2015, Signed 6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Trust Fund</td>
<td>Sweeps $73 million and no funding for new PWTF loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Profits</td>
<td>Retains current local profit sharing at $49.4/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Taxes</td>
<td>Restores to historic funding level of $50.1 million (last biennium was $25 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>Fully funded at $9.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Budget</td>
<td>Passed 6/30/2015, Signed 6/30/2015 (SCA staff will provide additional overview on July 8, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana Reforms (HB 2136)</td>
<td>Passed, Signed 6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Train Safety (HB 1449)</td>
<td>Passed, Signed 5/18/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control Zone Districts (HB 1940)</td>
<td>Passed, Signed 5/6/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Bonds (HB 1223)</td>
<td>Passed, Signed 4/25/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1571 - Paint Stewardship (HB 1521)</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Property Tax Cap</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Fiscal Sustainability (HB 2156)</td>
<td>Passed House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Area Agency on Aging (AAA)</td>
<td>Increase of $10 million statewide for the case management program, a nine percent increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 5987 - Transportation Package: PASSED

The Legislature successfully negotiated a Transportation Package (ESSB 5987) that raises $16.1 billion – originally $15.1 billion approved by the Senate in spring – over 16 years and allocates funding for state and local projects, grant programs, multimodal options, and provides authority for local jurisdictions to seek approval for new taxing authority. The motor vehicle fuel tax will be increased by a total of $0.117 per gallon, starting with a $0.07 per gallon increase effective August 1, 2015 and another $0.049 per gallon increase effective July 1, 2016.

The package includes providing Sound Transit the authority to ask voters for limited property, sales and motor vehicle excise tax hikes, up to $15 billion, to expand light rail. As part of negotiations to pass the package, leadership negotiated a requirement that Sound Transit pay a tax on ST projects. An amendment was approved stating that, rather than Sound Transit paying $518 million of the new ST3 taxes to the general fund, a Puget Sound taxpayer accountability account has been established that will be spent on education improvement investments only within the boundaries of the regional transit authority (Sound Transit). Additionally, Sound Transit must contribute $20 million over five years to affordable housing, and must give developers of affordable housing the first opportunity to bid on 80% of its surplus property.

Of importance to SCA members, cities or counties with overlapping boundaries of a transportation benefit district (TBD) may absorb and take on the powers of transportation TBDs. Additionally, TBDs will now have authority to impose a vehicle fee of up to $40 if a $20 fee has been in effective for at least 24 months. After the $40 has been in place for two years additional councilmanic increases are authorized, but would be subject to referendum.

The package calls for a list of “Connecting Washington Projects”, which includes several major state transportation projects, including the state Route 520 overhaul, upgrading I-405, finishing work on state routes 509 and 167, tackling I-5 congestion at Joint Base Lewis-McChord and continuing work on a new I-395 corridor through Spokane. A list of investments in the Puget Sound region prepared by PSRC staff can be found here. Additionally, the compromise package
has roughly $1 billion in multimodal funding, the highest ever for bicycling and pedestrian safety in a Washington legislative transportation projects package. Projects within King County include: SR 520 Regional Bike Path & Trail, Mountains to Sound Greenway, Wilburton Reconnection Project, a Federal Way trail, Cross-Kirkland Corridor, and Interurban Trail in Pacific.

The package also includes direct distribution of funds to cities and counties of $375 million split 50% cities/50% counties. Of the $187.5 million to cities, $87.5 million comes from gas tax revenues, $100 million from the Multimodal Account. The package includes $75 million for bike/ped projects. It includes $56 million in the Safe Routes to Schools grants program, It includes $106 million for the Complete Streets Grant Program (administered by the TIB). It includes $123 million for the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB).

Ultimately, the Governor agreed not to implement low-carbon fuel standards by rule in the package. However, the Legislature could pass the low carbon fuel standards through legislation.

Still to be completed as of this writing is the passage of the bond bill that would enable the transportation package projects to advance in the schedule identified in the package legislation. AWC has provided this summary of what's contained in the almost-finalized new transportation package.

2015-2017 Operating Biennial Budget: PASSED & SIGNED
The 2015-17 operating budget spends a total of $38.2 billion Near General-State and Opportunity Pathways and represents a $4.4 billion increase from current spending levels in the 2013-15 biennium. The budget proposal makes changes based on forecast updates and other more recent developments since the April budget was released.

- Invests about $1.3 billion in K–12 basic education to address growing school needs, meets the state’s constitutional obligations, expands access to full-day kindergarten and decreases class sizes in grades K–3.
- Reduces the cost of tuition at the state’s four-year colleges and universities and two-year community colleges, and increases funding for College Bound Scholarships.
- Makes a major investment in early learning, including Early Start and the Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program.
- Increases funding for state parks.
- Fully funds collective bargaining agreements for state employees and home care worker contracts and retirement benefits.
- Funds the Initiative 732 cost-of-living for teachers, plus funds for additional teacher compensation.
- Makes investments to address court-mandated fixes in the state’s mental health system and increases funding for other important social services.
- Provides a 2015–17 operating budget of about $38 billion and meets the state’s four-year balanced budget requirement.
• Funding sources include account transfers and a net increase in revenue from closing tax exemptions and extending some current exemptions that support needed jobs. Includes provision to expand Washington’s ability to collect taxes from out-of-state entities that make sales within the state.

On a negative note, the budget sweeps $73 million from the Public Works Trust Fund associated with loan repayments and fund balance. Projects currently funded will be funded to completion. However, there is no funding for new projects as revenue streams have been diverted to the state's education fund. SCA will be working over the coming months to develop ideas for how to fund critical infrastructure projects in the future.

The Association of Washington Cities (AWC) has published a comparison chart of the budget proposals and adopted budget as of June 30, 2015, please see link here.

HB 2136 - Marijuana market reforms: PASSED & SIGNED
HB 2136 contains provisions that adjust the tax rates on medical and recreational marijuana and would share a portion of the marijuana excise tax with local governments. Included in the legislation signed by Governor Inslee on June 30, 2015 include:

• Eliminating the 25 percent producer and processor taxes and increases the 25 percent retailer tax to 37 percent and specifies that the taxes are levied on the buyer.
• Allocates $6 million per year ($12 million for 2015-17) to cities and counties, distributed based on the sales conducted in the jurisdiction. This retail-sales based formula was advanced to incentivize jurisdictions to remove bans.
• Provides marijuana tax revenues for local jurisdictions, distributed based on retail sales and population, at an annual cap of $15 million per year until June 30, 2019, and $20 million per year thereafter.
  ◦ For the 2017-19 biennium and thereafter, after appropriations, the State Treasurer transfers the balance to the general fund, except if fiscal year tax collections exceed $25 million; thereafter 30 percent of previous year's revenue is distributed to eligible counties, cities, and towns to a maximum of $15 for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, and a maximum of $20 million per year each year thereafter.
  ◦ Of the monies disbursed, 30 percent of the total goes to counties, cities, and towns based on the proportional amount of retail sales of marijuana within the individual jurisdiction. The remaining 70 percent is disbursed to counties, cities, and towns ratably on a per capita basis as follows: counties will receive 60 percent of this amount – based on total county population – and cities will receive the remaining 40 percent on a per capita basis.
  ◦ Any jurisdiction that prohibits the siting of a marijuana business is prohibited from receiving a local distribution.
• Local governments are allowed to reduce the buffer for retail stores from 1000 feet down to 100 feet from recreation center, child care centers, public parks, public transit centers, libraries, and certain game arcades if they choose to do so. However, the 1,000 foot buffer requirement for schools and playgrounds is maintained. In order to reduce
the buffer requirement, a county, city or town must pass an ordinance declaring that
the reduction will not negatively impact the jurisdiction’s law enforcement efforts,
public safety, or public health.

- Local governments have the authority to prohibit marijuana production and processing
  in areas zoned primarily for residential or rural use with a minimum lot size of five acres
  or smaller.

The following legislation and/or issues were supported by the Sound Cities Board of Directors
during the 2015 Legislative Session:

HB 1449 - Oil Train Safety – PASSED & SIGNED
SCA adopted a position in support of oil train safety in 2014. The legislature passed HB 1449
relating to the safe transport of hazardous materials. The bill changes the regulatory programs
covering the overland and over-water transportation of oil. It requires railroads to do oil spill
response planning and provide information to the Department of Ecology about crude oil
transport activities. Additionally, it authorizes rule-making by the State Board of Pilotage
Commissioners to require tug escorts for oil-laden vessels and rule-making by the Utilities and
Transportation Commission to set safety standards for private railroad crossings. HB 1449 was
signed by the Governor on May 14 and goes into effect on July 1, 2015.

HB 1940 - Flood Control Zone Districts – PASSED & SIGNED
The legislature passed HB 1940 which would protect the King County Flood Control District’s
levy from suppression, as well as flood control districts within the Chehalis River basin. The
protection from suppression would expire on January 1, 2023. SCA sent a letter urging the
Legislature to adopt this legislation on March 12, 2015. HB 1940 was signed by the Governor on
May 6 with a partial veto and goes into effect on 1/1/2018. The Governor’s partial veto
eliminated the protection from suppression January 1, 2023 expiration date.

HB 1223 - Affordable Housing Bonds – PASSED & SIGNED
The legislature passed HB 1223 which would allow King County to bond against future King
County lodging tax revenues to acquire land and build workforce housing and has been signed
by the Governor on April 25 and goes into effect on 7/24/2015. SCA adopted a position in
support of this legislation in February 2015. This legislation will allow up to $45 million in new
housing funds to be released over the next six years to create and preserve affordable
workforce housing in coordination with transit investments. HB 1223 was signed by the
Governor on April 25 and goes into effect on July 24, 2015.

HB 1571 - Paint Stewardship – Did Not Pass
HB 1571 would create a paint recycling program under the Department of Ecology and was
scheduled for a public hearing in the Senate Energy, Environment and Telecommunications
committee on March 17. The SCA Board of Directors sent a letter on March 30 to the Senate
Energy, Environment and Telecommunications committee to express support for a product
stewardship program that will allow residents to return unused paint for reuse, recycling, or
proper disposal. HB 1571 was passed out the House but was not passed out of Senate committee before the April 1 deadline.

King County Area Agency on Aging (AAA) -
The SCA Board of Directors joined with the City of Seattle and other SCA cities to express support for the King County Area Agency on Aging (AAA) request to increase the reimbursement rates for Medicaid case management. While AAA requested a $28 million increase ($14 million state; $14 million federal match) to the case management program, the Legislature ultimately provided an increase of $10 million statewide for the case management program, which represents about a 9% increase.

Next Steps
The third session of the 2015 Legislature continues as legislators work on whether to delay implementation of Initiative 1351, the smaller-class size initiative voters approved last fall, to help fill a $2 billion hole in the budget. SCA staff will continue to monitor the implementation of priority legislation and will begin to identify 2016 priority issues to bring to PIC in late-2015/early-2016.
Item 12:
Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County

Discussion Item

SCA Staff Contact
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, Katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

Discussion Item:
Members will have an opportunity to update the PIC in regards to upcoming ballot measures.

Background:
The purpose of this item is to provide information for SCA member cities on upcoming ballot measures. This item will be an ongoing, monthly item on the PIC agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Best Start for Kids Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Bridging the Gap transportation levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle Schools</td>
<td>District operations and capital levies (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Low-income housing (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans and Human Services Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFIS Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Families and Education Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps
SCA staff will update this document on a regular basis. Please share this information with your city, and provide information on upcoming elections in your city to Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, at Katie@soundcities.org.
Item 13: SCA Issues for 2015

DISCUSSION ITEM

SCA Staff Contact
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst, katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

Discussion Item:
SCA staff is seeking feedback on issues members would like the PIC to consider in 2015.

Background
At the January 14, 2015 Public Issues Committee (PIC) meeting, SCA Executive Director asked members to note any issues PIC should consider in 2015. Following is a list of issues members noted at that meeting, and at subsequent meetings. SCA staff will keep this list updated throughout the year. This will be an ongoing, monthly PIC item.

Ongoing Issues for 2015:

- Homelessness
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - Update on adoption of Committee to End Homelessness Strategic Plan in July
  - Possible update on action steps being undertaken by cities at future PIC Meetings

- Best Starts for Kids Levy
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - Pre-PIC item 4/8/2015
  - Final action anticipated for July

- Food Policy
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - PSRC Regional Food Policy Council Blueprints were on agenda for 2/11/2015 as an informational item
  - At April PIC, it was suggested that PIC have a future briefing on the King County Local Food Initiative
  - Future items may come back to PIC in 2015

- Sound Transit 3
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC, discussed at April PIC
  - A briefing on ST3 will come to PIC as a pre-PIC workshop and/or discussion item
• Service Guidelines Task Force
  o Pre-PIC item 3/11/2015, monthly updates will be provided to PIC
  o SCA staff will monitor and provide updates

• Metro Long Range Plan
  o Pre-PIC item on 3/11/2015
  o SCA staff is monitoring, and propose bringing back to PIC as a discussion item
    timed with the Regional Transit Committee September workshop

• Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan/Recycling Targets
  o Pre-PIC workshop on 5/13/2015
  o At 5/13/2015 PIC meeting, request for recycling targets to be added as topic for
    discussion and/or potential action
  o Will be coming back to PIC for discussion, possible action at future PIC meetings

• Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD)
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o Pre-PIC item on 6/10/2015

• Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA)
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o Board discussed at April meeting, staff will be providing feedback to PSCAA staff
    based on the discussion at PIC and Board
  o SCA staff will monitor and provide updates to PIC

• Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) issues
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o SCA staff will work with committee members to schedule future PIC items

• Funding for roads in unincorporated King County
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o This item was discussed at length at April 2015 SCA Board meeting
  o Was also discussed at May 2015 City Managers meeting, and that group will
    have an upcoming presentation
  o Will come back for discussion at a future PIC meeting, potentially as a pre-PIC
    workshop

If you or your city have additional items to be added to this list, please contact Katie Kuciemba at Katie@soundcities.org.
Item 14: Regional Water Quality Committee Update

Informational Item

SCA Staff Contact
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, Doreen@soundcities.org, 206-495-3525

Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) members
Councilmember John Wright, Lake Forest Park (caucus chair & RWQC vice chair);
Councilmember Doris McConnell, Shoreline; Councilmember Wayne Osborne, Auburn; Council
President Ed Prince, Renton; Deputy Mayor Penny Sweet, Kirkland; Councilmember Benson
Wong, Mercer Island.

Summary
The Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) has been working on a reestablished
WaterWorks Grant Program in recent months. On April 27, 2015, the King County Council
approved the WaterWorks Grant Program, an annual grant program with about $850,000 in
funding for water quality projects in the King County Wastewater Service Area. Specifics of the
grant program and an outline of the program’s history can be found below. Applications for
the 2015 WaterWorks funding cycle will be accepted in the summer of 2015. SCA will disseminate
the grant information when it is available.

Another project RWQC recently began working on is a comprehensive review of, with potential
amendments and updates to, the Regional Wastewater Service Plan (RWSP) policies, KCC 28.86. The RWQC has created the RWSP Subcommittee on which Councilmember John Wright, Lake
Forest Park, serves as SCA’s representative. The RWSP policies form the basis for the
metropolitan wastewater system in King County. Councilmember Wright welcomes feedback
from member cities on the RWSP policies and potential changes to them.

There are two committees that provide policy guidance to the King County Council in the
wastewater treatment arena; the RWQC and the Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement
Advisory Committee (MWPAAC). On RWQC, SCA has three members representing members’
collective interest; other RWQC members represent Seattle, water and sewer districts, and King
County. MWPAAC, in accordance with RCW 35.28.210, is made up of one representative from
each city and water/sewer district within the wastewater treatment service area. A roster of
MWPAAC members can be found here. MWPAAC was instrumental in the development of
WaterWorks grant criteria and is also in the process of a major review of RWSP policies.
**WaterWorks Grant Program**

In 2014, the King County Council adopted an appropriation of $4,096,930 over the 2015-2016 biennium for water quality improvement activities. The purpose of the funding is to reinstate a previously suspended Water Quality Improvement Program, focusing on “engaging residents, businesses, community organizations and customers in actively working to improve water quality in the Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) service area through funding provided and administered by WTD”. The funding was split into two pots; one, the WaterWorks Grant program, was funded at $2,000,000. The remaining $2,096,043 is to be allocated to specific water quality improvement activities, programs or projects located within the King County wastewater treatment service area, as proposed by a King County Councilmember. The King County Council adopted a budget proviso requiring an ordinance be adopted setting out the WaterWorks Grant Program funding criteria, restrictions and procedures and that ordinances be adopted for the use of the remaining $2,096,043. The WaterWorks Grant Program criteria can be found in [Attachment A](#).

**Program History**

A previous iteration of the Water Quality Improvement Program, sometimes referred to as “Culver Funding”, was in place from 1997 – 2010. To find out more about the history of the program, see [Attachment B](#), RWQC Briefing dated March 4, 2015 on WaterWorks Grant-Making Program for Water Quality Improvement Projects. Such funding was used for many projects related to water quality, including supporting numerous “Friends of” environmental groups.

SCA took a position on Culver Funding in July 1996:

> SCA supports the position that while Culver Funding is important to this region, the County, with its regional partners, needs to look towards alternative funding sources for the Culver Program.

In September 2006, a change that reflected SCA’s position (the sewer & water districts had similar comments) was made to the Regional Wastewater Services Financial Policy 8. A report addressing Financial Policy 8 was transmitted to the King County Council in 2007. A number of alternate funding options were considered in that report, including utilizing the general fund, asking for a levy lid lift, developing an endowment, and potentially, accessing revenues from a yet to be created flood control district. The County Executive recommended that the Water Quality Improvement Program funds be capped at 1.5 percent of the 2007 Wastewater operating budget. The final outcome was that the funding was limited to 1.5 percent of a given year’s operating budget, but not capped at the 2007 level. The financial policy limiting such funding to 1.5 percent of the operating budget is still in place today.

The Water Quality Improvement Program was one target of a 2008 lawsuit brought by the Soos Creek and Cedar River water and sewer districts alleging that it was illegal to use wastewater funds for water quality projects. In 2010, funding for the program was eliminated while the lawsuit was adjudicated. In 2013, King County prevailed in Pierce County Superior Court and that decision was upheld by the Washington State Supreme Court. Once that decision was issued, King County began working with MWPAAC on policies to reinstate the funding.
Regional Wastewater Services Plan Policies
The Regional Wastewater Service Plan (RWSP) policies are found in King County Code 28.86. As noted above, the RWSP policies form the basis for the metropolitan wastewater system in King County and address the following areas: treatment plants; conveyance system, inflow & infiltration, combined sewer overflow control, biosolids, water reuse, wastewater services, water quality protection, environmental mitigation, public involvement, financial, and reporting. The current review of RWSP policies is the first comprehensive review since the policies were adopted in 1999. In 2005 there was a limited review of the policies based on caucus recommendations from SCA and sewer & water districts. Those policy reviews did result in some changes.

A subcommittee of MWPAAC is reviewing the policies and providing proposed changes to RWQC staff. RWQC staff will then bring MWPAAC’s proposed changes and potentially, other changes proposed by the County Executive, to RWQC’s RWSP Subcommittee. To date, proposed MWPAAC changes have mainly been technical or administrative in nature, though there may be more substantive issues that arise as additional policies are reviewed.

It is anticipated that the RWQC Subcommittee will review the policies over the next several months with action by the RWQC in late 2015 or early 2016. If you are interested in reviewing learning more about the existing policies or if you would like to provide feedback or concerns with the proposed amendments, contact Doreen Booth at Doreen@soundcities.org or contact your city’s MWPAAC member.

Attachments

A. WaterWorks Grant Criteria
B. RWQC Briefing dated March 4, 2015
WaterWorks Grant Program
Implementation Guidelines for Project Criteria, Eligibility, Project Selection Process and Administration of Grants
April 1, 2015

Purpose

Up to 1.5% of the annual Wastewater Treatment Division operating budget may be allocated by the King County Council for projects to improve water quality in the Wastewater Treatment Division (“WTD”) service area to leverage or complement the water quality mission of King County’s regional wastewater system.

Funding shall be applied to specific water quality improvement activities, programs, or projects located within the King County wastewater treatment service area and meeting the eligibility criteria below. The provision below shall apply to projects that receive funding through the WaterWorks grant program.

Criteria

Programs, activities, projects approved for funding must meet the following eligibility criteria:

- Create a benefit to or improvement of water quality within WTD’s service area and benefit its ratepayers; and
- Demonstrate that water quality benefits are related to the WTD’s regional water quality responsibilities.

Eligibility to apply for WaterWorks Funds

The following entities are eligible to be recipients of the WaterWorks grant funding:

- Non-Profit groups (including but not limited to associations, community groups, and educational institutions)
- Cities, counties, and special purpose districts
- Tribes

Any other entity (such as a private business) interested in using WaterWorks grant funding would need to partner with an eligible entity.
Staffing

- WTD shall be responsible for administering and staffing the program, utilizing a percentage of program funds to pay for this administration.

- WTD shall develop administrative details of the grants program including development of process, application materials, announcements, review process, grant/contract distribution, tracking, financial accounting, reporting requirements, etc.

Project Selection Process

1. WTD staff will prepare and advertise a request for proposals (RFP) and receive applications on an annual basis.

2. A Grant Ranking Committee (“Committee”) will review, rank and recommend projects for funding.
   a. The Committee will be staffed by WTD.
   b. The Committee will be made up of nine people appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by Council as follows:
      - Three (3) King County resident representatives from within the King County wastewater service area
      - One (1) water quality technical specialist
      - Three (3) representatives from the Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee (MWPAAC), one each representing Seattle, participant cities other than Seattle, and participant sewer districts; and
      - Two (2) King County Council representatives.

3. The Committee will make its recommendation to the County Executive based upon the Criteria and the strength of the applicants to demonstrate:
   a. **Water Quality Benefits.** Project proposals should be explicit regarding the water quality benefits. Examples of project benefits include:
      - Addressing a water quality problem or implementation of a project to maintain water quality
      - Addressing contaminants entering the system, i.e. pollution prevention, source identification, fats/oils/grease, product stewardship, emerging chemicals, etc.
      - Protecting or improving watersheds, streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands and tidewaters in the service area.
• Providing education, on the ground improvement projects, programs, research, technology development, or related ideas.

• Building awareness of water quality and environmental protection and promotion of behavioral changes for improved water quality gains/outcomes.

b. Implementation Strength. Strong project applicants will demonstrate the following:

• Ability to leverage other funding or in-kind donations

• Community involvement benefits; i.e. strength and diversity of partnerships and community stewardship.

• Certainty of success in delivery.

• Cost effectiveness of the proposal.

• Clear goals and opportunities, and measurable outcomes

4. The County Executive will confirm the project list or make adjustments.

5. The County Executive will transmit to the King County Council a project list, including for each project: a summary description of how the project meets the selection criteria and the proposed project grant with an ordinance to approve the grant funding allocation for each project.

6. WTD will administer the contracts for approved projects.

7. WTD staff will provide annual briefings (or as requested) to MWPAAC and the Regional Water Quality Committee on the status of the WaterWorks Grant Program including information on the number of proposals received, projects funded in that year, and summary of completion of past projects.
SUBJECT
A briefing on draft legislation for the re-establishment of WaterWorks grant-making program for water quality improvement projects.

SUMMARY
This briefing will provide an update to the October and December, 2014 briefings on the Metropolitan Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee’s recommendations regarding reinstatement of funding for water quality improvement projects, including the criteria and process more awarding grants for projects within the service area.

The briefing will provide an opportunity to review draft legislation to provide the guidelines and criteria for water quality projects and the process to award grants.

ANALYSIS
The Regional Wastewater Services Plan (RWSP) adopted in 1989 contained financial policy FP-8 which specified by policy the allowable use of up to one and one-half percent of the of annual wastewater treatment division’s operating budget for the purposes on “water quality improvement activities, programs and projects”.

Appropriation and allocation of funds for water quality improvement activities, programs, and projects was suspended while a lawsuit filed by two agencies with contracts with King County regarding the alleged illegal use of wastewater system funds for the purposes specified in policy FP-8 (and other topics) was pending. In 2013, the Supreme Court of Washington State upheld a lower court ruling that use of the wastewater system operating funds was allowable for the purposes described in policy FP-8. The appeal process for the lawsuit was exhausted in early 2014.
Subsequently, Wastewater Treatment Division staff began working with MWPAAC in the second quarter of 2014 to gather input and suggestions regarding “criteria and limitations” for funding of water quality improvement activities, programs and projects. MWPAAC appointed a subcommittee entitled the “Our Waters Working Group”, chaired by Pam Carter, Commissioner for the Valley View Sewer District.

The working group proposed criteria and limitations to MWPAAC’s general assembly this summer and MWPAAC has made its recommendations to the Executive. In October the RWQC was briefed by a MWPAAC representative and member of the work group and Executive staff regarding MWPAAC’s recommendations. The briefing came during the middle of the Council’s deliberations regarding the Executive’s proposed 2015-16 budget.

The Executive proposed an appropriation of: $4,096,930 over the biennium for the WaterWorks program. He noted in his budget documents that his intent was to reinstate the water quality program focused on “engaging residents, businesses, community organizations and customers in actively working to improve water quality in the WTD service area through funding provided and administered by WTD”. The amount proposed to be appropriated the maximum allowable under the King County Code which authorizes up to 1.5 percent of WTD’s operating budget to be expended on water quality improvement activities, programs, and projects.

The working group proposed criteria and limitations to MWPAAC’s general assembly this summer and MWPAAC has made its recommendations to the Executive via a memorandum (dated September 10, 2014) to Pam Elardo, WTD’s Division Director. The memorandum was also presented to the Regional Water Quality Committee on October 1, 2014 (Briefing 2014-0176 – Attachment 1).

The Council determined that there was insufficient time during budget deliberations this fall to develop and specify the funding criteria, restrictions and procedures. Therefore the Council appropriated the funds also adopted the following budget proviso restricting the expenditure of the funds:

**P2 PROVIDED FURTHER THAT:**
Of this appropriation, $4,096,043 shall not be expended or encumbered until the council adopts ordinances regarding water quality improvement project funding as specified in this proviso. Each ordinance shall reference the subject matter, the proviso’s ordinance, ordinance section and proviso number in both the title and body of the ordinance. Upon council adoption of each ordinance, funding shall be released for expenditure as follows:

A. $2,000,000 shall be released for the WaterWorks grant program upon the adoption by the council of an ordinance establishing the grant award criteria and process for the WaterWorks grant program following the discretionary referral to, consideration and recommendation by the regional water quality committee. The grant program shall allocate funding to local
and regional governments, including King County, nonprofit organizations, community organizations and businesses, for the purpose of water quality improvement projects within the King County wastewater service area; and

B. The remaining $2,096,043 shall be released upon adoption of an ordinance or ordinances allocating these funds to specific water quality improvement activities, programs or projects located within the King County wastewater treatment service area.

The ordinances required by this proviso shall be introduced by a King County councilmember in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff, the policy staff director and the lead staff for the transportation, economy and environment committee, or its successor.

Based on the input from MWPAAC and further discussion with members of the RWQC, staff has been preparing draft legislation to re-instate the grant making program. At the writing of this staff report – the draft legislation was still under-going administrative and legal review. It is anticipated to be available prior to the committee meeting and an electronic copy will be distributed by email – with hard copies distributed at the meeting.

BACKGROUND

Background and History
King County owns and operates a regional sewage treatment system developed by the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro), which was merged with King County in 1993.

The County, as successor to Metro, provides sewage treatment and disposal service to 34 local sewer utilities owned and operated by cities and special districts in King and Snohomish Counties. This service relationship is governed by long term agreements that, among other things, provide for payment to the County for sewage treatment and disposal. These agreements restrict the kinds of expenses the County can charge local utilities for to those expenses incurred to treat and dispose of sewage. The revenues collected from local sewer utilities in accordance with these agreements, coupled with some related charges and occasional state and federal assistance for capital needs, constitute the financial support for development and operation of the metropolitan sewage treatment system.

When Metro was created in 1959 the discharge of untreated and partially treated sewage into Lake Washington and Puget Sound was the primary cause of water quality degradation in the region. The primary remedy was removal of all sewage discharges to Lake Washington and reduction of untreated sewage discharges to Puget Sound through the development of a modern regional sewage treatment system. The civic campaign to create Metro and generate public support for the massive capital investment deemed necessary to develop a regional sewage treatment system, coupled
with the successful development of that system, caused Metro to be regarded as the region’s preeminent water quality agency. This led to expectations that Metro would be a major player in water quality activities in addition to sewage treatment and has, from time to time, created some pressure to use sewer revenues to help pay for these other activities.

These expectations were aided by provisions in state law that gave Metro broad powers to engage in water pollution abatement activities and abetted by the fact that there were no other entities in the region with Metro’s water quality focus or technical expertise.

**History**
Metro’s identification with water quality and the monitoring capability it developed in support of its sewage treatment responsibilities made it a logical participant in the Water Quality Management Study, begun in 1971, that was undertaken to define a basin-wide water quality management program in the Cedar and Green River Basins. This study, one of four guided by the River Basin Coordinating Committee (RIBCO), was undertaken with a federal grant and funding and contributed services from Metro and local governments. The study included an analysis of water quality conditions in the region’s major water bodies and development of a handbook that addressed small lake conditions and rehabilitation measures.

The RIBCO studies were followed in 1974 by the designation of Metro as the agency responsible, under Section 208 of the 1972 Clean Water Act, for water quality planning for the Cedar-Green River basins. Metro developed a comprehensive area wide water quality plan with federal funding made available under the provisions of Section 208. Metro continued to engage in various water quality activities and updates of that plan after federal funding was no longer available. These activities were supported by sewer revenues but the expenditures constituted a very small percentage of Metro’s water pollution control operating budget. Examples included lake management and restoration activities and technical studies on storm water. Metro also engaged in public education/awareness activities regarding water quality. Other local governments began assuming water quality responsibilities and participated in both the funding and management of these activities.

**CULVER Report**
In 1988, in response to pressure from local sewer agencies, the Metro Council formed a special task force – the “Water Quality Program Review Committee” to review Metro's responsibilities, authorities, programs and its funding for activities not directly related to sewage treatment. The task force was chaired by A.J. Culver - then mayor of Issaquah and a member of the Metro Water Quality Committee, representing the small cities. The “Final Report of the Water Quality Program Review Committee” was circulated on June 1, 1988. This report is commonly referred to as the Culver Report.

The report found that Metro had historically spent close to 3.5 percent of its operating budget of non-directly related sewage treatment activities. It recommended that 3.0 – 3.5 percent was a "reasonable amount" to dedicate to these types of activities at least
until 1995 when Metro was scheduled to undertake additional and expensive capital improvements. This allocation became known as CULVER funds.

In 1996, the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) recommended financial policies to the council which was adopted by, Motion 9869, “...financial policies for the water quality program within the Department of Natural Resources of King County”. Financial Policy 8 limits the use of funds for non-sewer water quality activities, programs and projects to 1.5 percent of the wastewater operating budget. This language was later modified and adopted into the current RWSP financial policies as stated and described in the introduction to this document.

The Regional Wastewater Services Plan (RWSP) adopted in 1999 contained financial policy FP-8 which specified by policy the allowable use of up to one and one-half percent of the annual wastewater treatment division’s operating budget for the purpose on “water quality improvement activities, programs and projects”.

Amendments to the policies were adopted by the Council on September 25, 2006 by Ordinance 15602, (as recommended by the Regional Water Quality Committee and the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee1) including changes to FP-8 so that it was amended to read as follows (shown in strikeout and underline form):

FP 8: “Water quality improvement activities, programs and projects, in addition to those that are functions of sewage treatment, may be eligible for funding assistance from sewer rate revenues after consideration of criteria and limitations suggested by the metropolitan water pollution abatement advisory committee, and, if deemed eligible, shall be limited to one and one half percent of the annual wastewater system operating budget. An annual report on activities, programs and projects funded will be made to the RWQC. (This policy shall remain in effect until such time as a financial plan for the surface water regional needs assessment is adopted and implemented.) Alternative methods of providing a similar level of funding assistance for water quality improvement activities shall be transmitted to the RWQC and the council within seven months of policy adoption.”

A report was submitted by the Executive in 2007, but was not reviewed by the RWQC or Council in any committee.

A 2008, lawsuit filed by Cedar River Water and Sewer District and Soos Creek Water and Sewer District with vs. King County alleged the illegal use of wastewater funds to support/fund water quality projects (also known as ‘Culver Fund Projects’). In 2010, appropriation and allocation of water quality project funding in conformance with FP-8 was suspended while the lawsuit was being deliberated.

In 2013, the State Supreme Court ruled in favor and upheld the decisions of the Pierce County Superior Court which concluded that:

1 Predecessor to the current Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee)
King County, as Metro’s successor, is authorized by RCW 35.58.200 to engage in water pollution abatement activities, including activities related to sewage treatment and disposal, and water quality improvements including the Culver Fund activities at issue in this lawsuit.

All Culver Fund activities and projects at issue in this lawsuit are for water pollution abatement as defined by the statue, and related directly and indirectly to sewage treatment and disposal. Plaintiffs have failed to carry their burden of establishing that the county lacks the legal authority to include Culver expenditures in calculating the sewage system’s total monetary requirements under the Contract.

Financial Policy 8 authorizes the County to engage in water quality improvement activities, programs, and projects, in addition to those that are functions of sewage treatment, after consideration of criteria and limitations suggested by MWPAAC, and to fund those projects from sewer rate revenues up to 1.5 percent of the annual wastewater system’s operating budget. The Culver Fund expenditures at issue in this case were properly determined to be eligible for funding from sewer rate revenues after consideration of criteria and limitations suggested by MWPAAC, and did not exceed 1.5 percent of the annual wastewater system operating budget.

The Contracts between the county and plaintiffs expressly contemplate that the component agencies are subject to the County’s reasonable rules and regulations as they may be enacted and evolve over time, and the County will operate its wastewater treatment facilities pursuant to a Comprehensive Plan that evolves over time. These evolving obligations include the component agencies’ obligations to pay for water pollution abatement activities, including water improvement activities; The reasonable rules and regulation referenced in the Contract include the RWSP enacted in 1999, and the Culver Fund policy (Financial Policy 8) contained therein.

Following the final appeals to the lawsuit being exhausted in the first quarter of 2014, Wastewater Treatment Division staff reached out to contract agencies via MWPAAC to express the Executive’s intention to reinstate the funding and allocations for water quality projects in his proposed 2015-16 County budget.

Subsequently, Wastewater Treatment Division staff began working with MWPAAC in the second quarter of 2014 to gather input and suggestions regarding “criteria and limitations” for funding of water quality improvement activities, programs and projects. MWPAAC appointed a subcommittee entitled the “Our Waters Working Group”, chaired by Pam Carter, Commissioner for the Valley View Sewer District to develop MWPAACs recommendations regarding this funding.
The working group proposed criteria and limitations to MWPAAC’s general assembly this summer and MWPAAC made its recommendations to the Executive. These recommendations were also presented to RWQC at its October 2014 meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:** none